



January 2020

## Maladjustment Correlates Associated With Sexual Perpetration Tactics

Katya Maureen Mickelson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

---

### Recommended Citation

Mickelson, Katya Maureen, "Maladjustment Correlates Associated With Sexual Perpetration Tactics" (2020). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3286.  
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/3286>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [und.common@library.und.edu](mailto:und.common@library.und.edu).

MALADJUSTMENT CORRELATES ASSOCIATED WITH SEXUAL PERPETRATION  
TACTICS

by

Katya Maureen Mickelson  
Bachelor of Arts, Concordia College, 2007

A Thesis  
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

Grand Forks, North Dakota

August  
2020

This thesis, submitted by Katya Maureen Mickelson in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts from the University of North Dakota, has been read by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done and is hereby approved.

---

Name of Chairperson

---

Name of Committee Member

---

Name of Committee Member

---

Name of Committee Member

This thesis is being submitted by the appointed advisory committee as having met all of the requirements of the School of Graduate Studies at the University of North Dakota and is hereby approved.

---

Chris Nelson  
Dean of the School of Graduate Studies

---

Date

## PERMISSION

Title Maladjustment Correlates Associated with Sexual Perpetration Tactics

Department Psychology

Degree Master of Arts

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my thesis work or, in his absence, by the Chairperson of the department or the dean of the School of Graduate Studies. It is understood that any copying or publication of other use of this thesis or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Katya Maureen Mickelson  
August 2, 2020

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                        | Page |
|------------------------|------|
| LIST OF TABLES .....   | v    |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... | vi   |
| ABSTRACT .....         | vii  |
| INTRODUCTION .....     | 1    |
| METHODS .....          | 20   |
| PROCEDURE .....        | 24   |
| DATA ANALYSIS .....    | 24   |
| RESULTS .....          | 27   |
| DISCUSSION .....       | 31   |
| LIMITATIONS .....      | 34   |
| CONCLUSION .....       | 34   |
| REFERENCES .....       | 55   |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table   | Page  |
|---|-------|
| 1. Participant Characteristics .....  | 35    |
| 2. Macro-Tactics of Sexual Perpetration .....   | 36    |
| 3. Micro-Tactics of Sexual Perpetration .....   | 37    |
| 4. Indicators of Maladjustment .....  | 38    |
| 5. Family of Origin Economic Status .....   | 39    |
| 6. Current Economic Status .....  | 39    |
| 7. Arrest History .....   | 40    |
| 8. Number of Jobs Terminated From .....   | 40    |
| 9. Longest Period (in Months) of Unemployment Since Age 18 .....                                    | 41    |
| 10. Number of Marriages .....   | 41    |
| 11. Number of Divorces .....  | 41    |
| 12. Number of Live-in Relationships .....   | 42    |
| 13. Number of Live-in Relationship Breakups .....   | 42    |
| 14. Self-Reported Act of Rape .....   | 42    |
| 15. Tactical Group Descriptive Statistics .....   | 43    |
| 16. Descriptive Statistics .....  | 44    |
| 17. Severity Index .....  | 45    |
| 18. Trait Differences by Sexual Perpetration Group Analyses of Covariance .....                     | 46    |
| 19. Trait Difference by Macro-Tactics of Sexual Perpetration Group Analyses of<br>Covariance .....  | 47    |
| 20. Trait Differences of Macro-Tactics Sexual Perpetration Group Analyses of<br>Covariance .....    | 48    |
| 21. Trait Differences by Macro-Tactic of Sexual Perpetration Group Analyses of<br>Covariance .....  | 49    |
| 22. Trait Differences by Micro-Tactics of Sexual Perpetration Group Analyses of<br>Covariance ..... | 50-51 |
| 23. Trait Differences of Micro-Tactics of Sexual Perpetration Group Analyses of<br>Covariance ..... | 52-53 |
| 24. SES Severity Index .....  | 54    |

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deepest appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Alan King, for all of his support and patience. Additionally, thank you to my committee members Drs. RaeAnn Anderson and Thomas Petros for your help through this process. Stepanie Brezinski, Angie Minnich, Kathryn Lang, Kaitlin Guston, and Kelly Cuccolo thank you for everything too numerous to list. Adequate words do not exist to express my appreciation to Davey and Gump so I will just say thank you.

To Davey and Gump for literally everything.



## ABSTRACT

This project completed a partial replication and extension of a prior study (Norton-Baker, Russell, & King, 2018) regarding tactical differences in sexual perpetration victimization strategies. Respondents ( $n = 559$ ) completed the Revised Sexual Experiences Survey-Long Form Perpetrator (SES-LFP) before being assigned to different macro-tactical groups (i.e. Non-Violent, Coercive, Aggressive, Polytactic). Membership to groups of micro-tactics of sexual perpetration was then assigned (sexual harassment, non-consensual distribution of sexual content, voyeurism, exhibitionism, sexual coercion, sexual coercion facilitated by substances, sexual perpetration, sexual perpetration facilitated by substances, and multiparticipant offenders). Participants completed the PID-5 as well as other measures of maladjustment. Polytactic perpetrators had consistently higher PID-5 domain and facet scores with evidence of other forms of maladjustment (e.g. higher time spent incarcerated, higher rates of job termination, higher rates of relationship instability). Significant differences were found between micro-tactic groups and non-violent controls on both PID-5 scores and other indicators of maladjustment. These findings suggested that perpetrators of sexual perpetration can be differentiated in both their macro/micro-tactics and levels of personality maladjustment. Systematic efforts to examine tactical differences in perpetrators may enhance the prediction, prevention, and treatment of sexual perpetration.

### **Maladjustment Correlates Associated with Selected Sexual Perpetration Tactics**

Sexual perpetration is broadly defined as any sexual activity wherein consent is not freely given (Center for Disease Control, 2019). This unwanted sexual activity includes sexual threats, unwanted sexual contact and experiences, sexual coercion, and rape (Walters, Chen & Breiding, 2012). The economic consequences of sexual perpetration in America total more than \$127 billion per year, or about \$151,423 per rape per year (Where We Stand, 2017; Delisi, 2010). In addition to the economic consequences felt by taxpayers, victims of sexual perpetration contend with numerous health consequences. These individuals are more likely to experience depression, anxiety, traumatic stress, revictimization, and long-term health consequences (Campbell & Wasco, 2005; Santiago, McCall-Perez, Gorcey & Beigel, 1985; Rothbaum, Foa, Riggs, Murdock, & Walsh, 1992). As the economic and personal consequences are significant, efforts to further refine both theory and predictive diagnostics regarding perpetrators of rape are important.

### **Sexual Perpetration Tactics**

Studies of individuals who engage in sexual perpetration have focused disproportionately on the antecedents (e.g. juvenile delinquency, attitudes promoting violence against women) and direct consequences (e.g. incarceration, mental health implications) of these acts. The tactics and strategies relied upon by sexual aggressors to victimize their targets has been given more limited attention. One recent analysis (Norton-Baker, Russell, & King, 2018) instead examined differentiated male perpetrators of unwanted sexual contact based on whether they relied exclusively on coercion, physical force, or a combination of the two tactics to achieve their objectives. The aim of this analysis was to identify whether levels of personality pathology differed between these tactic conditions. The researchers asserted the findings would assist in bridging the gap between research and clinical practice by allowing practitioners to add

more evidence-based predictors (e.g. rape myth acceptance, relevant personality profiles) to assessment procedures. Survey respondents ( $N = 672$ ) were administered the Sexual Experiences Survey-Short Form Perpetration (SES-SFP; Koss et al., 2007) and sorted into four tactical conditions: A) nonviolent controls ( $n = 509$ ); B) physical/aggressive ( $n = 52$ ); C) non-physical/coercive ( $n = 57$ ); or D) and what the researchers called “polytactic” (i.e. individuals who utilize both physical/aggressive means and non-physical/coercive means to gain unwanted sexual contact;  $n = 54$ ). Criterion trait scores were provided by the Personality Inventory for the DSM-5 (PID-5; Krueger, Derringer, Markon, Watson, & Skodol, 2012). Polytactic individuals scored significantly higher than all three of the comparison groups on nine facet dimension (Suspiciousness, Irresponsibility, Intimacy Avoidance, Grandiosity, Callousness, Attention Seeking, Perceptual Dysregulation, & Rigid Perfectionism) and Antagonism as a domain score. Coercive individuals were found to be higher than controls on six facet dimensions (Deceitfulness, Distractibility, Emotional Lability, Irresponsibility, Perseveration, & Separation Insecurity). Facet clusters were aggregated to identify diagnostic criteria for selected personality disorders based on an established rubric (Yam & Simms, 2014). This study found rates of potential antisocial and narcissistic personality disorder(s) were three times higher among polytactic respondents than those found in the other three comparison conditions. The results obtained from these analyses suggested that men employing polytactic methods were significantly more maladaptive in personality functioning than nonviolent, physically aggressive, or coercive men.

This study was limited in its lack of control for the severity of sexual perpetration distributed across the three sexual perpetration conditions. Polytactic men tended to score higher on the SES-SFP as at least one instance of coercion and at least one instance of physical force

were required for inclusion in this category. As such, potential personality pathology may have been higher among polytactic men as a result of their sexual perpetration severity rather than the tactics that they employed. Additionally, estimated diagnostic rates of personality disturbance in this study did not assess evidence of impairment in interpersonal and/or daily living functioning. The present study will attempt to replicate these prior findings will extending the literature with analyses of a range of additional maladjustment indicators and micro-tactics employed in the act of sexual perpetration. For the purpose of this study macro-tactics will include the broad classifications of non-violence, coercion, aggression, and polytactic (as defined by Norton-Baker, Russell, & King, 2018). Micro-tactics will include more specific means of gaining unwanted sexual contact (i.e.

### **The Sexual Experiences Survey**

The Sexual Experiences Survey has been used extensively in the literature to identify the prevalence self-reported acts of sexual perpetration (Spitzberg, 1999; Anderson et al., 2019). The developers of this measure created a survey comprised of 12 yes-no questions regarding victimization and the perpetration of sexual coercion, sexual threat, and sexual force. The original survey included forms for victimization and perpetration. Victimization forms were utilized for a female population only and perpetration forms were used solely for males. The factors which emerged from this analysis corresponded with three levels of sexual victimization and perpetration (i.e. sexual coercion, sexual threat, and sexual force).

The original SES was later modified to improve communication clarity and four categories of sexual perpetration emerged: non-sexually aggressive, sexually coercive, sexually abusive, and sexually assaultive. Additionally, data indicated self-disclosure of sexually aggressive behaviors changed when individuals were interviewed. Findings suggested 34% of

individuals were classified as less sexually aggressive when interviewed than when completing the SES. This data suggests the SES is a valuable tool in detecting underreported instances of sexual perpetration.

As researchers continued to use and alter the SES to meet individual needs, Koss et al. (2007) revised the original survey and converted it into both long and short versions to aid in continuity of the assessment. Additionally, the survey was adapted for use in assessing both sexual perpetration victims and perpetrators. The following four versions were created: the SES Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP), the SES Long-Form Victimization (SES-LFV), the SES Short-Form Perpetration (SES-SPF), and the SES Short-Form Victimization (SES-SFV). The long forms of the SES included items to assess for noncontact misdemeanor sex crimes, as well as items relating to sexual contact and substances. Furthermore, the language in all four forms was altered to reduce vague and ambiguous wording, and to eliminate heteronormative bias by using words which allow for both women and men to be perpetrators and/or victims of sexual perpetration. Scoring of the SES reveals the prevalence of the perpetration of, or experience of, non-perpetration, coercion, non-contact, contact, attempted rape, and rape.

### **The Confluence Model**

The Confluence Model (Malamuth, 1986) has provided one of the earliest and most widely supported theoretical models of sexual perpetration. Confluence theory implicates dominance as a sexual motive, hostility toward women, attitudes promoting violence against women, sexual experience, and sexual arousal in response to aggression. Additionally, predictive ability increased when a combination of these factors was employed. A regression equation was created including these interactions among predictive factors which was more effective than a purely additive model.

Efforts have been made to further refine and validate the Confluence Model by comparing men who sexually aggress on women, men who non-sexually aggress on women (e.g. physical violence, domestic violence), and those who do both. In one study, researchers surveyed a sample of college men to examine five latent factors and 16 measured variables (Malamuth, Sockloskie, Koss & Tanaka, 1991). Statistical analysis of data indicated hostile childhood experiences impacted one's involvement in delinquency, which then led to aggression via two paths. The first path suggested hostile attitudes led to sexual and nonsexual coercion resulting in aggression. The second path suggested sexual promiscuity, when interacting with hostility, led to aggression. This study further refined and validated The Confluence Model.

Researchers have sought to replicate and extend earlier confluence work in their efforts to predict general patterns of conflict with women within a longitudinal framework. In one study, a sample of men were surveyed, and followed-up with after ten years (Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes & Al, 1995). Researchers were interested to examine if these men's relationships with women were distressed, if they engaged in sexual perpetration, if they engaged in nonsexual perpetration, and/or if they experienced a combination of these behaviors. Statistical analysis indicated strong support for confluence theory. Data suggested the use of a hierarchical conceptualization could further refine the model. More specifically, the data suggested hostile masculinity and impersonal sex both had pathways towards conflict with women.

Other work has expanded the Confluence Model and its risk factors for sexual perpetration. Researchers have found delinquency, hostile masculinity, impersonal sex, and a misperception of women's sexual cues were all positively and directly linked with the frequency of sexually violent acts perpetrated by men (Abbey et al., 2011). Additionally, these researchers found childhood victimization, personality traits typifying subclinical levels of psychopathy, and

use of alcohol were indirectly linked to with the frequency of sexually violent acts perpetrated by men. Other researchers have found that not only do hostile masculinity and impersonal sex interact in a manner which predicts sexual perpetration, but that empathy moderates these constructs in predicting sexual perpetration (Wheeler, George, & Dahl, 2002). More specifically, these researchers found men with high levels of hostile masculinity and impersonal sex, and with low levels of empathy report higher rates of perpetrating sexual perpetration than all other males. Additionally, men with high levels of hostile masculinity and impersonal sex, and with high levels of empathy reported rates of perpetrating sexual perpetration at a similar rate to other males. Much of the work regarding the Confluence Model and risk factors associated with it has been done comparing men who engage in sexual perpetration to men who do not engage in sexual perpetration. As such, the literature could benefit from examining risk factors through the lens of different tactics for sexual perpetration (Degue & Dilillo, 2004; Degue et al., 2010).

### **Personality Indicators for Sexual perpetration**

Efforts have been made in research to link mental health conditions to the perpetration of sexual perpetration. Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD) is manifested in a grandiose self-image, fantasies regarding power and status, entitlement, arrogance, interpersonal exploitation, and a lack of empathy (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Research has indicated the NPD features relating to grandiosity, exploitation of others and sense of entitlement are positively associated with sexual perpetration (Zeigler-Hill, Enjaian, & Essa, 2013; Russell & King, 2017). NPD traits have been positively linked with acts of sexual perpetration, and subjects with NPD traits have been shown to hold more rape supportive beliefs (Bushman et al., 2003; Mouilso & Calhoun, 2012).

Many traits consistent with NPD are also core traits of Antisocial Personality Disorder (ASPD; e.g. lack of empathy, impulsivity, manipulative behaviors, and exploitation of others; Paulhus, 2014). These core traits have been consistently linked to the perpetration of sexual perpetration. ASPD contains attributes relating to impulsivity, deceit, aggressiveness, a lack of respect for the safety of others, and a lack of remorse (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Psychopathy is a construct which appears to be related to ASPD due to the shared elements regarding disinhibition, impulsiveness, and aggression (Coid & Ullrich, 2010; Strickland, Drislane, Lucy, Krueger & Patrick, 2013; Venables, Hall & Patrick, 2013). Research has indicated those with traits related to psychopathy and antisocial tendencies are at a higher rate for engaging in sexual perpetration, and for engaging in the recidivism of sexual perpetration (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005; Mouilso & Calhoun, 2012; Kosson, Kelly & White, 1997; Serin, Mailoux & Malcolm, 2001). Further examination of the core traits of NPD, ASPD, and other personality disorders could serve to refine predictive efforts for sexual perpetration via the development of robust personality profiles of sexual perpetrators, as well as the identification of more detailed risk factors associated with sexual predation. Additionally, the literature could benefit from examining potential personality disorders and their link to various sexually aggressive tactics.

