UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC À MONTRÉAL

HE SAID, SHE SAID : AN EXAMINATION OF SEXUAL COERCION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF MIXED-SEX COUPLES

DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF PHD IN PSYCHOLOGY

BY

MÉLANIE M. BROUSSEAU

MARCH 2011

UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC À MONTRÉAL

LA COERCITION SEXUELLE CHEZ LES COUPLES SELON LA PERSPECTIVE DE CHAQUE PARTENAIRE

THÈSE

PRÉSENTÉE

COMME EXIGENCE PARTIELLE

DU DOCTORAT EN PSYCHOLOGIE

PAR

MÉLANIE M. BROUSSEAU

MARS 2011

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere thanks and appreciation to the many people who helped and stood by me during this project which spanned numerous years.

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to my two advisors, Sophie Bergeron, PhD, and Martine Hébert, PhD. This thesis would not have been possible were it not for your ongoing support and collaboration, not to mention your patience and understanding. I am truly grateful for the fact that you had faith in me and supported me in my choice of research topic. Your mentoring has meant a lot to me. I especially want to thank Dr. Bergeron for offering me the opportunity to embark on the adventure that was my doctoral research.

Secondly, I would like to thank Pierre McDuff for all his invaluable help with the statistical analyses for this research. You always welcomed my questions and your sense of humour made even the most complicated statistics enjoyable for me. Thank you also to my research assistants and my colleagues at UQAM who helped me with the data collection and data entry.

I am also indebted to the numerous professors at l'Université du Québec à Montréal who saw value in my research and allowed me to recruit participants in their classrooms. Your collaboration was greatly appreciated. Moreover, to all the participants who took the time to fill-out my questionnaires, I sincerely thank you.

I also want to sincerely thank my clinical supervisors, Claude Bélanger, Ph.D., Deborah Weissberg, M.A., Jean Grenier, Ph.D., and Kathleen Lalande, Ph.D. who helped me develop my skills and knowledge as a clinical psychologist. I truly enjoyed my learning experiences with you.

Thank you also to the members of my jury, Dr. Mara Brendgen, Dr. Sophie Boucher, and Dr. E. Sandra Byers, for accepting to evaluate my research and for their professionalism regarding my thesis.

This research was made possible by the three research fellowships as well as a research grant awarded by the *Centre de Recherche Interdisciplinaire sur les Problèmes Conjugaux et les Agressions Sexuelles (CRIPCAS).*

To my loving husband who has been by my side through most of this journey: Thank you for not giving up on me, and helping me anyway you could. It was not always easy, but we survived!

To Daphnée, my daughter, thank you for teaching me about priorities and showing me the world through the eyes of a toddler. Your numerous interruptions were always appreciated, even in the most stressful of times. And to Justin, my son: thank you for motivating me to get this thesis done. The thought of finally holding you in my arms encouraged me to complete this chapter in my life so that I can start a new one with you in our family.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my parents for supporting me throughout my life and academic career. Thank you for always being there for me. I wish to also thank all my friends and family members who encouraged me and supported me throughout my studies. You made this journey all the more enjoyable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter II

Chapter III

RÉSUMÉ

La coercition sexuelle (CS), définie comme l'utilisation de manipulation, de menaces, et de pression psychologique et physique dans le but d'obtenir des relations et/ou activités sexuelles avec un(e) partenaire non-consentant(e), semble être un phénomène fréquent chez les couples adultes. Tant les femmes que les hommes peuvent commettre et être la cible de coercition sexuelle. En effet, 13% à 43% des femmes et 18% à 30% des hommes rapportent être victimes de coercition sexuelle selon différentes études. Malgré que plusieurs recherches aient exploré la coercition sexuelle, les études antérieures ont rarement examiné la coercition selon la perspective de chacun des membres du couple. La présente thèse de doctorat documente la coercition sexuelle et les facteurs de risques associés selon une perspective dyadique. Le but de cette recherche est d'identifier le taux de CS selon les deux partenaires des couples, ainsi que de développer des modèles de prédiction de la victimisation et perpétration de la CS chez les femmes et les hommes.

Le premier chapitre de cette thèse portera sur l'état des connaissances au sujet de la CS, certains facteurs de risques associés, ainsi que les théories des scripts sexuels et de la dissonance cognitive. Plus spécifiquement, l'agression sexuelle vécue en enfance, la victimisation et la perpétration de CS dans les relations amoureuses antérieures, ainsi que la motivation sexuelle seront explorées en tant que facteurs prédicteurs possibles.

Le deuxième chapitre porte sur les résultats de notre première étude évaluant le taux de coercition sexuelle chez les couples. Plus spécifiquement, cette étude a examiné les taux de victimisation et de perpétration de CS, l'accord entre partenaires face à la présence de CS, ainsi que le degré de réciprocité parmi un échantillon de 222 couples hétérosexuels. Les taux de CS dans les relations amoureuses passées ont aussi été explorés. Les résultats ont démontré qu'au-delà de 50% des couples ont rapporté avoir vécu de la CS dans leur relation amoureuse. Plus spécifiquement, 25% des couples rapportaient de la victimisation chez la femme seulement, 10% rapportaient de la victimisation chez les hommes seulement, et 20% des couples rapportaient que la CS était réciproque. De plus, les résultats ont démontré que moins de 30% des couples étaient en accord quant à la présence de la CS au sein de leur relation amoureuse. Par ailleurs, les hommes et les femmes rapportaient généralement plus de CS dans leurs relations amoureuses passées qu'au sein de leur couple actuel. Ceci semble appuyer la théorie de la dissonance cognitive qui stipule que les gens ont tendance à minimiser les incidents de coercition sexuelle dans leurs relations actuelles, mais qu'ils seraient plus objectifs et rapporteraient plus facilement de la CS dans leurs relations antérieures. Il est aussi possible que la présence de CS ait causé la rupture dans les relations antérieures. Le chapitre 3 présente les résultats de notre

deuxième étude visant les modèles de prédiction de victimisation et de perpétration de coercition sexuelle chez les femmes et les hommes. Notre étude a examiné la motivation sexuelle (les raisons pour lesquelles les gens ont des relations sexuelles), ainsi que des antécédents d'agression sexuelle vécue en enfance et de CS dans les relations amoureuses antérieures comme facteurs de risque pour la victimisation et la perpétration de CS chez les couples hétérosexuels. Plus spécifiquement, cette étude a exploré si les motifs sexuels de pouvoir, la réduction du stress, la pression du partenaire, et l'imposition contribuaient à la prédiction de la CS, au-delà de l'agression sexuelle vécue en enfance et des antécédents de CS. Les résultats suggèrent que l'agression sexuelle vécue en enfance était un prédicteur significatif seulement pour prédire les comportements coercitifs chez les femmes, tandis que les antécédents de CS prédisaient la victimisation et la perpétration de CS chez les hommes seulement. La CS réciproque chez les couples, quant à elle, permet de prédire la victimisation et la perpétration de CS tant chez les femmes que chez les hommes. Les résultats démontrent aussi que la motivation sexuelle du pouvoir était un facteur prédicteur significatif pour la perpétration de la CS, tandis que la motivation d'imposition était un facteur prédicteur significatif pour la victimisation chez les femmes et les hommes. La motivation de la pression du partenaire, par contre, s'est avérée être un prédicteur significatif seulement pour la victimisation chez les femmes. Ces résultats démontrent la pertinence de la théorie des scripts sexuels pour mieux comprendre le phénomène de la CS.

Le dernier chapitre résume les résultats des deux études, présente une discussion critique de leur apport théorique et clinique et propose des pistes quant à la conduite des études futures. En somme, la présente thèse démontre que les antécédents d'agression sexuelle vécue en enfance et de coercition sexuelle augmentent les risques de revictimisation et de reperpétration de CS dans le couple. Les résultats démontrent l'importance d'investiguer la coercition sexuelle du point de vue des deux partenaires dans un couple, ainsi que de considérer la motivation sexuelle en tant que facteur prédicteur, afin de mieux cerner la problématique. Puisque seulement 30% des couples sont en accord quant à l'évaluation de la présence de la CS au sein de leur relation, les résultats suggèrent aussi que les hommes et les femmes doivent être sensibilisés pour mieux reconnaître les comportements de coercition sexuelle. Par ailleurs, les programmes de prévention devraient cibler davantage les jeunes dès les premières relations amoureuses pour réduire les risques de coercition sexuelle dans leurs relations amoureuses futures, ainsi que la revictimisation et la reperpétration y étant associés.