### **Coercion and Physical Force**

Much of the current literature on sexual perpetration has focused on sexual perpetration and sexual coercion as two fundamental tactics used as sexual victimization strategies. In reference to sexual perpetration, aggression refers to the use of physical tactics to gain unwanted sexual contact (Degue et al., 2010). The physical tactics used to gain sexual contact include aggression (i.e. physical violence to render an unwilling partner unable to avoid the encounter),



and drug-facilitated aggression (i.e. a perpetrator using intoxicants to render the victim unable to give consent; Degue et al., 2010; Kilpatrick, Resnick, Ruggiero, Conoscenti & Mccauley, 2007). Sexual perpetration also may include the use of chemical means (e.g. alcohol, drugs) to reduce a victim's inhibitions, or their ability to avoid the sexual encounter (e.g. alcohol, drugs; Gilmore et al., 2014; DeGue et al., 2010).

The prevalence of sexual perpetration has been studied at length over the past 35 years. A prior study evaluated data generated from 341 women and 294 men who completed an anonymous survey regarding their most recent date (Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987). The findings indicated 77.6% of women who responded experienced sexual perpetration. Additionally, 14.7% of women who responded indicated they experienced physical force which resulted in forceable sexual intercourse. Another study examined rape within the confines of marriage wherein a sample of 930 women in San Francisco were surveyed on their experiences of sexual perpetration via physical force (Russell, 1990). Findings generated by this study indicated 8% of the women surveyed experienced rape perpetrated by their husbands. The researchers found this number grew to 14% when women who were ever married were asked about rape within the relationship. A more recent study revealed similar marital rape prevalence rates (i.e. affecting 10-14% of married women) and found approximately one third of women in relationships, married or in long term relationships, endorsed experiencing unwanted sexual contact with their partner (Bergen & Barnhill, 2006; Bergen, 2016). Tactics involving alcohol appear to be commonly used in the perpetration of sexual perpetration as studies indicate they occur in roughly half of all reported instances sexual assault (Abbey et al., 1996; Abbey et al., 2001; Abbey et al., 2004). Today, more than 23 million women in the United States, an estimated 19.3% of the female

population, have been raped in their lifetime (Breiding et al., 2014). Each year there is an average of 321,500 rape victims aged 12 and over (Department of Justice, 2018).

Not only has research set out to document the prevalence of sexual perpetration, but has sought to identify risk factors associated with those who use physical force to perpetrate sexual perpetration. One such risk factor identified in the literature is the construct of hostile masculinity. Hostile masculinity refers to men who are distrustful of women, easily angered by women, and who approach relationships with women in an adversarial manner in which they seek dominance (Abbey et al., 2011; Malamuth, 2003, Malamuth et al., 1995; Parkhill & Abbey, 2008; Russell & King, 2017). Both hostility towards women and rape myth acceptance are common components in hostile masculinity, and have both been suggested as risk factors for physical sexual perpetration (Abbey, Jacques-Tiura, & Lebreton, 2011; DeGue, & DiLillo, 2004; DeGue, DiLillo & Scalora, 2010; Lisak & Roth, 1988). Hostility towards women refers to behaviors illustrating distrust and aggression towards women whereas rape myth acceptance refers to inaccurate beliefs regarding rape (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). Additionally, the literature suggests male misunderstanding of the sexual cues of women may be a risk factor for sexual perpetration using physical force (Abbey, Mcauslan, Zawacki, Clinton & Buck, 2001). Another study found in a population of adolescents a history of childhood sexual abuse, witnessing family violence, substance use, behaviors suggesting a risk of suicide, and gang affiliation were risk factors for physical sexual perpetration (Borowsky, Hogan & Ireland, 1997).

One specific form of unwanted non-copulatory (oral or genital) sexual perpetration derived from physical forces, as highlighted in the SES, is referred to in the literature as frotteurism (e.g. touching or rubbing another individual without their consent). Research

indicates victims of frotteurism may experience psychological distress, as well as feelings of disgust and violation, and behavioral changes (Clark, Jeglic, Calkins, & Tatar, 2016).

Frotteuristic behaviors are relatively understudied, but some literature suggests the prevalence of such behaviors as between 7.9%-35% (American Psychological Association, 2013; Johnson, Ostermeyer, Sikes, Nelsen, & Coverdale, 2014). Additionally, the literature suggests 11% of sexually violent offenders endorsed engaging in behaviors relating to frotteurism (Abel et al., 1987). While there appears to be a dearth of literature regarding the risk factors associated with the perpetration of frotteurism there is some indication that nonsexual antisocial behavior and hypersexuality are linked with this form of sexual perpetration (American Psychological Association, 2013).

Another common form of sexual perpetration identified in research is coercion. The literature defines coercive sexual perpetration as the use of nonphysical means to obtain unwanted sexual contact (DeGue, DiLillo, Scalora, 2010). Research suggests verbal sexual coercion (i.e. the use of verbal tactics such as threats and overwhelming arguments) is a common form of sexual perpetration (Gilmore et al., 2014; DeGue et al., 2010). In one study, researchers administered the SES to a nationwide sample of 6,159 women and men (Koxs, Gidyca & Wisniewski, 1987). Analysis of responses indicated 44% of women experienced sexual coercion. Another study examined sexual coercion within the context of intimate partner relationships (Basiel, 2002). Data from a 1997 national sample suggested 34% of women experienced sexual coercion committed by either a husband, or intimate partner. Additionally, these findings suggested sexual coercion was not only perpetrated via verbal tactics (e.g. intimate partners suggesting sexual contact was the respondent's duty as a romantic partner), but 24% of women experienced sexual coercion wherein monetary tactics were employed (e.g. unwanted

sexual contact to obtain spending money). More recently, findings from a national survey on sexual perpetration indicated 13% of women experience sexual coercion during their lifetime (Walters, Chen & Breiding, 2012). The literature indicates no statistically significant change in the rates and prevalence of sexual coercion in the past 50 years, suggesting sexual coercion is a common form of sexual perpetration today (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004).

The body of literature on sexual coercion has worked to identify risk factors for men who engage in coercive sexual perpetration. Early research suggested sexually coercive males endorsed aggression against both women and men, reduced social constraints, and personality characteristics relating to irresponsibility (Rapaport & Burkhart, 1984). Other work has reported a history of early behavioral problems suggestive of psychopathology is a risk factor for sexually coercive behavior (Lalumiere & Quinsey, 1996). Additionally, the researchers indicated sensation-seeking, self-perceived mating success, and promiscuity as being risk factors for sexually coercive behaviors. The literature has also suggested sexually coercive men endorse promiscuity and permissive views on rape (Tyler, Hoyt & Whitbeck, 1998). Within a college sample, both men and women who engage in sexually coercive behaviors endorse high sex-related alcohol expectancies (Palmer, McMahon, Rounsaville & Ball, 2009). In one study, researchers examined sexually coercive behavior within the context of attachment. Results suggested attachment avoidance as being linked to the perpetration of sexually coercive behaviors (Karantzas et al., 2016). In another study, researchers compared a sample of sexually coercive males to a group of men who did not engage in sexually violent behaviors (DeGue & DiLillo, 2004). Data suggested sexually coercive men were more likely to endorse rape myths and held greater hostility towards women than their non-offending counterparts. The sexually coercive men reported higher levels of adversarial views towards relationships with women.

Additionally, sexually coercive men reported more promiscuity, delinquency, and psychopathic personality traits. These men were more likely to struggle with empathy and to have a history of childhood abuse. The researchers noted the sexually coercive men did not significantly differ from existing research on physically sexually aggressive men on child physical abuse, delinquency, and domination/hedonism motives regarding sexual encounters.

The literature contains efforts to compare sexually coercive men to physically sexually aggressive men and to non-sexually violent men. One study surveyed men by asking them to disclose any sexually coercive or aggressive behavior since age 14 (Lyndon, White & Kadlec, 2007). These men were separated into three groups: non-sexually violent men, men who engaged in sexual coercive behaviors, and men who engaged in sexually aggressive behaviors. The researchers found the men who engaged in sexually coercive behaviors were more likely have a relationship with their victim than the men who engaged in sexually aggressive behaviors, but less likely than men who reported no history of sexually violent behaviors. The literature has also suggested rape myth acceptance, generalized aggression, promiscuity, interpersonal reactivity and empathic concern, social potency, a history of childhood sexual abuse, and educational level could reliably distinguish sexually coercive men from non-sexually violent men (DeGue, DiLillo & Scalora, 2010).

While the majority of the literature on sexual perpetration has focused on the differences between perpetrators and non-perpetrators, some research has discussed the differences between those who engage in forced versus coerced sexual perpetration. One prior study suggested hostile childhood experiences impacted delinquent behaviors which could then either lead to sexual coercion via hostile attitudes and personality, or to sexual perpetration via the interaction of sexual promiscuity and its interaction with hostility (Malamuth, Sockloskie, Koss & Tanaka,

1991). Another work examined a sample of university men for sexual behaviors involving consensual sexual encounters, physical sexual perpetration, verbal coercion, and perceived uncontrollable arousal (Byers & Eno, 1991). All four categories of sexual behaviors were found to be associated with the belief in traditional gender roles and rape myths. Sexual aggressors were associated with high levels of violence acceptance and arousability, as well as erotophobia. The authors suggested the individuals who engage in sexual perpetration were more likely to consider themselves highly arousable, erotophobic, accepting of interpersonal violence, and less likely to engage in dating/romantic relationships. More than half of the men in the sample who endorsed consensual sexual encounters also endorsed the use of verbal coercion. One prior study found shared risk factors for sexual perpetration between sexually aggressive and sexually coercive men were belief in rape myths, sexual promiscuity, generalized aggression, and low empathic concern (Degue, DiLillo & Scalora, 2010). The researchers found key differences between traits held by sexual coercers and those who use physical force. Sexual coercers more commonly illustrated manipulative tendencies as well as the ability to identify with the feelings of fictional characters. The researchers suggested these two risk factors were useful in securing unwanted sexual contact via verbal means. Men prone to the use of physical force were found to have a tendency to engage in impulsive behavior and to eschew social norms. Additionally, sexual aggressors who used physical force were found to have higher levels of egocentricity and childhood emotional abuse. The researchers suggested these factors helped bridge the gap between sexual coercion and sexual perpetration.

### **Other Forms of Sexual Perpetration**

To date, much of the sexual perpetration literature has only addressed sexual perpetration and sexual coercion in broad terms. However, further delineation of specific tactics involving

physical force and sexually coercive tactics could prove beneficial in the prediction of individuals at risk of perpetrating sexual perpetration. One potential distinction in tactics could involve the use of substances to facilitate sexual perpetration. In the literature, both sexual perpetration and, at times, sexual coercion address the use of substance facilitated sexual perpetration, but much of the research has focused on the prevalence and victims of substance facilitated sexual perpetration. Studies have suggested substance facilitated sexual perpetration is common in that alcohol tends to be an element in between one- and two-thirds of reported sexual assault cases reported to police, where drugs were suspected in 10% of reported cases (Kelly, Lovett & Regan, 2005; Testa & Parks, 1996). Other work has distinguished between assaults preceded by voluntary incapacitation (i.e. a victim who was aware they were using to the point of intoxication) and involuntary incapacitation (i.e. a victim having their drink spiked). One such study found within drug-related assaults, 84.6% could be attributed to voluntary incapacitation and 15.4% could be attributed to involuntary incapacitation (Lawyer, Resnick, Bakanic, Burkett & Kilpatrick, 2010). However, these numbers could be artificially low as some work has suggested victims of drug-facilitated rape are less likely to report their assaults to law enforcement (Kilpatrick et al., 2007). A prior study examined a sample of women ( $N = 1,998$ ) who had experienced forcible rape, incapacitated rape, and/or substance facilitated rape (McCauley, Ruggiero, Resnick & Kilpatrick, 2010). The researchers found individuals who had experienced forcible rape had increased rates of binge drinking, marijuana use, and illicit drug use. Individuals with a history of forcible rape and substance facilitated rape had increased incidence of marijuana and illicit drug use. Research has suggested alcohol exacerbates existing risk factors for sexual perpetration (Abbey, Zawacki, Buck, Clinton & McAuslan, 2001). This research has also suggested stereotypes about women who drink, the effects alcohol has on

sexual and aggressive behavior, as well as its effects on cognitive and motor skills can impact sexual assault. Empirical support has been found for the linkage of alcohol and sexual assault. Research has indicated the beliefs and experiences of dating, sexuality, and alcohol can lead to a man's misperception of a female's sexual cues resulting in sexual assault (Abbey, 1991; Abbey, Ross, & McDuffie, 1994; Abbey, Ross, McDuffie, & McAuslan, 1996; Abbey, McAuslan & Ross, 1998). While substance facilitated sexual perpetration has been researched at length, little has been done to discuss the differences between men who use substances to engage in sexual perpetration (i.e. a perpetrator using intoxicants to render the victim unable to give consent) and men who use substances to engage in sexual coercion (i.e. chemical means to reduce inhibitions).

One non-contact sexual perpetration strategy involves showing another individual sexual material (e.g. pornographic images) without consent. This type of unwanted sexual contact is relatively understudied possibly due to relatively recent technologies allowing for its transference (e.g. social media, texting) and recent social awareness (e.g. the #MeToo Movement). Some estimates indicate 53% of women 18- to 34-years old have received photographs of male genitalia, while over one-third of women 35- to 54-years old endorsed receiving these images (Bame, 2017). Of 18- to 34- year old women, 78% reported receiving these images without consent. However, only 27% of men age 18- to 34- endorsed sending these images. While this appears to be a relatively common tactic used to gain unwanted sexual contact, little research has been done examining perpetrators of this type of sexual perpetration. Some studies suggest youth who engage in sending unwanted sexual material engage in aggressive and delinquent behaviors, have academic issues, engage in substance use, have a poor emotional bond with caregivers, and limited parental monitoring (Ybarra, Mitchell, 2004; Ybarra, Espelage & Mitchell, 2007). In one



college sample, researchers found rape supportive beliefs, peer approval of forced sex, number of sexual partners, and exposure to pornography all contributed to the use of technology to engage in this sexual coercion tactic (Thompson & Morrison, 2013).

Another non-contact tactic for sexual perpetration is sexual harassment. Sexual harassment is defined as unwanted sexual advances, solicitation for sexual contact, or any other harassing contact of a sexual nature (United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, n.d.). Researchers have examined sexual harassment over different categories including sexual bribery, unwanted sexual advances, and unwanted sexual comments (Till, 1980; Gruber, 1992). A recent survey found 81% of women sampled experienced some form of sexual harassment (Kearl, 2018). Additionally, this survey found perpetrators of sexual harassment were most frequently solo men who were strangers to their victims. Research indicates risk factors for sexual harassment perpetration include Dark Triad traits (i.e. narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism), low levels of honesty-humility, and have motivation to engage in self-protection (Key & Ridge, 2011; Lee et al., 2003; Zeigler-Hill, Besser, Morag, & Campbell, 2016). The literature also suggests men who engage in sexual harassment may target women who violate gender norms (Berdahl, 2006). Other work has found men's short-term mating orientation is predictive of unwanted sexual attention and men's hostile sexism is predictive of both unwanted sexual attention and gender harassment (Diehl, Rees & Bohner, 2012).