Mots-clés : accord inter-partenaire, agression, coercition sexuelle, couples, motivation sexuelle, reciprocité, victimisation.

ABSTRACT

Sexual coercion (SC), defined as using manipulative psychological and physical tactics to obtain sexual activities from an unwilling partner, is a prevalent problem affecting women and men alike. Indeed, studies on victimization and perpetration of sexual coercion have generally reported victimization rates of 13% to 43% for women, and 18% to 30% for men. However, these rates have generally been obtained using responses from individuals rather than from both members of couples. This doctoral dissertation examines sexual coercion and associated risk factors within a dyadic perspective. The purpose of this research is to document the rate of sexual coercion from the perspective of both partners, as well as to develop predictive models for female and male victimization and perpetration.

The first chapter of this dissertation reviews the current knowledge concerning sexual coercion, the associated risk factors, as well as the theories of sexual scripts and cognitive dissonance. More specifically, childhood sexual abuse (CSA), SC victimization and perpetration in previous relationships, as well as sexual motivation are reviewed as potential predictors of SC.

Chapter 2 presents the results of study 1 on the rate of sexual coercion in heterosexual couples within the framework of cognitive dissonance. More specifically, this study examined the rate of SC victimization and perpetration, inter-partner agreement concerning its occurrence, as well as its degree of reciprocity within a sample of 222 heterosexual couples. SC within previous romantic relationships for both partners was also examined. Results showed that over one in two couples reported experiencing some SC. More specifically, 25% of couples reported female victimization only, 10% reported male victimization only, and 20% reported reciprocal SC. Moreover, less than 30% of couples agreed on the occurrence of sexual coercion within their ongoing relationship. Conversely, both men and women reported more SC victimization within previous relationships than in their current one. This lends support to cognitive dissonance theory which proposes that men and women may minimize coercive events that are occurring in the present relationship, but be more objective regarding past coercive relationships. It may also be possible that the presence of sexual coercion may have led to the break-up of the past relationships, thus inflating the report of SC in previous relationships.

Chapter 3 presents the results of study 2 that aimed to develop predictive models of sexual coercion victimization and perpetration for women and men. Our study investigated sexual motivation, or the reasons people engage in sexual activities, as well as a history of CSA and previous experiences of SC, as possible risk factors for current SC victimization and perpetration within a sample of heterosexual couples. Specifically, this study examined whether sexual motives,

namely power, stress relief, partner pressure and imposition, contributed unique variance to the prediction of sexual coercion beyond that accounted for by past CSA and SC events. Results suggest that CSA was only a significant predictor of female SC perpetration, whereas male SC victimization and perpetration were predicted by SC victimization and perpetration in previous relationships. Coexisting or reciprocal sexual coercion within couples also predicted SC victimization and perpetration for both genders. Further, findings demonstrated that power motives were significant predictors of SC perpetration, and imposition was a significant predictor of SC victimization for both genders. However, partner pressure was significant only for female SC victimization. These results lend support to the theory of traditional sexual scripts, for both male and female participants.

The final chapter consists of a general discussion focusing on the theoretical and clinical implications of the findings, as well as future directions for research. In summary, the results of this thesis suggest that revictimization and reperpetration are significant concerns for both partners in couples who have experienced sexual abuse or coercion in the past. Moreover, they demonstrate the important value of obtaining data from both partners to provide a relational perspective of sexual coercion, as well as examining sexual motivation as a valuable predictive factor. Considering that only 30% of the couples agreed on the presence of SC in their relationships, findings suggest that men and women need to be more sensitized to recognizing sexually coercive behaviours. Finally, preventative measures need to be offered early in dating relationships to reduce the risk of SC, and subsequent revictimization and/or reperpetration.

Keywords: couples, perpetration, sexual coercion, sexual motivation, victimization inter-partner agreement; reciprocity.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Women and men have been in sexual relationships since the beginning of time. Whether it is to fulfill the need for intimacy, physical pleasure, power, reproduction, or just to avoid potential conflict, sexual interactions have played a prominent part in couple relationships. Accordingly, the quality of sexual interactions may influence couple adjustment and satisfaction (Impett, Peplau, & Gable, 2005; Lawrance & Byers, 1995; Williams & Frieze, 2005). As much as sexuality can be used to bring two people together, it can also be a source of conflict for many. More specifically, in instances of coercive sexuality, it can be devastating.