Other non-contact methods of obtaining unwanted sexual contact include paraphilia-like voyeurism (e.g. watching someone undress without their consent, videotaping someone having sex without their consent), and exhibitionism (e.g. showing another individual one's genitalia without consent, masturbating in front of another without their consent). Data from a national survey of adults in Sweden aged 18- to 60-years old (Langstrom 2005; Langstrom, 2006)

indicated 3.1% of the sample engaged in behaviors relating to exhibitionism, while 7.7% of the sample endorsed behaviors relating to voyeurism. Additionally, this survey suggested men were twice as likely to engage in behaviors relating to exhibitionism and three times as likely to engage in behaviors relating to voyeurism than women. Analysis of this survey suggested both of these paraphilia-like behaviors were linked with lower life satisfaction, substance use, high sexual arousal, and frequent pornography consumption. The literature has identified parental sensitivity, avoidant personality disorders, and depressive personality disorders as potentially unique contributors to behaviors relating to exhibitionism (Bogaerts, Vanheule, Leeuw & Desmet, 2006). Other works has suggested behaviors relating to both voyeurism and exhibitionism have strong to moderate associations with sexually coercive behavior (Baur et al., 2014). Additionally, some data has indicated within populations of exhibitionism 25% of individuals recidivate and 5-10% of individuals who engage in behaviors relating to exhibitionism move onto contact sexual offenses (e.g. sexual assault, rape; McNally & Fremouw, 2014).

As shown, sexual perpetration can be committed through various contact and non-contact means. All of the methods discussed can occur deliberately or opportunistically, and perpetrators of such behaviors may offend individually or with other men. Further research into the risk factors and specific potential personality disorders associated with different tactics of obtaining unwanted sexual contact could assist in refining predictive models for sexual perpetration.

### **Overall Project Objectives**

This project will replicate and extend a prior study (Norton-Baker et al., 2018) of tactical differences in sexual perpetration strategies. The current study will further differentiate potentially meaningful tactical strategies using the SES-LFP to include sexual harassment, non-

consensual distribution of sexual content, voyeurism, exhibitionism, sexual coercion, sexual coercion facilitated by substances, sexual perpetration via physical force, sexual perpetration facilitated by substances, and multiparticipant offenses. Sexual harassment (SH) will be defined as making unwanted comments of a sexual nature, or making unwanted obscene phone calls. Non-consensual distribution of sexual content (NCDS) will be classified as sending unwanted sexual or obscene materials to another individual. Voyeurism (VOY) will include the endorsement of items relating to watching another undress, watching another engage in sexual acts, and/or making a digital record of these behaviors (i.e. taking photographs, making videos) without consent. Exhibitionism (EXH) will be defined as exposing one's genitals, making sexual motions (e.g. pretending to masturbate, imitating oral sex) without consent. Verbal sexual coercion (VSC) will include verbal threats to end a relationship, the spreading of rumors, making of false promises, and unyielding verbal pressure to gain unwanted sexual contact. Sexual coercion facilitated by substances (SCFS) will be defined as encouraging another to use substances (i.e. alcohol, drugs) to the point where they were too intoxicated to give consent or to stop what was happening. Sexual perpetration via physical force (SAPF) will be considered the use of force (e.g. holding one down, pinning one's arms, having a weapon) to gain unwanted sexual contact. Sexual perpetration facilitated by substances (SAFS) will be defined as giving someone a drug (e.g. GHB, Rohypnol) without their consent, or serving another individual high alcohol content drinks when they are presented as regular strength drinks to the point where they were too intoxicated to give consent or to stop what was happening. Multiparticipant offenses (MP) will be defined as any sexually aggressive act which was committed with at least one additional offender.

Participants will also be administered the PID-5 to establish personality traits and profiles evident within each of the tactical groups. This study will extend the current literature beyond personality analyses through the inclusion of additional developmental antecedents and consequences of tactical group assignment that may prove meaningful. Participants will be asked to complete the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Questionnaire, and the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS). Additionally, participants will be asked to indicate their employment status, current and historical socioeconomic status, relationship status, family history of alcoholism, history of mental health diagnoses, and legal history (see Table 1 and Table 4).

### **Study Hypotheses**

This study examined the following hypothesis:

- H1: Polytactic males are hypothesized to score higher on the PID-5 and on all other maladjustment indicators even after statistical control for overall sexual perpetration severity.
- H2: Individuals who endorse engaging in any act of sexual perpetration with a group of individuals are expected to score higher on measures of maladjustment than males who engage in sexual perpetration alone even after statistical control for overall sexual perpetration severity.
- H3: Polytactic men will be more likely to indicate “yes” on the final question of the SES-LFP (e.g. “Do you think you may have ever raped someone?”).
- H4: Men who endorse the use of physical tactics (e.g. sexual perpetration via physical force) will have higher levels of maladjustment indicators than males who endorse the use non-physical tactics (e.g. sexual harassment) even after statistical control for overall sexual perpetration severity.

H5: Respondents' PID-5 scores will be positively correlated with scores on other indicators of maladjustment.

## Methods

### Participants

Participants were recruited via Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) as prior research has indicated MTurk is an acceptable platform for recruiting research participants (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011; Clifford, Jewell, & Waggoner, 2015). IRB approval was granted for this project and all respondents were provided informed consent and debriefing. An initial sample ( $n = 607$ ) of national adult males (i.e. United State residents age 18 and over) was compiled. These individuals completed the survey with less than 25% missing responses for financial compensation (\$0.50). The initial sample was refined to exclude respondents who did not meet certain criteria. Participants were asked to confirm they identified as male and those who did not were excluded ( $n = 35$ ). Male respondents who did not correctly identify a palindrome (i.e. word spelled the same way both forward and backward) in a multiple-choice comprehension item were excluded ( $n = 0$ ). A final attention check item asked each respondent if " *Now that you have completed this survey, will you provide a final summary regarding your general attentiveness and honesty in responding?*" Respondents were excluded ( $n = 5$ ) if they answered with either " *not really, my responses were semi-random*" or " *no, I didn't read most of the items and my responses were almost entirely random*". The final sample ( $n = 559$ ) of men had an average age of 38.52 years of age ( $SD = 12.07$ , Range = 18-77). The ethnicity of the final sample was as follows: White, 79.8%; Black, 7.5%; Hispanic, 5.5%; Pacific Islander, 0.4%; Asian, 3.8%; Middle Eastern, 0.2%; Biracial, 2.0%, Other, 0.9%).

## Measures

**The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Questionnaire.** The ACE Questionnaire (Felitti et al., 1998) is a 23-item measure assessing adverse childhood experiences occurring before age 16. The adverse childhood experiences are examined over seven categories including psychological abuse, physical abuse, sexual abuse, domestic violence, exposure to household members with substance abuse issues, exposure to household members with mental illness, and exposure to household members who were incarcerated. Respondents are asked to respond either *Yes*, *No*, or *Rather Not Say* to a variety of questions relating to abuse (emotional, physical, sexual) and household dysfunction. Responses are then totaled for an overall ACE score. One study assessing the reliability of the ACE Questionnaire suggests the ACE Questionnaire has an overall test-retest coefficient of .71 ( $p < .001$ ), with items relating to household dysfunction as more stable ( $r = .65, p < .001$ ) and items relating to abuse and neglect as somewhat less stable ( $r = .71, p < .001$ ; Zanotti et al., 2018).

**The Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5).** The advent of the DSM-5 led to a hybrid model of personality disorders involving both clinical diagnostics and groupings of symptoms/traits (Krueger, Derringer, Markon, Watson, & Skodal, 2012). The PID-5 was created to examine this hybrid model of personality disorders (Krueger & Markon, 2014). The PID-5's reliability and validity indicators have been suggested as acceptable, with some work citing its Cronbach's alpha values for facet scores as  $> .70$ , and as  $> .90$  for domain scores (Quilty, Ayearst, Chmielewski, Pollock, & Bagby, 2013; Fossati, Kruger, Markon, Borroni, & Maffei, 2013). The PID-5 is a 220-item measure which assesses five personality domains (Negative Affect, Detachment, Antagonism, Disinhibition, and Psychoticism). These personality domains are comprised of 25 personality facets (e.g. callousness, deceitfulness, risk taking). Items ask the

respondent to rate the degree to which they agree with statements (e.g. I have a very short temper, I enjoy being in love). Responses are based on a four-point Likert-type scale (0 = *Very false or Often False*, 1 = *Sometimes or Somewhat False*, 2 = *Sometimes or Somewhat True*, 3 = *Very True or Often True*). Research suggests the internal consistencies of the PID-5 domain trait scales were all greater than .70 (Quilty, Ayearst, Chmielewski, & Pollock, 2013). More specifically, Negative Affect  $\omega = .84$ ; Detachment  $\omega = .75$ ; Psychoticism  $\omega = .87$ ; Antagonism  $\omega = .83$ ; and Disinhibition  $\omega = .80$ . In a prior study examining the test-retest reliability of the PID-5 in a clinical sample across 1.44 years found the median Cohen's  $d$  was -.12, suggesting little change from time one to time two (Wright et al., 2015).

**The Sexual Experiences Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP).** The SES-LFP (Koss et al., 2006) assesses the frequency of perpetration of unwanted sexual acts during both the past 12-months, as well as overall since the age of 14. Respondents indicate the frequency (0, 1, 2, or  $\geq 2$ ) of various sexual acts. Scores are then calculated to indicate the prevalence of the following categories: non-perpetrator, coercion, non-contact offenses, contact offenses, attempted rape, and rape. Research indicates internal consistency for the short form of the measure (i.e. SES-SFP) measure as adequate ( $\alpha = .74$  women,  $\alpha = .89$  men) as was test-retest reliability ( $r = .93$ ; Cecil, Matson, 2006; Koss & Gidycz, 1985). This study also assessed differences in self-disclosure of sexual perpetration on the SES and during an interview. A Pearson correlation ( $r = .61$ ;  $p < .001$ ) between these two instances was established. However, less is published on the SES-LFP. One study has placed SES-LFP internal consistency as adequate ( $\alpha = .84$ ; Sisco & Koss, 2006, as cited in Sisco & Figueredo, 2008). Data indicates the internal consistency as lower for women ( $\alpha = .84$ ) which the authors suggested could be due to heteronormative bias within the SES-LFP, or due to stochastic female perpetration.

**SES Severity index.** This analysis was designed as an attempt to both replicate prior findings and attempt to control for the potential group confound of overall sexual perpetration severity. Polytactic aggressors tend to generate higher overall SES-LFP since their operational definition requires affirmative responses on relatively more items in the questionnaire. A concern was raised, but not controlled, in the earlier analysis (Norton-Baker et al., 2018) that the overall level of sexual aggressiveness would likely be associated with personality pathology and thus confound group comparisons based on preferred tactics. This study relied upon a customized SES Severity index that was calculated from the dichotomous scores for items which appeared on both the SES-LFP and the short perpetrator form (SES-SFP; e.g. threatening to physically harm an individual to gain sexual contact, using force to gain sexual contact, obtaining sexual contact when someone is too intoxicated to give consent). These items were all included in both the short and long form of the SES. SES severity indices have not been relied upon in the sexual perpetration literature given recognition that higher scores can arise from both the frequency and severity of self-reported acts. To this extent, an accepted operational definition of sexual perpetration "severity" has not arisen in the literature. The customized index relied upon in this study constitutes a rough and imprecise measure of overall aggressiveness (see Tables 17 and 24).

**Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS).** The SWLS (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) is a 5-item measure assessing a respondent's judgment of their life satisfaction. Respondents indicate the level to which they agree or disagree with each item ranging from 7 (*Strongly Agree*) to 1 (*Strongly Disagree*). Responses are then scored to assess global judgements of life satisfaction ranging from Extremely Satisfied to Extremely Dissatisfied. Research has suggested the SWLS is a measure with appropriate reliability and validity for a



diverse range of ages, has sufficient sensitivity, and a temporal stability of .87 over a two month period and .54 over the span of four years (Pavot, Diener, Colvin, & Sandvik, 1991; Pavot & Diener, 1993). Additionally, prior work has shown the SWLS correlates negatively with clinical measures of distress (Blais, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Briere, 1989).

### **Procedure**

Recruitment of participants took place via Amazon's MTurk. Participants provided informed consent and completed the survey on Qualtrics. After completing the survey participants were provided with a debriefing procedure via Qualtrics. The average time to complete the survey was 37 minutes.

### **Data Analysis**

Respondents were initially classified as either Non-Violent ( $n = 250$ ) or Violent ( $n = 309$ ). Membership in the Non-Violent group was granted if there were no affirmative responses on the SES regarding non-contact, coercive, contact, attempted rape, or rape offenses. Participants who endorsed at least one instance of non-contact, coercive, contact, attempted rape, and/or rape on the SES-LFP were assigned to the Violent group. After this initial classification (i.e. Non-Violent, Violent) macro-tactics of sexual perpetration were assigned to participants. Non-Violent men continued their membership under the macro-tactic of Non-Violent men ( $n = 250$ ). Violent men were then placed in the macro-tactic groups of either Coercive, Aggressive, or Poly-tactic. Participants who endorsed at least one instance of either non-contact, or coercive offenses on the SES were assigned membership to the Coercive group ( $n = 139$ ). Aggressive group membership ( $n = 56$ ) was assigned to individuals who endorsed at least one instance of contact offenses, attempted rape, or rape on the SES. Participants who endorsed at least one

instance of macro coercion and at least one instance of macro aggression were assigned membership to the Polytactic group ( $n = 42$ ). Table 15 presents descriptive statistics (e.g. mean, standard deviation) for the macro-tactic groups of sexual perpetration.

After being assigned membership to macro categories (i.e. Non-Violent, Coercive, Aggressive, Polytactic) participants were then assigned to groups of micro-tactics of sexual perpetration. Participants were included in the Sexual Harassment (SH;  $n = 58$ ) category if they endorsed SES items regarding the making unwanted comments of a sexual nature, or making unwanted obscene phone calls. Individuals were included in the category of Non-Consensual Distribution of Sexual Content (NCDSC;  $n = 50$ ) if they endorsed SES items relating to sending unwanted sexual or obscene materials to another individual. Voyeurism membership (VOY;  $n = 86$ ) was assigned if participants endorsed acts related to watching another undress, watching another engage in sexual acts, and/or making a digital record of these behaviors (i.e. taking photographs, making videos) without consent. Participants who endorsed a history of exposing their genitals, making sexual motions (e.g. pretending to masturbate, imitating oral sex) without consent were assigned to the Exhibitionism group (EXH;  $n = 67$ ). Verbal Sexual Coercion membership (VSC;  $n = 48$ ) was assigned if the participant indicated a history of verbal threats to end a relationship, the spreading of rumors, making of false promises, and unyielding verbal pressure to gain unwanted sexual contact. The Sexual Coercion Facilitated by Substances category (SCFS;  $n = 39$ ) was filled by individuals who endorsed encouraging another to use substances (i.e. alcohol, drugs) to the point where they were too intoxicated to give consent or to stop what was happening. Participants were included in the Sexual perpetration via Physical Force category (SAPF;  $n = 30$ ) if they endorsed a history of threats of force (e.g. holding one down, pinning one's arms, having a weapon) to gain unwanted sexual contact. Sexual

perpetration Facilitated by Substances (SAFS;  $n = 40$ ) included participants who endorsed giving an individual a drug (e.g. GHB, Rohypnol) without their consent, or serving another individual high alcohol content drinks when they are presented as regular strength drinks to the point where they were too intoxicated to give consent or to stop what was happening.

Participants were assigned membership to the Multiparticipant micro-tactic of sexual perpetration (MP;  $n = 27$ ) if they endorsed obtaining unwanted sexual contact with at least one other accomplice. Table 15 presents descriptive statistics (e.g. mean, standard deviation) for the macro-tactic groups of sexual perpetration.

All five PID-5 domain scores (i.e. Antagonism, Detachment, Disinhibition, Psychoticism, Negative Affect) were utilized in this study. Additionally, the eight most significant PID-5 facet scores (i.e. Callousness, Grandiosity, Intimacy Avoidance, Irresponsibility, Perceptual Dysregulation, Rigid Perfectionism, Suspiciousness, Unusual Beliefs) from the Norton-Baker et al. (2018) study were retained for analysis in the current study. PID-5 scores were converted to t-scores ( $M = 50$ ,  $SD = 10$ ) for analysis. Table 16 illustrates the means and SDs of the PID-5 domains and facets which were used in this study.

A series of ANCOVAs, with age as a covariate, were run to test for the effects of macro-tactics of sexual perpetration on mean PID-5 t-scores (see Table 8). Another series of ANCOVAs with age as a covariate, were performed to test for the effects of micro-tactics of sexual perpetration on mean PID-5 t-scores (see Table 11). To assess the potential impact of overall severity on group differences, a severity index of sexual perpetration was compiled. SES-LFP items which also are represented on the Sexual Experiences Short Form, Perpetrator (SES-SFP) were compiled and totaled. These items were then totaled to form an overall severity index (see Table 24). Then a series of ANCOVAs, utilizing both age and severity index as covariates,

were computed to assess the macro and micro-tactics of sexual perpetration impacts on overall PID-5 scores.

## Results

A series of ANCOVAs with age as a covariate were run for the four macro-tactic groups of sexual perpetration (i.e. Non-Violent, Coercive, Aggressive, Polytactic; see Table 18). Polytactic offenders scored significantly higher on all PID-5 domains (i.e. Antagonism, Detachment, Disinhibition, Psychoticism, Negative Affect; see Table 18) than Non-Violent, Coercive, and Aggressive individuals. Within the facet scores examined on the PID-5 (i.e. Callousness, Grandiosity, Intimacy Avoidance, Irresponsibility, Perceptual Dysregulation, Rigid Perfectionism, Suspiciousness, Unusual Beliefs) no significant differences were found between any of the macro-tactic groups for Suspiciousness ( $p > .05$ ). Under the facet of Callousness, Aggressive individuals scored significantly (see Table 18) than Non-Violent and Coercive groups. Polytactic individuals were found to have higher levels of Callousness than Non-Violent, Coercive, and Aggressive individuals. The Polytactic group had significantly higher scores on Grandiosity than all other groups. Under Intimacy Avoidance, Aggressive individuals scored significantly higher than Non-Violent and Coercive individuals. Polytactic individuals scored significantly higher than all other groups on Intimacy Avoidance (see Table 18). The Aggressive group generated significantly different scores than Non-Violent and Coercive groups under Irresponsibility. Polytactic individuals scored significantly higher than all other groups on Irresponsibility and Perceptual Dysregulation facets. Additionally, the Polytactic group had significantly different scores from all other groups on both and Unusual Beliefs and Rigid Perfectionism (see Table 18).

To control for possible differences between groups due to severity scores another series of ANCOVAs, utilizing age and severity index as a covariates, were run for the four macro-tactic groups of sexual perpetration (i.e. Non-Violent, Coercive, Aggressive, Polytactic; see Table 19). Polytactic offenders scored significantly higher on all PID-5 domains (i.e. Antagonism, Detachment, Disinhibition, Psychoticism, Negative Affect) than Non-Violent, Coercive, and Aggressive individuals (see Table 19). Within the facet scores examined on the PID-5 (i.e. Callousness, Grandiosity, Intimacy Avoidance, Irresponsibility, Perceptual Dysregulation, Rigid Perfectionism, Suspiciousness, Unusual Beliefs) no significant differences were found between any of the macro-tactic groups for Suspiciousness ( $p > .05$ ; see Table 19). Under the facet of Callousness, Aggressive individuals scored significantly higher than the Non-Violent and Coercive groups. Polytactic individuals were found to have higher levels of Callousness than Non-Violent, Coercive, and Aggressive individuals (see Table 19). The Polytactic group had significantly higher scores on Grandiosity than all other groups. Under Intimacy Avoidance, Polytactic individuals scored significantly higher than Non-Violent, Coercive, and Aggressive individuals. Polytactic individuals scored significantly higher than all other groups on the facets of Irresponsibility and Perceptual Dysregulation facet (see Table 19). Rigid Perfectionism and Unusual Beliefs scores were significantly elevated for Polytactic individuals (see Table 19).

Another series of ANCOVAs, with age as and severity index as covariates, were run for PID-5 scores and the different groups of micro-tactics to control for group differences attributable to overall severity (Table 22) . In so doing, all micro-tactical groups (i.e. EXH, MP, NCDSC, SAPF, SAFS, SCFS, SH, VSC, VOY) scored significantly higher than non-violent controls on Antagonism, Detachment, and Psychoticism. Under the domain of Disinhibition SH scores were not significantly different than non-violent controls, but all other micro-tactical

groups were significantly elevated. All micro-tactical groups had significantly elevated scores under the domain of Negative Affect except for SH who were statistically similar to non-violent controls.

Within the PID-5 Callousness facet, all micro-tactical scores were significantly elevated compared to non-violent controls (see Table 22). All Grandiosity scores were significantly elevated for micro-tactical groups as compared to non-violent controls. Within the Irresponsibility facet, all micro-tactical scores were elevated compared to non-violent controls. All micro-tactical group scores for Perceptual Dysregulation were significantly different from the non-violent control scores. Rigid Perfectionism scores for the EXH group were similar to non-violent controls while all other scores were significantly higher. Under the Suspicious facet, all micro-tactical groups had scores which were significantly elevated compared to non-violent controls. Similarly, all micro-tactical group scores under Unusual Beliefs were significantly higher than non-violent controls.

A series of ANCOVAs, with age as a covariate, were then run for the macro-tactic groups and other indicators of maladjustment. ACEs scores were significantly higher for the Polytactic group (see Table 21). Scores for alcohol consumption (ALC) were significantly higher for the Polytactic group. No significant differences were found between the family of economic status of the different groups (see Tables 5 and 21). Current economic status (CES) was significantly different for members of the Polytactic group (see Tables 6 and 21). The Polytactic group also had a significantly higher average time spent incarcerated than other groups (AH; see Tables 7 and 21). No significant differences were found between tactical groups for longest period of unemployment (Tables 9 and 21). Members of the Polytactic and Aggressive groups had significantly higher rates of employment termination (NJTF) than other groups (see Tables 8 and

21). The Polytactic group had significantly higher amounts of both live-in relationships (NLIR) and higher numbers of live-in relationship breakups (NLIRB; see Tables 12, 13, and 21).

Similarly, the Polytactic group had significantly higher rates of both marriage (NM) and divorce (ND; see Tables 10, 11, and 21). No significant differences were found between group scores for SWLS (see Table 21). The Polytactic group had higher rates of self-reported acts of rape (SRAR) than other groups (see Tables 14 and 21).

Another series of ANCOVAs controlling for severity (i.e. with age and severity index as covariates) were then run for the macro-tactic groups and indicators of maladjustment. ACEs scores were not significantly different for any of the macro-tactic groups (see Table 20). Scores for alcohol consumption (ALC) were not significantly different between groups (see Table 20). No significant differences were found between the family of economic status (FOES) of the different groups (; see Tables 5 and 23). Current economic status (CES) was not significantly different between groups ( $p > .05$ ; see Tables 6 and 20). The Polytactic group had a significantly higher average time spent incarcerated than other groups (AH; see Tables 7 and 20). No significant differences were found between tactical groups for longest period of unemployment (LPU;  $p > .05$ ; see Tables 9 and 20). Members of the Polytactic and Aggressive groups had significantly higher rates of employment termination (NJTF) than other groups (see Tables 8 and 23). The Polytactic group had significantly higher amounts of both live-in relationships (NLIR) and higher numbers of live-in relationship breakups (NLIRB; see Tables 12, 13, and 20). Similarly, the Polytactic group had significantly higher rates of both marriage (NM) and divorce (ND; see Tables 10, 11, and 20). No significant differences were found between group scores for SWLS ( $p > .05$ ; see Table 20). The Polytactic group had higher rates of self-reported acts of rape (SRAR) than other groups (see Tables 14 and 20).

Utilizing age and severity index as covariates, a series of ANCOVAs were run for the micro-tactic groups and indicators of maladjustment (Table 23). ACEs scores were significantly different from non-violent controls for all of the macro-tactic groups. Scores for alcohol consumption (ALC) were not significantly different between SH and non-violent control groups. All other micro-tactical groups had significantly higher ALC scores than non-violent controls. No significant differences were found between the family of economic status (FOES) or current economic status (CES) different between micro-tactical and non-violent control groups ( $p > .05$ ; see Tables 6 and 23). All micro-tactical groups, except for NCDSC had a significantly higher average time spent incarcerated than other groups (AH; see Tables 7 and 23). All groups, except for SH, had significantly more live-in relationships (NILR) and live-in relationship breakups (NILRB). Similar findings (i.e. all group scores elevated except SH) were found for both number of marriages (NM) and number of divorces (ND). EXH and SCFS group scores for the longest period of unemployment (LPU) were significantly different than non-violent controls (see Tables 9 and 23). All groups, except for SH, had a greater number of jobs from which they were terminated than non-violent controls. Individuals in the SAFS, VSC, SAPF, and MP groups had significantly lower SWLS scores than non-violent controls. All micro-tactical groups, except for SH, had more and self-reported acts of rape than non-violent controls.

## **Discussion**

Many of the PID-5 scores for the Non-Violent, Coercive, and Aggressive groups were similar, but Poly tactic individuals had consistently higher scores thus replicating a portion of the Norton-Baker et al. (2018) findings. As predicted, Poly tactic men consistently had the highest average PID-5 domain scores even after severity was statistically controlled for. Aggressive and Coercive men did not elevate on Antagonism, Detachment, Psychoticism, or Negative Affect. As



such, these findings seemed to suggest men who utilize both coercion and physical aggression to obtain unwanted sexual contact have distinctly elevated maladaptive personality traits (i.e. Antagonism, Detachment, Psychoticism, Negative Affect).

Average Polytactic scores were elevated for all examined PID-5 facets except for Suspiciousness (i.e. Callousness, Grandiosity, Intimacy Avoidance, Irresponsibility, Perceptual Dysregulation, Rigid Perfectionism, Unusual Beliefs). These Polytactic elevations remained even after statistical control for severity was included. Aggressive individuals had higher average Callousness, Intimacy Avoidance, and Irresponsibility facet scores than individuals from the Coercive and Non-Violent groups. When the severity index was included in the analysis, Aggressive group scores for Perceptual Dysregulation, Irresponsibility, Intimacy Avoidance, and Callousness were elevated. Additionally, Coercive group means for Antagonism and Callousness were significantly higher than those from the Non-Violent group. These findings provided further support for a distinctly pernicious constellation of maladaptive personality traits in Polytypic offenders. These data also suggested that Aggressive men were more maladaptive than Coercive and Non-Violent men. Coercive men may have more maladaptive personality traits than non-violent men when severity is accounted for. Callousness was consistently elevated across all sexually violent groups (i.e. Polytypic, Aggressive, Coercive) even after control of sexual perpetration severity which suggested it was an especially important factor as a sexual perpetration trait.

Several significant differences were found when participants were separated into micro-tactics of sexual perpetration (i.e. EXH, MP, NCDSC, SAPF, SAFS, SCFS, SH, VSC, VOY). All micro-tactical groups had significantly higher scores than non-violent controls on Antagonism, Detachment, and Psychoticism. The SH group was similar to non-violent controls

on both Disinhibition and Negative Affect. EXH was similar to non-violent controls on Negative Affect. Additionally, all micro-tactical groups had significantly higher scores Callousness, Grandiosity, Irresponsibility, Perceptual Dysregulation Perceptual Dysregulation, Suspiciousness, and Unusual Beliefs. EXH was not significantly different from non-violent controls under Rigid Perfectionism. These findings suggest that any endorsement of sexual perpetration are linked to higher rates of maladaptive personality traits than non-violent controls.

The examination of other indicators of maladjustment (e.g. number of divorces, number of jobs terminated from, alcohol use) lend further support to the Polytactic group being more dysfunctional than other groups. Polytactic men had consistently higher rates of time spent incarcerated, relationship instability (i.e. more breakups, more divorces), and jobs terminated from even with severity accounted for. Additionally, as predicted Polytactic men were more likely to self-report an act of rape than other macro-tactic groups. Again, these findings seem to suggest Polytactic men as having more pronounced dysfunction than other groups.

Several significant differences within the micro-tactic analysis of other indicators of maladjustment were noteworthy. Even with severity accounted for individuals who endorsed engaging in sexual harassment not more likely to be terminated from their place of employment than non-violent men. These findings were particularly important in that they highlighted that work remains within the employment sector to address sexual harassment and non-contact sexual offenses. Support was not universally found for the hypothesis that the MP group would have consistently higher measures of maladjustment than other groups. However, MP groups were significantly different from non-violent controls under many maladjustment indicators (i.e. ACES, ALC, AH, NILRB, ND, NJTF, NLIR, NM, SWLS, and SRAR). Mixed support was found for the hypothesis that the use of physical tactics would lead to higher levels of

maladjustment. Individuals who endorsed the use of SAPF and SAFS were significantly elevated on many indicators (i.e. SRAR, SWLS, NM, NILR, NJTF, ND, NILRB, AH, ALC, ACES) compared to non-violent controls. Tactics employing the use of drugs and alcohol to gain unwanted sexual contact had elevations which were similar to physically aggressive individuals (i.e. elevations in SRAR, SWLS, NM, NILR, NJTF, ND, NILRB, AH, ALC, ACES). These findings provided further support for the notion that the use of aggression and substances as a tactic for sexual offenses would be associated with high rates of maladaptive behavior.

### **Limitations**

The results of this study should be interpreted within the context of a number of design and analytic limitations. These data were generated from retrospective self-reports without efforts to validate the accounts of each respondent. Research has warned of potential social desirability response sets in surveys with content similar to this project (Meston, Heiman, Trapnell, & Paulhus, 1998). The customized index relied upon in this study to control for overall sexual perpetration severity constituted a rough and imprecise measure that may or may not have been effective in controlling this potential confound. The sample size ( $n = 559$ ) was modest and unevenly distributed without evidence regarding the extent to which the perpetrators represented those that might be found in the general population. Only the top eight PID-5 facets found significant in the earlier Norton-Baker et al. (2018) analysis were examined in this study. Future works should broaden the net of criterion measures to include all of the PID-5 facets.

### **Conclusion**

Polytactic men had consistently higher PID-5 scores and rates of other indicators of maladjustment. These individuals appear to be uniquely ruinous and significantly different from

offenders which only employ one tactic to gain unwanted sexual contact. Within macro-tactic groups Callousness appears to be a common personality trait which may warrant specific attention when attempting to develop predictive models of sexual perpetration. In this same vein, significant differences were found between micro-tactic groups. The use of physical force and the use of substances (i.e. drugs and alcohol) to gain unwanted sexual contact appears to coincide with elevations in other areas of maladjustment (e.g. employment termination, arrest history). As such, the examination of both macro and micro-tactics of sexual perpetration may help not only improve predictive models for sexual perpetration, but may prove to be useful information in prevention and treatment of sexual perpetration.