Sexual coercion (SC), defined as making an unwilling person engage in sexual activity through the use of manipulative psychological or physical tactics (Teten, Hall, & Capaldi, 2009), often occurs between men and women who know each other, who are dating or who are in serious long-term relationships (Struckman-Johnson, Struckman-Johnson, & Anderson, 2003). Although socially perceived in the majority of cases as involving female victimization and male perpetration, studies have found that women and men can both be the perpetrator and/or the target of sexual coercion (Krahé, Scheinberger-Olwig, & Bieneck, 2003; Russell & Oswald, 2002; Spitzberg, 1999; Struckman-Johnson, 1988; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003).

While studies conducted in the past decades have proven to be useful for understanding some aspects of sexual coercion, they have generally had several limitations. First, the majority of studies on sexual coercion have either investigated sexual coercion experiences in past relationships or with the current partner, but not both. Second, when sexual coercion has been examined within relationships, only one member of the dyad has been surveyed. Therefore response rates have rarely been compared within couples. Consequently, prior reported prevalence rates may be inaccurate. Indeed, prevalence rates often vary depending on who is asked; victims generally report experiencing more coercion than perpetrators report inflicting (Anderson & Sorensen, 1999; Johnson & Sigler, 2000; Kolivas & Gross, 2007; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003). Some researchers may interpret this result as meaning that perpetrators underreport the use of sexual coercion, or that the

perceptions of both parties do not coincide. Therefore, to our knowledge, the prevalence of coercion perpetration and victimization of both partners and the accuracy of their reports have never been studied systematically. Thus a clear picture of the extent to which SC may be reciprocal within couples has not yet been established.

Research to date has examined various factors related to the occurrence of either SC victimization or perpetration, but rarely both simultaneously. Moreover, empirical reports have failed to present a more global understanding of sexual coercion within the context of a history of childhood sexual abuse (CSA), previous sexual coercion experiences and sexual intentions. Indeed, some studies suggest that CSA and previous experiences of sexual coercion may increase the risk of sexual coercion, whereas sexual motivation, or the reasons people engage in sexual activities, may provide a better understanding of sexually coercive behaviours (Hill, 2003). The dearth of research examining coercive behaviours and victimization simultaneously may be to blame for the inconsistent relations found between some of the factors and sexual coercion. For instance, CSA and previous sexual coercion experiences may be associated differently with current sexual coercion. These discrepancies highlight the need to provide additional data in this regard.

The purpose of the present research was two-fold. The first aim was to address the above limitations by examining and comparing the reported rates of victimization and perpetration of sexual coercion from the perspective of both partners in romantic relationships. The results may provide guidelines for the design of targeted prevention and intervention programs. A second important goal of this study was to develop a predictive model of SC victimization and perpetration within young adults' romantic relationships. Current sexually coercive behaviours were examined in conjunction with possible predictors such as the participants' possible childhood sexual abuse, sexual coercion experiences in previous relationships, as well as sexual motivation.

Theoretical Framework and Objectives

The following section will present the current state of knowledge concerning coercion within the context of sexual negotiation. More specifically, two theoretical models will be presented to understand sexual coercion within couples: the traditional sexual scripts model (Byers, 1996; Simon & Gagnon, 1986) and the cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957). Lastly, the roles of predictive factors such as CSA, previous experiences of SC, and sexual motivation will be explored.

Defining Sexual Coercion

Sexual coercion encompasses all unwanted sexual activities perpetrated against a person (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004). It can include sexual touching, sexual assault and forced intercourse. Although rape and sexual assault have been used interchangeably as meaning forced unwanted sexual intercourse against the will of the victims (Parrot, 1999), some studies and laws establish a distinction between the two (Anderson & Savage, 2005). Empirically, rape has often been defined as forced non-consensual intercourse (penile-vaginal, penile-anal), whereas sexual assault involves unwanted sexual activities and contact other than intercourse (Spitzberg, 1998).