**Table 1**

*Participant Characteristics*

| <b>Characteristics</b>        | <b>Measurement Source</b> |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Current Economic Status (CES) | Customized Scale          |
| Work History                  | Customized Scale          |
| Relationship History          | Customized Scale          |

**Table 2***Macro-Tactics of Sexual perpetration*

| <b>Macro-Tactic</b>     | <b>Criterion</b>   | <b>Measurement Source</b>  |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| Non-violent Respondents | No endorsement of sexual perpetration  | The Revised Sexual Experiences Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP; Koss et al., 2006) |
| Coercive Respondents    | Endorsement of the use of non-physical means to gain unwanted sexual contact.    | The Revised Sexual Experiences Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP; Koss et al., 2006) |
| Aggressive Respondents  | Endorsement of the use of physical force to gain unwanted sexual contact.        | The Revised Sexual Experiences Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP; Koss et al., 2006) |
| Polytactic Respondents  | Endorsement of both coercion and physical force to gain unwanted sexual contact. | The Revised Sexual Experiences Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP; Koss et al., 2006) |

**Table 3***Micro-Tactics of Sexual Perpetration*

| Micro-Tactic  | Criterion  | Measurement Source   |
|---|--|--|
| Exhibitionism (EXH)                                   | Exposing one's genitals, making sexual motions (e.g. pretending to masturbate, imitating oral sex) without consent.  | The Revised Sexual Experiences Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP; Koss et al., 2006) |
| Multiparticipant (MP)                                 | Engaging in any sexual perpetration tactic with at least one other individual.   | The Revised Sexual Experiences Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP; Koss et al., 2006) |
| Non-Consensual Distribution of Sexual Content (NCDSC) | Sending unwanted sexual or obscene materials to another individual.  | The Revised Sexual Experiences Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP; Koss et al., 2006) |
| Sexual perpetration via Physical Force (SAPF)         | The use of force (e.g. holding one down, pinning one's arms, having a weapon) to gain unwanted sexual contact.   | The Revised Sexual Experiences Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP; Koss et al., 2006) |
| Sexual perpetration Facilitated by Substances (SAFS)  | Giving someone a drug (e.g. GHB, Rohypnol) without their consent, or serving another individual high alcohol content drinks when they are presented as regular strength drinks to the point where they were too intoxicated to give consent or to stop what was happening. | The Revised Sexual Experiences Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP; Koss et al., 2006) |
| Sexual Coercion Facilitated by Substances (SCFS)      | Encouraging another to use substances (i.e. alcohol, drugs) to the point where they were too intoxicated to give consent or to stop what was happening.  | The Revised Sexual Experiences Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP; Koss et al., 2006) |
| Sexual Harassment (SH)                                | Unwanted comments of a sexual nature, or making unwanted obscene phone calls.  | The Revised Sexual Experiences Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP; Koss et al., 2006) |
| Verbal Sexual Coercion (VSC)                          | Verbal threats to end a relationship, the spreading of rumors, making of false promises, and unyielding verbal pressure to gain unwanted sexual contact.   | The Revised Sexual Experiences Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP; Koss et al., 2006) |
| Voyeurism (VOY)                                       | Watching another undress, watching another engage in sexual acts, and/or making a digital record of these behaviors (i.e. taking photographs, making videos) without consent.  | The Revised Sexual Experiences Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP; Koss et al., 2006) |

**Table 4***Indicators of Maladjustment*

| <b>Characteristics</b>     | <b>Measurement Source</b>   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Alcohol Consumption (ALC)  | Customized Scale  |
| Arrest History (AH)        | Customized Scale  |
| Childhood Traumatic Events | The Adverse Childhood Experiences<br>Questionnaire<br>(ACE; Felitti et al., 1998)                     |
| Personality Indicators     | The Personality Inventory for DSM-5<br>(PID-5; Krueger, Derringer, Markon, Watson,<br>& Skodal, 2012) |
| Satisfaction of Life       | Satisfaction With Life Scale<br>(SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin,<br>1985)                    |

**Table 5***Family of Origin Economic Status*

|         |          | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> | <b>Valid<br/>Percent</b> | <b>Cumulative<br/>Percent</b> |
|---------|----------|------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Valid   | Poverty  | 15               | 2.7            | 2.7                      | 2.7                           |
|         | Poor     | 42               | 7.5            | 7.6                      | 10.3                          |
|         | Upper    | 195              | 34.9           | 35.1                     | 75.0                          |
|         | Poor     |                  |                |                          |                               |
|         | Low      | 61               | 10.9           | 11.0                     | 21.2                          |
|         | Average  |                  |                |                          |                               |
|         | Average  | 104              | 18.6           | 18.7                     | 39.9                          |
|         | High     | 85               | 15.2           | 15.3                     | 90.3                          |
|         | Average  |                  |                |                          |                               |
|         | Well Off | 44               | 7.9            | 7.9                      | 98.2                          |
|         | Wealthy  | 9                | 1.6            | 1.6                      | 99.8                          |
|         | Rich     | 1                | .2             | .2                       | 100.0                         |
|         | Total    | 556              | 99.5           | 100.0                    |                               |
| Missing | System   | 3                | .5             |                          |                               |
| Total   |          | 559              | 100.0          |                          |                               |

**Table 6***Current Economic Status*

|         |          | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> | <b>Valid<br/>Percent</b> | <b>Cumulative<br/>Percent</b> |
|---------|----------|------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Valid   | Poverty  | 22               | 3.9            | 4.0                      | 4.0                           |
|         | Poor     | 30               | 5.4            | 5.5                      | 9.5                           |
|         | Upper    | 189              | 33.8           | 34.4                     | 73.1                          |
|         | Poor     |                  |                |                          |                               |
|         | Low      | 70               | 12.5           | 12.7                     | 22.2                          |
|         | Average  |                  |                |                          |                               |
|         | Average  | 91               | 16.3           | 16.5                     | 38.7                          |
|         | High     | 101              | 18.1           | 18.4                     | 91.5                          |
|         | Average  |                  |                |                          |                               |
|         | Well Off | 38               | 6.8            | 6.9                      | 98.4                          |
|         | Wealthy  | 8                | 1.4            | 1.5                      | 99.8                          |
|         | Rich     | 1                | .2             | .2                       | 100.0                         |
|         | Total    | 550              | 98.4           | 100.0                    |                               |
| Missing | System   | 9                | 1.6            |                          |                               |
| Total   |          | 559              | 100.0          |                          |                               |



**Table 7***Arrest History*

|       |                    | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|--------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Never              | 389       | 69.6    | 69.6          | 69.6               |
|       | Less than 1 Day    | 2         | .4      | .4            | 99.1               |
|       | 1-2 Days           | 51        | 9.1     | 9.1           | 78.7               |
|       | 2-3 Days           | 12        | 2.1     | 2.1           | 80.9               |
|       | 3 Days-1 Month     | 12        | 2.1     | 2.1           | 83.0               |
|       | 1 Month            | 26        | 4.7     | 4.7           | 87.7               |
|       | 1-6 Months         | 16        | 2.9     | 2.9           | 90.5               |
|       | 6 Months-1 Year    | 21        | 3.8     | 3.8           | 94.3               |
|       | 1-2 Years          | 11        | 2.0     | 2.0           | 96.2               |
|       | 2-5 Years          | 10        | 1.8     | 1.8           | 98.0               |
|       | 5-10 Years         | 4         | .7      | .7            | 98.7               |
|       | More than 10 Years | 2         | .4      | .4            | 99.1               |
| Total |                    | 559       | 100.0   |               |                    |

*Note.* Measured by time spent incarcerated

**Table 8***Number of Jobs Terminated From*

|         |        | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid   | 0      | 434       | 77.6    | 78.9          | 78.9               |
|         | 1      | 33        | 5.9     | 6.0           | 84.9               |
|         | 2      | 18        | 3.2     | 3.3           | 88.2               |
|         | 3      | 20        | 3.6     | 3.6           | 91.8               |
|         | 4      | 23        | 4.1     | 4.2           | 96.0               |
|         | 5      | 14        | 2.5     | 2.5           | 98.5               |
|         | >5     | 8         | 1.4     | 1.5           | 100.0              |
|         | Total  | 550       | 98.4    | 100.0         |                    |
| Missing | System | 9         | 1.6     |               |                    |
| Total   |        | 559       | 100.0   |               |                    |

**Table 9***Longest Period (in Months) of Unemployment Since Age 18*

|         |        | Frequency | Percent | Valid<br>Percent | Cumulative<br>Percent |
|---------|--------|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Valid   | 0      | 122       | 21.8    | 22.1             | 22.1                  |
|         | 1      | 42        | 7.5     | 7.6              | 29.7                  |
|         | 2      | 42        | 7.5     | 7.6              | 37.3                  |
|         | 3      | 46        | 8.2     | 8.3              | 45.7                  |
|         | 4      | 42        | 7.5     | 7.6              | 53.3                  |
|         | 5      | 27        | 4.8     | 4.9              | 58.2                  |
|         | >5     | 27        | 41.3    | 41.8             | 100.0                 |
|         | Total  | 552       | 98.7    | 100.0            |                       |
| Missing | System | 7         | 1.3     |                  |                       |
| Total   |        | 559       | 100.0   |                  |                       |

**Table 10***Number of Marriages*

|         |        | Frequency | Percent | Valid<br>Percent | Cumulative<br>Percent |
|---------|--------|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Valid   | 0      | 243       | 43.5    | 43.5             | 43.5                  |
|         | 1      | 245       | 43.8    | 43.9             | 87.5                  |
|         | 2      | 60        | 10.7    | 10.8             | 98.2                  |
|         | ≥3     | 10        | 1.8     | 1.8              | 100.0                 |
|         | Total  | 558       | 99.8    | 100.0            |                       |
| Missing | System | 1         | .2      |                  |                       |
| Total   |        | 559       | 100.0   |                  |                       |

**Table 11***Number of Divorces*

|         |        | Frequency | Percent | Valid<br>Percent | Cumulative<br>Percent |
|---------|--------|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Valid   | 0      | 413       | 73.9    | 75.1             | 75.1                  |
|         | 1      | 92        | 16.5    | 16.7             | 91.8                  |
|         | 2      | 36        | 6.4     | 6.5              | 98.4                  |
|         | ≥3     | 9         | 1.6     | 1.6              | 100.0                 |
|         | Total  | 550       | 98.4    | 100.0            |                       |
| Missing | System | 9         | 1.6     |                  |                       |
| Total   |        | 559       | 100.0   |                  |                       |

**Table 12***Number of Live-In Relationships*

|         |        | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid   | 0      | 198       | 35.4    | 35.9          | 35.9               |
|         | 1      | 171       | 30.6    | 31.0          | 67.0               |
|         | 2      | 122       | 21.8    | 22.1          | 89.1               |
|         | ≥3     | 60        | 10.7    | 10.9          | 100.0              |
|         | Total  | 551       | 98.6    | 100.0         |                    |
| Missing | System | 8         | 1.4     |               |                    |
| Total   |        | 559       | 100.0   |               |                    |

**Table 13***Number of Live-In Relationship Breakups*

|         |        | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid   | 0      | 281       | 50.3    | 50.8          | 50.8               |
|         | 1      | 137       | 24.5    | 24.8          | 75.6               |
|         | 2      | 76        | 13.6    | 13.7          | 89.3               |
|         | ≥3     | 59        | 10.6    | 10.7          | 100.0              |
|         | Total  | 553       | 98.9    | 100.0         |                    |
| Missing | System | 6         | 1.1     |               |                    |
| Total   |        | 559       | 100.0   |               |                    |

**Table 14***Self-Reported Act of Rape*

|         |        | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid   | No     | 530       | 94.8    | 95.0          | 95.0               |
|         | Yes    | 28        | 5.0     | 5.0           | 100.0              |
|         | Total  | 558       | 99.8    | 100.0         |                    |
| Missing | System | 1         | .2      |               |                    |
| Total   |        | 559       | 100.0   |               |                    |

**Table 15***Tactical Group Descriptive Statistics*

| <b>Tactical groups</b>                           | <b>Label</b> | <b><i>n</i></b> | <b><i>a</i></b> | <b><i>M</i></b> | <b><i>SD</i></b> | <b>Range</b> |
|--|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|
| Nonviolent                                       | NV           | 250             | .980            | 0.00            | 0.00             | 0-0          |
| Sexual Coercion                                  | SC           | 139             | .630            | .8072           | 1.98388          | 0-18         |
| Sexual perpetration via<br>Physical Force        | SAPF         | 565             | .845            | 1.0456          | 4.29060          | 0-28         |
| Polytactic Offenses                              | PO           | 42              | .846            | 1.7172          | 5.54027          | 0-44         |
| Exhibitionism                                    | EXH          | 67              | .512            | .1739           | .49691           | 0-3          |
| Multiparticipant                                 | MP           | 27              | .679            | .1216           | .58149           | 0-6          |
| Non-Consensual Distribution<br>of Sexual Content | NCDSC        | 50              | .292            | .1100           | .34890           | 0-2          |
| Sexual perpetration via<br>Physical Force        | SAPF         | 30              | .690            | .1271           | .56192           | 0-5          |
| Sexual perpetration<br>Facilitated by Substances | SAFS         | 40              | .929            | .7561           | 2.85236          | 0-18         |
| Sexual Coercion Facilitated<br>by Substances     | SCFS         | 39              | .789            | .2250           | .93828           | 0-9          |
| Sexual Harassment                                | SH           | 58              | .216            | .1243           | .108             | 0-2          |
| Verbal Sexual Coercion                           | VSC          | 48              | .883            | .4361           | 1.66929          | 0-16         |
| Voyeurism  | VOY          | 86              | .393            | .2180           | .52059           | 0-3          |

**Table 16***Descriptive Statistics*

| <b>PID-5 Domain</b>                  | <b><i>M</i></b> | <b>Median</b> | <b><i>S.E. of M</i></b> | <b><i>SD</i></b> | <b>Range</b> |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Antagonism                           | .35             | .22           | .01                     | .33              | 1.77         |
| Detachment                           | 1.56            | 1.29          | .04                     | .95              | 5.05         |
| Disinhibition                        | .44             | .32           | .01                     | .32              | 1.57         |
| Negative Affect                      | .42             | .30           | .02                     | .35              | 1.95         |
| Psychoticism                         | .29             | .15           | .01                     | .33              | 1.68         |
| <b>PID-5 Facet</b>                   |                 |               |                         |                  |              |
| Irresponsibility                     | .47             | .43           | .01                     | .33              | 1.86         |
| Perceptual Dysregulation             | .24             | .08           | .01                     | .33              | 1.67         |
| Rigid Perfectionism                  | .36             | .20           | .02                     | .40              | 1.90         |
| Suspiciousness                       | .94             | .86           | .02                     | .35              | 1.86         |
| Unusual Beliefs                      | .26             | .13           | .02                     | .35              | 1.88         |
| <b>SES-LFP</b>                       |                 |               |                         |                  |              |
| Attempted Rape                       | .48             | .00           | .10                     | 2.05             | 14.00        |
| Coercion                             | .27             | .00           | .05                     | 1.14             | 14.00        |
| Contact                              | .18             | .00           | .03                     | .67              | 6.00         |
| Non-Contact                          | .61             | .00           | .06                     | 1.35             | 10.00        |
| Rape                                 | .53             | .00           | .10                     | 2.04             | 13.00        |
| <b>Maladjustment Indicators</b>      |                 |               |                         |                  |              |
| Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACES) | .85             | 3.42          | 3.76                    | 1.73             | 0-23         |
| Alcohol Consumption (ALC)            | .80             | 17.41         | 9.73                    | -.08             | 0-42         |
| Satisfaction With Life (SWL)         | .90             | 21.01         | 8.02                    | -.34             | 0-30         |

*Note.* PID-5 scores were converted to T-scores for purposes of subsequent data presentation.

**Table 17***Severity index*

|              |       | Frequency | Percent | Valid<br>Percent | Cumulative<br>Percent |
|--------------|-------|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Valid</b> | 0     | 366       | 65.5    | 65.5             | 65.5                  |
|              | 1     | 96        | 17.2    | 17.2             | 82.6                  |
|              | 2     | 27        | 4.8     | 4.8              | 87.5                  |
|              | 3     | 12        | 2.1     | 2.1              | 89.6                  |
|              | 4     | 6         | 1.1     | 1.1              | 90.7                  |
|              | 5     | 3         | 0.5     | 0.5              | 91.2                  |
|              | 6     | 1         | 0.2     | 0.2              | 91.4                  |
|              | 7     | 1         | 0.2     | 0.2              | 91.6                  |
|              | 11    | 1         | 0.2     | 0.2              | 91.8                  |
|              | 13    | 1         | 0.2     | 0.2              | 91.9                  |
|              | 16    | 1         | 0.2     | 0.2              | 92.1                  |
|              | 17    | 1         | 0.2     | 0.2              | 92.3                  |
|              | 20    | 1         | 0.2     | 0.2              | 92.5                  |
|              | 21    | 1         | 0.2     | 0.2              | 92.7                  |
|              | 30    | 1         | 0.2     | 0.2              | 92.8                  |
|              | 31    | 1         | 0.2     | 0.2              | 93.0                  |
|              | 39    | 1         | 0.2     | 0.2              | 93.2                  |
|              | 40    | 24        | 4.3     | 4.3              | 97.5                  |
|              | 41    | 5         | 0.9     | 0.9              | 98.4                  |
|              | 43    | 1         | 0.2     | 0.2              | 98.6                  |
|              | 51    | 1         | 0.2     | 0.2              | 98.7                  |
|              | 55    | 1         | 0.2     | 0.2              | 98.9                  |
|              | 76    | 1         | 0.2     | 0.2              | 99.1                  |
|              | 80    | 5         | 0.9     | 0.9              | 100.0                 |
|              | Total | 559       | 100.0   | 100.0            |                       |

**Table 18***Trait Differences by Sexual Perpetration Group Analyses of Covariance*

| PID-5 Dimension          | Non-Violent<br>(n = 250) |     | Coercive<br>(n = 139) |      | Aggressive<br>(n = 56) |      | Polytactic<br>(n = 42) |      | F            | p     | η <sup>2</sup> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----|-----------------------|------|------------------------|------|------------------------|------|--------------|-------|----------------|
|                          | M                        | SE  | M                     | SE   | M                      | SE   | M                      | SE   |              |       |                |
| Antagonism               | 47.75 <sup>a</sup>       | .62 | 54.44 <sup>a</sup>    | .71  | 53.93 <sup>a</sup>     | .74  | 61.36 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.51 | <b>16.61</b> | p<.01 | .15            |
| Detachment               | 49.02 <sup>a</sup>       | .91 | 52.51 <sup>a</sup>    | 1.03 | 59.19 <sup>a</sup>     | 1.47 | 60.21 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.65 | <b>1.44</b>  | p<.01 | .66            |
| Disinhibition            | 47.89 <sup>a</sup>       | .60 | 53.65 <sup>a</sup>    | .70  | 54.61 <sup>a</sup>     | .71  | 61.68 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.44 | <b>23.40</b> | p<.01 | .20            |
| Psychoticism             | 48.23 <sup>a</sup>       | .62 | 53.14 <sup>a</sup>    | .71  | 53.81 <sup>a</sup>     | .72  | 61.25 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.48 | <b>17.18</b> | p<.01 | .15            |
| Negative Affect          | 48.78 <sup>a</sup>       | .64 | 53.37 <sup>a</sup>    | .75  | 52.56 <sup>a</sup>     | .79  | 55.89 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.61 | <b>6.52</b>  | p<.01 | .07            |
| <b>PID-5 Facet</b>       |                          |     |                       |      |                        |      |                        |      |              |       |                |
| Callousness              | 47.17 <sup>a</sup>       | .59 | 54.48 <sup>a</sup>    | .68  | 55.46 <sup>ab</sup>    | .70  | 61.62 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.45 | <b>25.64</b> | p<.01 | .21            |
| Grandiosity              | 48.18 <sup>a</sup>       | .63 | 53.39 <sup>a</sup>    | .71  | 53.55 <sup>a</sup>     | .73  | 59.23 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.51 | <b>10.71</b> | p<.01 | .10            |
| Intimacy Avoidance       | 48.67 <sup>a</sup>       | .62 | 52.80 <sup>a</sup>    | .70  | 54.23 <sup>ab</sup>    | .72  | 60.31 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.50 | <b>14.79</b> | p<.01 | .12            |
| Irresponsible            | 48.13 <sup>a</sup>       | .59 | 53.11 <sup>a</sup>    | .68  | 54.58 <sup>ab</sup>    | .68  | 60.81 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.41 | <b>25.17</b> | p<.01 | .20            |
| Perceptual Dysregulation | 47.97 <sup>a</sup>       | .60 | 53.58 <sup>a</sup>    | .68  | 54.59 <sup>a</sup>     | .69  | 61.89 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.43 | <b>21.08</b> | p<.01 | .17            |
| Rigid Perfectionism      | 48.51 <sup>a</sup>       | .64 | 52.42 <sup>a</sup>    | .74  | 52.51 <sup>a</sup>     | .76  | 56.76 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.60 | <b>6.03</b>  | p<.01 | .06            |
| Suspicious               | 49.28 <sup>a</sup>       | .64 | 51.76 <sup>a</sup>    | .73  | 51.41 <sup>a</sup>     | .75  | 53.96 <sup>a</sup>     | 1.56 | 4.90         | p>.05 | .05            |
| Unusual Beliefs          | 47.67 <sup>a</sup>       | .61 | 53.13 <sup>b</sup>    | .69  | 54.27 <sup>a</sup>     | .71  | 60.24 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.46 | <b>16.53</b> | p<.01 | .14            |

*Note.* Respondent age covaried in each ANCOVA. Significant cell differences designated by differing superscripts.

**Table 19***Trait Differences by Macro-Tactics of Sexual Perpetration Group Analyses of Covariance*

| PID-5 Dimension          | Non-Violent<br>(n = 250) |     | Coercive<br>(n = 139) |     | Aggressive<br>(n = 56) |     | Polytactic<br>(n = 42) |      | F            | p     | η <sup>2</sup> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|------------------------|-----|------------------------|------|--------------|-------|----------------|
|                          | M                        | SE  | M                     | SE  | M                      | SE  | M                      | SE   |              |       |                |
| Antagonism               | 47.21 <sup>a</sup>       | .64 | 55.04 <sup>a</sup>    | .73 | 54.55 <sup>a</sup>     | .76 | 60.90 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.50 | <b>15.79</b> | p<.01 | .17            |
| Detachment               | 49.03 <sup>a</sup>       | .66 | 52.83 <sup>a</sup>    | .75 | 53.59 <sup>a</sup>     | .78 | 60.07 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.59 | <b>9.51</b>  | p<.01 | .11            |
| Disinhibition            | 47.68 <sup>a</sup>       | .62 | 53.91 <sup>a</sup>    | .71 | 54.88 <sup>a</sup>     | .74 | 61.51 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.45 | <b>19.83</b> | p<.01 | .20            |
| Psychoticism             | 47.84 <sup>a</sup>       | .63 | 53.63 <sup>a</sup>    | .73 | 54.31 <sup>a</sup>     | .75 | 60.92 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.48 | <b>15.55</b> | p<.01 | .16            |
| Negative Affect          | 48.31 <sup>a</sup>       | .66 | 52.88 <sup>a</sup>    | .77 | 53.09 <sup>a</sup>     | .80 | 56.40 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.61 | <b>6.95</b>  | p<.01 | .08            |
| <b>PID-5 Facet</b>       |                          |     |                       |     |                        |     |                        |      |              |       |                |
| Callousness              | 46.68 <sup>a</sup>       | .61 | 55.02 <sup>ab</sup>   | .69 | 56.03 <sup>b</sup>     | .71 | 61.21 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.44 | <b>23.71</b> | p<.01 | .23            |
| Grandiosity              | 47.81 <sup>a</sup>       | .65 | 53.77 <sup>a</sup>    | .73 | 53.95 <sup>a</sup>     | .75 | 58.98 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.51 | <b>9.84</b>  | p<.01 | .11            |
| Intimacy Avoidance       | 48.79 <sup>a</sup>       | .64 | 52.67 <sup>a</sup>    | .72 | 54.10 <sup>a</sup>     | .74 | 60.43 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.51 | <b>12.42</b> | p<.01 | .13            |
| Irresponsible            | 47.94 <sup>a</sup>       | .61 | 53.31 <sup>a</sup>    | .69 | 54.79 <sup>b</sup>     | .70 | 60.64 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.41 | <b>21.25</b> | p<.01 | .20            |
| Perceptual Dysregulation | 47.51 <sup>a</sup>       | .62 | 54.04 <sup>a</sup>    | .69 | 55.07 <sup>b</sup>     | .71 | 61.49 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.43 | <b>19.16</b> | p<.01 | .18            |
| Rigid Perfectionism      | 48.09 <sup>a</sup>       | .66 | 52.81 <sup>a</sup>    | .75 | 52.93 <sup>a</sup>     | .97 | 56.41 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.60 | <b>6.07</b>  | p<.01 | .07            |
| Suspicious               | 49.05 <sup>a</sup>       | .66 | 51.97 <sup>a</sup>    | .75 | 51.63 <sup>a</sup>     | .77 | 53.77 <sup>a</sup>     | 1.57 | 4.35         | p>.05 | .05            |
| Unusual Beliefs          | 47.30 <sup>a</sup>       | .63 | 53.52 <sup>a</sup>    | .71 | 54.68 <sup>a</sup>     | .72 | 59.93 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.46 | <b>14.81</b> | p<.01 | .15            |

*Note.* Respondent age and severity index covaried in each ANCOVA. Significant cell differences designated by differing superscripts.



**Table 20***Trait Differences of Macro-Tactics Sexual Perpetration Group Analyses of Covariance*

| Indicator | Non-Violent<br>(n = 250) |     | Coercive<br>(n = 139) |     | Aggressive<br>(n = 56) |     | Polytactic<br>(n = 42) |      | F            | p     | n <sup>p2</sup> |
|-----------|--------------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|------------------------|-----|------------------------|------|--------------|-------|-----------------|
|           | M                        | SE  | M                     | SE  | M                      | SE  | M                      | SE   |              |       |                 |
| ACES      | 2.89 <sup>a</sup>        | .24 | 4.41 <sup>a</sup>     | .27 | 4.33 <sup>a</sup>      | .27 | 5.80 <sup>b</sup>      | .57  | <b>5.31</b>  | p<.01 | .05             |
| ALC       | 16.02 <sup>a</sup>       | .62 | 18.96 <sup>a</sup>    | .70 | 18.85 <sup>a</sup>     | .71 | 21.06 <sup>b</sup>     | 1.50 | <b>5.02</b>  | p<.05 | .12             |
| AH        | .71 <sup>a</sup>         | .15 | 2.17 <sup>a</sup>     | .17 | 2.20 <sup>a</sup>      | .17 | 3.76 <sup>b</sup>      | .36  | <b>13.52</b> | p<.01 | .11             |
| CES       | 4.63 <sup>a</sup>        | .10 | 4.60 <sup>a</sup>     | .11 | 4.56 <sup>a</sup>      | .11 | 4.31 <sup>b</sup>      | .24  | <b>1.41</b>  | p<.05 | .01             |
| NLIRB     | .65 <sup>a</sup>         | .06 | 1.14 <sup>a</sup>     | .07 | 1.21 <sup>a</sup>      | .07 | 1.72 <sup>b</sup>      | .15  | <b>9.23</b>  | p<.01 | .08             |
| ND        | .19 <sup>a</sup>         | .04 | .63 <sup>a</sup>      | .05 | .65 <sup>a</sup>       | .05 | 1.10 <sup>b</sup>      | .10  | <b>18.04</b> | p<.01 | .15             |
| FOES      | 4.69 <sup>a</sup>        | .10 | 4.65 <sup>a</sup>     | .11 | 4.62 <sup>a</sup>      | .11 | 4.84 <sup>a</sup>      | .24  | 1.07         | p>.05 | .01             |
| NJTF      | .33 <sup>a</sup>         | .08 | 1.20 <sup>a</sup>     | .09 | 1.40 <sup>b</sup>      | .10 | 2.54 <sup>b</sup>      | .20  | <b>25.38</b> | p<.01 | .20             |
| NLIR      | .97 <sup>a</sup>         | .06 | 1.31 <sup>a</sup>     | .07 | 1.25 <sup>a</sup>      | .07 | 1.61 <sup>b</sup>      | .15  | <b>3.82</b>  | p<.01 | .04             |
| NM        | .55 <sup>a</sup>         | .04 | .95 <sup>b</sup>      | .05 | .91 <sup>a</sup>       | .05 | 1.22 <sup>b</sup>      | .10  | <b>25.62</b> | p<.01 | .20             |
| LPU       | 3.54 <sup>a</sup>        | .16 | 3.64 <sup>a</sup>     | .18 | 3.50 <sup>a</sup>      | .18 | 3.85 <sup>a</sup>      | .38  | .78          | p>.05 | .01             |
| SWLS      | 20.61 <sup>a</sup>       | .53 | 21.73 <sup>a</sup>    | .58 | 22.18 <sup>a</sup>     | .60 | 22.92 <sup>a</sup>     | 1.26 | 2.05         | p>.05 | .02             |
| SRAR      | .01 <sup>a</sup>         | .01 | .12 <sup>a</sup>      | .02 | .12 <sup>a</sup>       | .02 | .21 <sup>b</sup>       | .03  | <b>6.97</b>  | p<.01 | .06             |

*Note.* Respondent age covaried in each ANCOVA. Significant cell differences designated by differing superscripts.

**Table 21***Trait Differences by Macro-Tactics of Sexual Perpetration Group Analyses of Covariance*

| Indicator | Non-Violent<br>(n = 250) |     | Coercive<br>(n = 139) |     | Aggressive<br>(n = 56) |     | Polytactic<br>(n = 42) |      | F            | p     | n <sup>2</sup> |
|-----------|--------------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|------------------------|-----|------------------------|------|--------------|-------|----------------|
|           | M                        | SE  | M                     | SE  | M                      | SE  | M                      | SE   |              |       |                |
| ACES      | 2.76 <sup>a</sup>        | .24 | 4.53 <sup>a</sup>     | .27 | 4.45 <sup>a</sup>      | .28 | 5.68 <sup>a</sup>      | .57  | 5.23         | p>.05 | .06            |
| ALC       | 15.98 <sup>a</sup>       | .64 | 18.99 <sup>a</sup>    | .71 | 18.89 <sup>a</sup>     | .73 | 21.03 <sup>a</sup>     | 1.50 | 4.19         | p>.05 | .05            |
| AH        | .77 <sup>a</sup>         | .15 | 2.13 <sup>a</sup>     | .17 | 2.15 <sup>a</sup>      | .17 | 3.81 <sup>b</sup>      | .36  | <b>11.58</b> | p<.01 | .12            |
| CES       | 4.66 <sup>a</sup>        | .10 | 4.56 <sup>a</sup>     | .11 | 4.52 <sup>a</sup>      | .12 | 4.35 <sup>a</sup>      | .24  | 1.55         | p>.05 | .02            |
| NLIRB     | .64 <sup>a</sup>         | .07 | 1.15 <sup>a</sup>     | .07 | 1.21 <sup>a</sup>      | .07 | 1.71 <sup>b</sup>      | .15  | <b>7.74</b>  | p<.01 | .08            |
| ND        | .19 <sup>a</sup>         | .04 | .62 <sup>a</sup>      | .05 | .65 <sup>a</sup>       | .05 | 1.10 <sup>b</sup>      | .10  | <b>15.05</b> | p<.01 | .15            |
| FOES      | 4.74 <sup>a</sup>        | .10 | 4.6 <sup>a</sup>      | .11 | 4.58 <sup>a</sup>      | .11 | 4.88 <sup>a</sup>      | .24  | 1.53         | p>.05 | .02            |
| NJTF      | .28 <sup>a</sup>         | .09 | 1.24 <sup>a</sup>     | .10 | 1.40 <sup>b</sup>      | .10 | 2.51 <sup>b</sup>      | .20  | <b>21.88</b> | p<.01 | .20            |
| NLIR      | .95 <sup>a</sup>         | .07 | 1.32 <sup>a</sup>     | .07 | 1.26 <sup>a</sup>      | .08 | 1.60 <sup>b</sup>      | .15  | <b>3.29</b>  | p<.05 | .04            |
| NM        | .56 <sup>a</sup>         | .04 | .95 <sup>a</sup>      | .05 | .90 <sup>a</sup>       | .05 | 1.23 <sup>b</sup>      | .10  | <b>21.40</b> | p<.01 | .20            |
| LPU       | 3.41 <sup>a</sup>        | .16 | 3.75 <sup>a</sup>     | .18 | 3.63 <sup>a</sup>      | .19 | 3.74 <sup>a</sup>      | .38  | 2.30         | p>.05 | .03            |
| SWLS      | 20.73 <sup>a</sup>       | .55 | 21.63 <sup>a</sup>    | .60 | 22.07 <sup>a</sup>     | .61 | 23.03 <sup>a</sup>     | 1.26 | 1.84         | p>.05 | .02            |
| SRAR      | .02 <sup>a</sup>         | .01 | .12 <sup>a</sup>      | .02 | .12 <sup>a</sup>       | .02 | .22 <sup>b</sup>       | .03  | <b>7.05</b>  | p<.01 | .07            |

*Note.* Respondent age and severity index covaried in each ANCOVA. Significant cell differences designated by differing superscripts.