Sexual coercion has had varying definitions throughout published research studies, depending on the researchers' classification of coercive behaviours and the measures used (Emmers-Sommer, 2002). Generally, sexual coercion is defined as making another person engage in sexual activity despite his or her unwillingness to do so (Spitzberg, 1998) by using various manipulative tactics such as psychological pressure (questioning the partner's orientation, insisting, continual argument, and insulting) and physical pressure (pinning a person down, using physical force or even a weapon). Some studies have conceptualized sexual coercion as being part of a continuum of sexual compliance which begins from non-consensual unwanted sexual attention leading up to sexual assault or forced intercourse (Littleton & Axsom, 2003; Meyer et al., 1998; Ryan, 1988; Spitzberg, 1998). Based on this definition, sexual

coercion encompasses most adult unwanted sexual experiences. For the purpose of the present thesis, the review of the literature will focus on partner rather than stranger sexual coercion. Furthermore, sexual coercion will refer to unwanted sexual activity since the age of 14, to focus on sexual experiences involving dating or romantic partners during adolescence and adulthood.

Female Victims, Male Perpetrators

Men are generally perceived as being more sexually aggressive than women – a statement that is supported by numerous studies (e.g. Christopher, Madura, & Weaver, 1998; Hamby, 2005; VanderLaan & Vasey, 2009). In a review of 120 studies on sexual coercion, Spitzberg (1999) found that approximately 13% of women had experienced forced intercourse in their lifetime, and 25% had been victims of coercion. Although rape prevention programs and traditional beliefs often present sexual aggression as a crime committed by strangers, women are more likely to be sexually victimized by people they know intimately (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Meyer, Vivian, & O'Leary, 1998; Stanko, 1997). Koss, Dinero, Siebel and Cox (1988) found that date rapes did not occur only on first dates; most occurred within steady long-term relationships. Indeed, it seems more socially acceptable for men to be entitled to sex with their long-term partners, and less acceptable for women to refuse (Margolin, Moran, & Miller, 1989).

In an American survey examining unwanted sexual experiences of women, 34% of a random sample ($N = 602$) reported being victims of sexual coercion by their partners (Basile, 2002). In this study, sexual coercion was more broadly defined to include partner imposed and self-imposed pressure, such as thinking that sex is expected after receiving a gift or after a romantic situation. Consequently, the reported coercion rate may have been inflated because it included situations where women felt they had to have sex with their partners out of personal guilt, rather than being directly coerced by their partner. Accordingly, the guilt and sense of duty seem better fitted as a motive for sex rather than a coercive strategy. Indeed, the current

study will examine various sexual motives to further explore their role as potential factors associated with the perception and experience of sexual coercion.

O'Sullivan, Byers and Finkelman (1998) examined the prevalence of sexual coercion in a random sample of university students and found that 42.5% of women had experienced some form of sexual coercion and 20% of men reported using sexually coercive tactics. Verbal pressure and arguments were the coercive tactics most often reported as used by the males to obtain sex play and intercourse.

Meyer and colleagues (1998) examined men's sexually aggressive behaviour by collecting data from both partners, in clinical and community samples, on the use of coercion by the husband towards the wife. This enabled the researchers to compare both spouses' reports of sexual aggression from the husband. In this study, sexual aggression was defined as unwanted sexual activities obtained through the use of verbal or psychological pressure up to and including use of physical force (Meyer et al., 1998). The results show that both members of clinical couples reported similar rates of husbands' perpetration of sexual coercion (35-36%) in the previous year (Meyer et al., 1998). In comparison, husbands from the community couples reported engaging in more coercion than their wives reported (23% vs. 13.5%). Thus, the discrepancies in couples' reports of sexual coercion decreased as the rate of sexual coercion increased. It is possible that more frequent or severe sexual coercion may be harder to downplay or ignore for either partner, whereas milder sexual coercion may be more ambiguous and overlooked in non-violent couples (Perry & Fromuth, 2005).