**Table 22***Trait Differences by Micro-Tactics of Sexual Perpetration Group Analyses of Covariance*

| PID-5 Dimension          | EXH            |                       | MP             |                       | NCDSC          |                       | SAPF           |                       |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
|                          | (n = 67)       |                       | (n = 27)       |                       | (n = 50)       |                       | (n = 30)       |                       |
|                          | <i>p</i>       | <i>n</i> <sup>2</sup> | <i>p</i>       | <i>n</i> <sup>2</sup> | <i>p</i>       | <i>n</i> <sup>2</sup> | <i>p</i>       | <i>n</i> <sup>2</sup> |
| Antagonism               | <i>p</i> < .01 | .09                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .09                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06                   |
| Detachment               | <i>p</i> < .01 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   |
| Disinhibition            | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .08                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .07                   |
| Psychoticism             | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06                   |
| Negative Affect          | <i>p</i> > .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   |
| <b>PID-5 Facet</b>       |                |                       |                |                       |                |                       |                |                       |
| Callousness              | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .10                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .12                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .09                   |
| Grandiosity              | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .07                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   |
| Intimacy Avoidance       | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   |
| Irresponsible            | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   |
| Perceptual Dysregulation | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .07                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .09                   |
| Rigid Perfectionism      | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   |
| Suspicious               | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   |
| Unusual Beliefs          | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06                   |

*Note.* Probabilities and effect sizes determined from independent (age and severity controlled) ANCOVAs that contrasted each micro-tactic subgroup with the remaining sample that did not identify behavior associated with that specified micro-tactic.

**Table 22 Continued***Trait Differences by Micro-Tactics of Sexual Perpetration Group Analyses of Covariance*

| PID-5 Dimension          | SAFS           |                       | SCFS           |                       | SH             |                       | VSC            |                       | VOY            |                       |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
|                          | (n = 40)       |                       | (n = 39)       |                       | (n = 58)       |                       | (n = 48)       |                       | (n = 86)       |                       |
|                          | <i>p</i>       | <i>n</i> <sup>2</sup> | <i>p</i>       | <i>n</i> <sup>2</sup> | <i>p</i>       | <i>n</i> <sup>2</sup> | <i>p</i>       | <i>n</i> <sup>2</sup> | <i>p</i>       | <i>n</i> <sup>2</sup> |
| Antagonism               | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .07                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .09                   |
| Detachment               | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   |
| Disinhibition            | <i>p</i> < .01 | .08                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .13                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .09                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   |
| Psychoticism             | <i>p</i> < .01 | .07                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .10                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   |
| Negative Affect          | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   |
| <b>PID-5 Facet</b>       |                |                       |                |                       |                |                       |                |                       |                |                       |
| Callousness              | <i>p</i> < .01 | .13                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .11                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .11                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .08                   |
| Grandiosity              | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   |
| Intimacy Avoidance       | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .07                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   |
| Irresponsible            | <i>p</i> < .01 | .07                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .11                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .07                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   |
| Perceptual Dysregulation | <i>p</i> < .01 | .09                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .15                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .08                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   |
| Rigid Perfectionism      | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   |
| Suspicious               | <i>p</i> < .01 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   |
| Unusual Beliefs          | <i>p</i> < .01 | .07                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .11                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   |

*Note.* Probabilities and effect sizes determined from independent (age and severity controlled) ANCOVAs that contrasted each micro-tactic subgroup with the remaining sample that did not identify behavior associated with that specified micro-tactic.

**Table 23***Trait Differences by Micro-Tactics of Sexual Perpetration Group Analyses of Covariance*

| Indicator | EXH<br>(n = 67) |                 | MP<br>(n = 27) |                 | NCDSC<br>(n = 50) |                 | SAPF<br>(n = 30) |                 |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
|           | p               | n <sup>p2</sup> | M              | n <sup>p2</sup> | M                 | n <sup>p2</sup> | M                | n <sup>p2</sup> |
| ACES      | <i>p</i> < .01  | .05             | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05             | <i>p</i> < .01    | .02             | <i>p</i> < .01   | .05             |
| ALC       | <i>p</i> < .01  | .03             | <i>p</i> < .01 | .01             | <i>p</i> < .01    | .02             | <i>p</i> < .05   | .01             |
| AH        | <i>p</i> < .01  | .05             | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04             | <i>p</i> > .05    | .01             | <i>p</i> < .01   | .02             |
| CES       | <i>p</i> > .05  | .38             | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00             | <i>p</i> > .05    | .00             | <i>p</i> > .05   | .00             |
| NLIRB     | <i>p</i> < .01  | .03             | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06             | <i>p</i> < .01    | .04             | <i>p</i> < .01   | .03             |
| ND        | <i>p</i> < .01  | .09             | <i>p</i> < .01 | .09             | <i>p</i> < .01    | .03             | <i>p</i> < .01   | .07             |
| FOES      | <i>p</i> > .05  | .00             | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00             | <i>p</i> > .05    | .00             | <i>p</i> < .05   | .01             |
| NJTF      | <i>p</i> < .01  | .12             | <i>p</i> < .01 | .20             | <i>p</i> < .01    | .03             | <i>p</i> < .01   | .14             |
| NLIR      | <i>p</i> < .01  | .03             | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02             | <i>p</i> < .01    | .03             | <i>p</i> < .05   | .01             |
| NM        | <i>p</i> < .01  | .04             | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04             | <i>p</i> < .01    | .02             | <i>p</i> < .01   | .04             |
| LPU       | <i>p</i> < .05  | .01             | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00             | <i>p</i> > .05    | .00             | <i>p</i> > .05   | .00             |
| SWLS      | <i>p</i> > .05  | .00             | <i>p</i> < .01 | .01             | <i>p</i> > .05    | .00             | <i>p</i> < .05   | .01             |
| SRAR      | <i>p</i> < .01  | .06             | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02             | <i>p</i> < .05    | .01             | <i>p</i> < .01   | .02             |

*Note.* Probabilities and effect sizes determined from independent (age and severity controlled) ANCOVAs that contrasted each micro-tactic subgroup with the remaining sample that did not identify behavior associated with that specified micro-tactic.

**Table 23 (continued)***Trait Differences by Micro-Tactics of Sexual Perpetration Group Analyses of Covariance*

| Indicator | SAFS           |                       | SCFS           |                       | SH             |                       | VSC            |                       | VOY            |                       |
|-----------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
|           | (n = 40)       |                       | (n = 39)       |                       | (n = 58)       |                       | (n = 48)       |                       | (n=86)         |                       |
|           | <i>p</i>       | <i>n</i> <sup>2</sup> | <i>p</i>       | <i>n</i> <sup>2</sup> | <i>p</i>       | <i>n</i> <sup>2</sup> | <i>p</i>       | <i>n</i> <sup>2</sup> | <i>p</i>       | <i>n</i> <sup>2</sup> |
| ACES      | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   |
| ALC       | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   |
| AH        | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .06                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   |
| CES       | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   |
| NLIRB     | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   |
| ND        | <i>p</i> < .01 | .08                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .09                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .08                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   |
| FOES      | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   |
| NJTF      | <i>p</i> < .01 | .12                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .25                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .15                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   |
| NLIR      | <i>p</i> < .01 | .02                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   |
| NM        | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .04                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .05                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   |
| LPU       | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   |
| SWLS      | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   |
| SRAR      | <i>p</i> < .05 | .02                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .02                   | <i>p</i> > .05 | .00                   | <i>p</i> < .01 | .03                   | <i>p</i> < .05 | .01                   |

*Note.* Probabilities and effect sizes determined from independent (age and severity controlled) ANCOVAs that contrasted each micro-tactic subgroup with the remaining sample that did not identify behavior associated with that specified micro-tactic.

**Table 24***SES Severity Index*

| Items  | Criteria<br>(same for all items)  |
|--|---|
| I fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of someone's body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt) or removed some of their clothes without their consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration) by: | Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn't want to. |
| I had oral sex with someone or had someone perform oral sex on me without their consent by:  | Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn't want to.   |
| I put my penis (men only) or I put my fingers or objects (all respondents) into a woman's vagina without her consent by:   | Encouraging and pressuring someone to use drugs such as pot, or Valium until they became too incapacitated (out of it) to consent or stop what was happening.   |
| I put in my penis (men only) or I put my fingers or objects (all respondents) into someone's butt without their consent by:  | Finding someone who was asleep or unconscious From alcohol and when they came to (regained consciousness) they could not stop what was happening.   |
| Even though it did not happen, I TRIED to have oral sex with someone or make them have oral sex with me without their consent by:  | Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.   |
| Even though it did not happen, I TRIED put in my penis (men only) or I tried to put my fingers or objects (all respondents) into a woman's vagina without their consent by:  | Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.   |
| Even though it did not happen, I TRIED to put in my penis (men only) or I tried to put my fingers or objects (all respondents) into someone's butt without their consent by:   |   |

All items taken from: The Revised Sexual Experiences Long-Form Perpetration (SES-LFP; Koss et al., 2006)

### References

- Abbey, A. (1991) Acquaintance rape and alcohol consumption on college campuses: How are they linked? *Journal of American College Health*, 39, 165-169.
- Abbey, A., Jacques-Tiura, A. J., & Lebreton, J. M. (2011). Risk factors for sexual perpetration in young men: an expansion of the confluence model. *Aggressive Behavior*, 37(5), 450–464. doi: 10.1002/ab.20399.
- Abbey, A., McAuslan, P., & Ross, L. T. (1998). Sexual assault perpetration by college men: The role of alcohol, misperception of sexual intent, and sexual beliefs and experiences. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 17, 167–195.
- Abbey, A., McAuslan, P., Zawacki, T., Clinton, A. M., & Buck, P. O. (2001). Attitudinal, Experiential, and Situational Predictors of Sexual Assault Perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(8), 784–807. doi: 10.1177/088626001016008004.
- Abbey, A., Ross, L. T., & McDuffie, D. (1994). Alcohol's role in sexual assault. In R. R. Watson (Ed), *Addictive behaviors in women* (pp. 97-123). Totowa, NJ: Humana Press.
- Abbey, A., Ross, L. T., McDuffie, D., & McAuslan, P. (1996). Alcohol and dating risk factors for sexual assault among college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20, 1 47-169.
- Abbey, A., Zawacki, T., Buck, P. O., Clinton, A. M., & McAuslan, P. (2001). Alcohol and sexual assault. *Alcohol Health and Research World*, 25, 43–51.
- Abel, G. G., Becker, J., Mittelman, M., Cunningham-Rathner, J., Rouleau, J., & Murphy, W. (1987). Self-reported sex crimes of nonincarcerated paraphiliacs. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2, 3-25. doi:10.1177/088626087002001001.



- Adams-Curtis, L. E., & Forbes, G. B. (2004). College Women's Experiences of Sexual Coercion. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 5(2), 91-122. doi:10.1177/1524838003262331.
- American Psychiatric Association (2013). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th edition). American Psychiatric Association: Arlington, VA.
- Anderson, R. E., Silver, K. E., Ciampaglia, A. M., Vitale, A. M., & Delahanty, D. L. (2019). The Frequency of Sexual Perpetration in College Men: A Systematic Review of Reported Prevalence Rates From 2000 to 2017. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 152483801986061. doi:10.1177/1524838019860619
- Bame, Y. (2017). 53% of millennial women have received a naked photo from a man. Retrieved from <https://today.yougov.com/topics/lifestyle/articles-reports/2017/10/09/53millennial-women-have-received-dick-pic>
- Basile, K. C. (2002). Prevalence of wife rape and other intimate partner sexual coercion in a nationally representative sample of women. *Violence and Victims*, 17(5), 511-524. doi:10.1891/vivi.17.5.511.33717.
- Baur, E., Forsman, M., Santtila, P., Johansson, A., Sandnabba, K., & Långström, N. (2016). Paraphilic sexual interests and sexually coercive behavior: A population-based twin study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 45(5), 1163–1172. doi: 10.1007/s10508-015-0674-2.
- Berdahl, J. (2006). The sexual harassment of uppity women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 425–437. doi: 10.1037/e633962013-260.
- Bergen, R. K. (n.d.). Marital Rape/Wife Rape, Marital Exemptions in Rape Statutes. *Encyclopedia of Interpersonal Violence*. doi: 10.4135/9781412963923.n280

- Bergen, R. K. (2016). An Overview of Marital Rape Research in the United States. *Marital Rape*, 19–28. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190238360.003.0002
- Blais, M. R., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Briere, N. M. (1989). L'Echelle de satisfaction de vie: Validation Canadienne-Francaise du "Satisfaction With Life Scale" [French Canadian Validation of the Satisfaction With Life Scale]. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 21, 210–223.
- Bogaerts, S., Vanheule, S., Leeuw, F., & Desmet, M. (2006). Recalled parental bonding and personality disorders in a sample of exhibitionists: A comparative study. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 17(4), 636–646. doi: 10.1080/14789940600915701.
- Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Basile, K. C., Walters, M. L., Chen, J., & Merrick, M. T. (2014, September 05). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual perpetration, stalking, and intimate partner violence victimization - National intimate partner and sexual perpetration survey, United States, 2011.
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. (2011). Amazons Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *PsycEXTRA Dataset*. doi: 10.1037/e527772014-223
- Bushman, B. J., Bonacci, A. M., Van Dijk, M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2003). Narcissism, sexual refusal, and aggression: Testing a narcissistic reactance model of sexual coercion. *J Pers Soc Psychol*, 84(5), 1027. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.1027>.
- Byers, E., & Eno, R. (1991). Predicting men's sexual coercion and aggression from attitudes, dating history, and sexual response. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, 4, 55–69.

- Campbell, R., & Wasco, S. M. (2005). Understanding rape and sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*(1), 127-131. doi:10.1177/0886260504268604.
- Cecil, H., & Matson, S. C. (2006). Sexual victimization among African American adolescent females: Examination of the reliability and validity of the Sexual Experiences Survey. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*, 89–104.
- Clark, S., Jeglic, E., & Mercado, C. C. (2012). More than a Nuisance: A Study of reactions to frotteurism and exhibitionism. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 28*(1), 3-19. doi: 10.1037/e669802012-546.
- Clark, S., Jeglic, E., Calkins, C., & Tatar, J. (2014). More than a nuisance: the prevalence and consequences of frotteurism and exhibitionism. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 28*(1), 3–19.
- Clifford, S., Jewell, R. M., & Waggoner, P. D. (2015). Are samples drawn from Mechanical Turk valid for research on political ideology? *Research & Politics, 2*(4), 205316801562207. doi: 10.1177/2053168015622072
- Coid, J., & Ullrich, S. (2010). Antisocial personality disorder is on a continuum with psychopathy. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 51*(4), 426–433. doi:10.1016/j.comppsy.2009.09.006.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*, 71-75.

DeGue, S., & Dilillo, D. (2004). Understanding perpetrators of nonphysical sexual coercion:

Characteristics of those who cross the line. *Violence and Victims, 19*(6), 673-688.

doi:10.1891/088667004780927701.

DeGue, S., DiLillo, D., & Scalora, M. (2010). Are all perpetrators alike? Comparing risk factors

for sexual coercion and aggression. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and*

*Treatment, 22*(4), 402-426. doi:10.1177/1079063210372140.

Delisi, M. (2010). Murder by numbers: Monetary costs imposed by a sample of homicide

offenders. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology, 21*, 501-513.

doi:10.1080/14789940903564388.

Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics (2018). National

crime victimization survey, 2013-2017. Retrieved August 8, 2019, from

<https://bjs.gov/>.

Diehl, C., Rees, J., & Bohner, G. (2012). Flirting with disaster: Short-term mating orientation

and hostile sexism predict different types of sexual harassment. *Aggressive*

*Behavior, 38*(6), 521-531. doi: 10.1002/ab.21444.

Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V., Koss,

M. P., Marks, J. S. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction

to many of the leading causes of death in adults. *American Journal of Preventive*

*Medicine, 14*(4), 245-258. doi: 10.1016/s0749-3797(98)00017-8.

Fossati, A., Krueger, R. F., Markon, K. E., Borroni, S., & Maffei, C. (2013). Reliability and

validity of the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5). *Assessment, 20*(6), 689-708.

doi: 10.1177/1073191113504984.

- Gilmore, A. K., Schacht, R. L., George, W. H., Davis, K. C., Norris, J., & Heiman, J. R. (2014). Verbal sexual coercion experiences, sexual risk, and substance use in women. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 23(7), 725-739. doi:10.1080/10926771.2014.
- Gruber, J. E. (1992). A typology of personal and environmental sexual harassment: Research and policy implications for the 1990's. *Sex Roles*, 26, 447-464.
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005). The characteristics of persistent sexual offenders: A meta-analysis of recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73(6), 1154-1163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1154>.
- Karantzas, G. C., McCabe, M. P., Karantzas, K. M., Pizzirani, B., Campbell, H., & Mullins, E. R. (2015). Attachment style and less severe forms of sexual coercion: A systematic review. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 45(5), 1053-1068. doi:10.1007/s10508-015-0600-7.
- Johnson, S, Ostermeyer, B, Sikes, K, Nelse, A, & Coverdale, J. (2014). Prevalence and treatment of frotteurism in the community: A systematic review. *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 43, 478-483.
- Kearl, H. (2018). The facts behind the #MeToo movement: A national study on sexual harassment and assault. *Stop Street Harassment*, 1-41.
- Kelly L., Lovett J. and Regan L. (2005) A gap or a chasm? Attrition in reported rape cases. Home Office Research Study 293. London, Home Office.
- Key, C.W., & Ridge, R.D. (2011). Guys like us: The link between sexual harassment proclivity and blame. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 28, 1093-1103.

Kilpatrick, D. G., Resnick, H. S., Ruggiero, K. J., Conoscenti, L. M., & Mccauley, J. (2007).

Drug-facilitated, incapacitated, and forcible rape: A national study. *PsycEXTRA*

*Dataset*. doi:10.1037/e667182007-001.

King, A.R., Breen, C.M., Russell, T.D., Nerpel, B.P., & Pogalz, C.R. (2017). Self-reported

executive functioning competencies and lifetime aggression. *Applied Neuropsychology:*

*Adult*, 25(5), 400-409. doi:10.1080/23279095.2017.1320555.

King, A.R., Ratzak, A., Ballantyne, S., Knutson, S., Russell, T.D., Pogalz, C.R., & Breen,

C.M. (2018). Differentiating corporal punishment from physical abuse in the prediction

of lifetime aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 44(3), 306-315.

King, A.R., Russel, T.D., & Bailly, M.D. (2017). Psychometric properties of the Lifetime

Assessment of Violent Acts. *Violence and Victims*, 32(6).

Koss, M. P. (2018). Hidden rape: Sexual perpetration and victimization in a national sample of

students in higher education. *Rape and Society*, 35-49. doi:10.4324/9780429493201-6.

Koss, M. P., & Gidycz, C. A. (1985). Sexual Experiences Survey: Reliability and

validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53(3), 422-423. doi:

10.1037//0022-006x.53.3.422.

Koss, M. P., & Oros, C. J. (1980). Hidden Rape: A survey of the incidence of sexual perpetration

and victimization on a university campus. *Midwestern Psychological*

*Association*. Midwestern Psychological Association. St. Louis.

- Koss, M. P., & Oros, C. J. (1982). Sexual Experiences Survey: A research instrument investigating sexual perpetration and victimization. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50*(3), 455-457.
- Koss, M. P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., Ullman, S., West, C., & White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual perpetration and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*(4), 357–370. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00385.x.
- Kosson, D. S., Kelly, J. C., & White, J. W. (1997). Psychopathy-related traits predict self-reported sexual perpetration among college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*(2), 241–254. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/088626097012002006>.
- Krahe', B. A., Reimer, T., Scheinberger-Olwig, R., & Fritsche, I. (1999). Measuring sexual aggression: the reliability of the Sexual Experiences Survey in a German sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*, 91–100.
- Krueger, R. F., Derringer, J., Markon, K. E., Watson, D., & Skodol, A. E. (2012). Initial construction of a maladaptive personality trait model and inventory for DSM-5. *Psychology of Medicine, 42*, 1879–1890. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0033291711002674>.
- Krueger, R. F., & Markon, K. E. (2014). The role of the DSM-5 personality trait model in moving toward a quantitative and empirically based approach to classifying personality and psychopathology. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 10*, 477–501. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032813-153732>.

- Lalumière, M. L., & Quinsey, V. L. (1996). Sexual deviance, antisociality, mating effort, and the use of sexually coercive behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 21(1), 33-48. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(96)00059-1.
- Langstrom, N., & Hanson, R. (2006). High rates of sexual behaviour in the general population: correlates and predictors. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 35: 37–52.
- Langstrom, N., & Seto, M.C. (2006). Exhibitionistic and voyeuristic behaviour in a Swedish national population survey. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 35: 427–35.
- Lawyer, S., Resnick, H., Bakanic, V., Burkett, T., & Kilpatrick, D. (2010). Forcible, drug facilitated, and incapacitated rape and sexual assault among undergraduate women. *Journal of American College Health*, 58(5), 453–460. doi:10.1080/07448480903540515.
- Lee, K., Gizzarone, M., & Ashton, M.C. (2003). Personality and the likelihood to sexually harass. *Sex Roles*, 49, 59–69.
- Lisak, D., & Roth, S. (1988). Motivational factors in nonincarcerated sexually aggressive men. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 795-802.
- Lyndon, A. E., White, J. W., & Kadlec, K. M. (2007). Manipulation and force as sexual coercion tactics: Conceptual and empirical differences. *Aggressive Behavior*, 33(4), 291-303 doi:10.1002/ab.20200.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1986). Predictors of naturalistic sexual perpetration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(5), 953-962. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.50.5.953.



- Malamuth, N. M. (2006). Criminal and noncriminal sexual aggressors. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 989(1), 33–58. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.2003.tb07292.x.
- Malamuth, N. M., Linz, D., Heavey, C. L., Barnes, G., & Al, E. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual perpetration to predict men's conflict with women: A 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(2), 353-369. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.69.2.353.
- Malamuth, N. M., Sockloskie, R. J., Koss, M. P., & Tanaka, J. S. (1991). Characteristics of aggressors against women: Testing a model using a national sample of college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 59(5), 670-681. doi:10.1037/0022-006x.59.5.670.
- Matson, K., Russell, T.D., & King, A.R. (2018). Gun enthusiasm, hypermasculinity, manhood honor and lifetime aggression. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 28(3), 369-383. doi:10.1080/10926771.2017.1420722
- Mccauley, J. L., Ruggiero, K. J., Resnick, H. S., & Kilpatrick, D. G. (2010). Incapacitated, forcible, and drug/alcohol-facilitated rape in relation to binge drinking, marijuana use, and illicit drug use: A national survey. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*. doi: 10.1002/jts.20489.
- Mcnally, M. R., & Fremouw, W. J. (2014). Examining risk of escalation: A critical review of the exhibitionistic behavior literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 19(5), 474–485. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2014.07.001.

- Meston, C. M., Heiman, J. R., Trapnell, P. D., & Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Socially desirable responding and sexuality self-reports. *Journal of Sex Research, 35*, 148–157. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00224499809551928>.
- Minnich, A., Erford, B.T., Bardhoshi, G., & Ataley, Z. (2018). Systematic review of the Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 96*(3), 335–344.
- Mouilso, E. R., & Calhoun, K. S. (2012). A mediation model of the role of sociosexuality in the associations between narcissism, psychopathy, and sexual perpetration. *Psychology of Violence, 2*(1), 16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026217>.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Linton, M. A. (1987). Date rape and sexual perpetration in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*(2), 186–196. [doi:10.1037/0022-0167.34.2.186](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.34.2.186).
- Norton-Baker, M., Russell, T. D., & King, A. R. (2018). “He seemed so normal”: Single tactic perpetrators of sexual perpetration are similar to non-violent men using the DSM-5s hybrid personality disorder model. *Personality and Individual Differences, 123*, 241–246. [doi:10.1016/j.paid.2017.11.032](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.11.032).
- Palmer, R. S., McMahon, T. J., Rounsaville, B. J., & Ball, S. A. (2009). Coercive sexual experiences, protective behavioral strategies, alcohol expectancies and consumption among male and female college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(9), 1563–1578. [doi:10.1177/0886260509354581](https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260509354581).

Parkhill, M. R., Abbey, A. (2008). Does alcohol contribute to the confluence model of sexual assault perpetration? *Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology, 27*, 529-554.

doi:[10.1521/jscp.2008.27.6.529](https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2008.27.6.529).

Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Toward a taxonomy of dark personalities. *Current Directory*

*Psychological Sciences, 23*(6),421–426. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721414547737>.

Pavot, W. G., Diener, E., Colvin, C. R., & Sandvik, E. (1991). Further validation of the Satisfaction with Life Scale: Evidence for the cross-method convergence of well-being measures. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 57*, 149-161.

Pavot, W. G., & Diener, E. (1993). Review of the Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Psychological Assessment, 5*, 164-172.

Preventing Sexual Perpetration | Features | CDC. (2019, April 1). Retrieved August 8, 2019, from <https://www.cdc.gov/features/sexualviolence/index.html>.

Quilty, L. C., Ayearst, L., Chmielewski, M., Pollock, B. G., & Bagby, R. M. (2013). The psychometric properties of the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 in an APA DSM-5 field trial sample. *Assessment, 20*(3), 362–369. doi: 10.1177/1073191113486183.

Rapaport, K., & Burkhart, B. R. (1984). Personality and attitudinal characteristics of sexually coercive college males. *PsycEXTRA Dataset*. doi:10.1037/e330462004-008

Rothbaum, B. O., Foa, E. B., Riggs, D. S., Murdock, T., & Walsh, W. (1992). A prospective examination of post-traumatic stress disorder in rape victims. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 5*(3), 455-475. doi:10.1002/jts.2490050309.

- Russell, T. D., & King, A. R. (2017). Distrustful, conventional, entitled, and dysregulated: PID5 personality facets predict hostile masculinity and sexual perpetration in community men. *Online First: Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1–24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260517689887>.
- Russell, D. E. H. (1990). *Rape in marriage*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Santiago, J. M., McCall-Perez, F., Gorcey, M., & Beigel, A. (1985). Long-term psychological effects of rape in 35 rape victims. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 142(11), 1338–1340. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1176/ajp.142.11.1338>.
- Selzer, M.L. 1971. The Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test: a quest for a new diagnostic instrument. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 127, 1653– 1658.
- Serin, R. C., Mailloux, D. L., & Malcolm, P. B. (2001). Psychopathy, deviant sexual arousal, and recidivism among sexual offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(3), 234–246. doi:10.1177/088626001016003004.
- Sisco, M. M., & Figueredo, A. J. (2008). Similarities between men and women in non-traditional aggressive sexuality: Prevalence, novel approaches to assessment, and treatment applications. *Journal of Sexual Perpetration*, 14, 253–266  
doi:10.1080/13552600802401283
- Sisco, M. & Koss, M. (2006). Assessing sexual violence perpetration: A preliminary report of the psychometric properties of a gender neutral assessment tool, the Sexual Experiences Survey Long Form Perpetration Version (SES-LFP), *Minneapolis, MN: International Society on Research on Aggression*.

- Spitzberg, B. H. (1999). An Analysis of Empirical Estimates of Sexual Perpetration Victimization and Perpetration. *Violence and Victims, 14*(3), 241-260. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.14.3.241
- Strickland, C. M., Drislane, L. E., Lucy, M., Krueger, R. F., & Patrick, C. J. (2013). Characterizing psychopathy using DSM-5 personality traits. *Assessment, 20*(3), 327–338. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1073191113486691>.
- Till, F. J. (1980). Sexual harassment: A report on the sexual harassment of students. *National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs*. Washington D.C.: Department of Education.
- Testa M. and Parks K.A. (1996) The role of women's alcohol consumption in sexual victimization. *Aggressive and Violent Behavior, 1*, 217–34.
- Teitelbaum, L.M. & Carey, K.B. (2000). Temporal stability of alcohol screening measures in a psychiatric setting. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 14*(4), 401-404.
- Thompson, M. P., & Morrison, D. J. (2013). Prospective predictors of technology-based sexual coercion by college males. *Psychology of Violence, 3*(3), 233–246. doi:10.1037/a0030904.
- Tyler, K. A., Hoyt, D. R., & Whitbeck, L. B. (1998). Coercive sexual strategies. *Violence and Victims, 13*(1), 47-61.
- United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (n.d.). Retrieved from [https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/sexual\\_harassment.cfm](https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/sexual_harassment.cfm).

- Venables, N. C., Hall, J. R., & Patrick, C. J. (2013). Differentiating psychopathy from antisocial personality disorder: a triarchic model perspective. *Psychological Medicine, 44*(5), 1005–1013. doi: 10.1017/s003329171300161x.
- Walters, M., Jenkins, L., & Merrick, M. (2012). National Intimate Partner and Sexual Perpetration Survey (NISVS): Summary of Findings for 2010. *PsycEXTRA Dataset*. doi:10.1037/e621642012-003.
- Wheeler, J. G., George, W. H., & Dahl, B. J. (2002). Sexually aggressive college males: empathy as a moderator in the “*Confluence Model*” of sexual perpetration. *Personality and Individual Differences, 33*(5), 759–775. doi: 10.1016/s0191-8869(01)00190-8.
- Where We Stand. (n.d.). Retrieved August 8, 2019, from [https://www.endsexualviolence.org/where\\_we\\_stand/costs-consequences-and-solutions/](https://www.endsexualviolence.org/where_we_stand/costs-consequences-and-solutions/).
- Wright, A. G. C., Calabrese, W. R., Rudick, M. M., Yam, W. H., Zelazny, K., Williams, T. F., & Simms, L. J. (2015). Stability of the DSM–5 Section III pathological personality traits and their longitudinal associations with psychosocial functioning in personality disordered individuals. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 124*, 199–207.
- Yam, W. H., & Simms, L. J. (2014). Comparing criterion- and trait-based personality disorder diagnoses in DSM-5. *Journal of abnormal psychology, 123*(4), 802–808. doi:10.1037/a0037633
- Ybarra, M. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2004). Online aggressor/targets, aggressors, and targets: a comparison of associated youth characteristics. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 45*(7), 1308–1316. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00328.x.

- Ybarra, M. L., Espelage, D. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2007). The co-occurrence of internet harassment and unwanted sexual solicitation victimization and perpetration: Associations with psychosocial indicators. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41*(6). doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.09.010.
- Zanotti, D. C., Kaier, E., Vanasse, R., Davis, J. L., Strunk, K. C., & Cromer, L. D. (2018). An examination of the test–retest reliability of the ACE-SQ in a sample of college athletes. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy, 10*(5), 559–562. doi: 10.1037/tra0000299
- Zeigler-Hill, V., Besser, A., Morag, J., & Campbell, W. K. (2016). The Dark Triad and sexual harassment proclivity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 89*, 47–54. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2015.09.048.
- Zeigler-Hill, V., Enjaian, B & Essa, L. (2013). The role of narcissistic personality features in sexual perpetration. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 32* (2), pp. 186-199.
- Zinzow, H. M., & Thompson, M. (2014). A longitudinal study of risk factors for repeated sexual coercion and assault in U.S. college men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 44*(1), 13-222. doi:10.1007/s10508-013-0243-5.