Male Victims, Female Perpetrators

Although a greater number of studies have examined female victimization, male targets of sexual coercion do exist (Emmers-Sommer & Allen, 1999; O'Sullivan et al., 1998; Russell & Oswald, 2002). In their study on the prevalence rate of sexual coercion within a student sample, O'Sullivan et al. (1998) found that 18.5% of male participants reported experiencing sexual coercion from a woman in the previous year. Similarly, Larimer, Lydum, Anderson, and Turner (1999) reported an overall

20.7% prevalence rate in the past year. In both studies, verbal pressure and attempted sexual intercourse following the use of drugs or alcohol were the coercive tactics most often reported to be used by women. In their study of men, Russell and Oswald (2002) found that almost 44% of their sample (N=117) reported being victims of sexual coercion from a female partner in their lifetime. These men reported that their partners used mild physical tactics (14.5%), verbal tactics (11.6%), or both (17.5%) to obtain sex.

Krahé et al. (2003) examined the prevalence of men's unwanted sexual interactions. They recruited 400 males from a variety of public settings in Germany, and asked them to complete anonymous questionnaires. Results suggested that 25.1% to 30.1% of the heterosexual male participants reported experiencing non-consensual sexual activity with a woman at least once in their lifetime. The participants also reported a similar prevalence rate (23.5-23.9%) for attempts at making them unwillingly engage in sexual activities. The most commonly reported unwanted sexual activities were kissing and petting, and to a lesser extent, intercourse and oral sex. Considering the rates of incidence and prevalence reported in these studies, it seems that men do experience unwanted non-consensual sex at rates similar to those found in women (Krahé et al., 2003). However, the lack of comparison with their female partner's perception of the activities may decrease or inflate the reported prevalence rate. Consequently, further research on both partners' experiences is needed to examine and compare the severity of experienced coercion for men and women. Only by obtaining the reports and perceptions of both partners within a relationship can the frequency rates be accurately measured.

Sexual Coercion Within Couples

Sexual activities and intercourse often occur as part of the natural evolution of a romantic or dating relationship (Spitzberg, 1998), however each partner may have their own perception of its necessity. Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling and Binderup (2000) used vignettes of a man sexually coercing his partner and they manipulated

their relationship status (strangers, newly dating, steady dating, or married) and their sexual history (previous intercourse or not). The researchers found that as the relationship between the victim and perpetrator became closer, the respondents were less likely to oppose the coercion. This was also true for couples who were described as having had intercourse together previously. Thus, sexual precedence may increase social and relationship tolerance for sexual coercion and create an expectation of sexual intercourse within established couples. Consequently, this may lead partners to feel obligated to have unwanted sex because they think they cannot refuse it, or they fear abandonment from their partner. Unfortunately, this may inadvertently reduce their desire for further sexual contact.

Victims and perpetrators may underreport events because of forgetfulness or outright concealment (Caetano, Schafer, Field, & Nelson, 2002). Moreover, they may also have difficulty perceiving the behaviours as coercive because they continue their sexual relationship (Craig, 1990). Indeed, sexual coercion by males often seems to be accepted as part of sexual relationships (Spitzberg, 1998) because sexual stereotypes present men as sexual predators and women as resistors. Furthermore, violence is often more easily recognized when it is extreme, whereas the subtle forms are more difficult to label as coercion (Caetano, Field, Ramisety-Mikler, & Lipsky, 2009). Hence, coercion is often only identified when resistance is present (Harney & Muehlenhard, 1991; Littleton & Axsom, 2003). Lim and Roloff (1999) examined people's perception of forced sex in various hypothetical scenarios. They found that respondents did not label the forced intercourse as sexual coercion when the tactics used were non-violent, but they did perceive the behaviour as inappropriate.

Considering that sexual coercion is prevalent in long-term relationships, it is surprising that very few studies have examined this subject within couples and from the perspective of both partners. One of the rare exceptions is a study by Caetano et al. (2009) that examined intimate partner violence within White, Black and Hispanic couples. Using the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2), they interviewed both partners of 1,025 couples and found that 12.7% to 24.4% of couples reported

experiencing sexual coercion; White couples reported the least and Black couples reported the most. More specifically, female victimization occurred in 10.5% to 19.0% of the couples while male victimization occurred in 5.0% to 13.0%. In addition, Caetano and colleagues (2009) found that there was a low agreement rate between partners on the occurrence of SC, varying from 16 to 26% for female victimization and 7 to 10% for male victimization. Moreover, the severity of the sexual coercion was the only factor associated with an increased level of couple agreement for female victimization. Unfortunately, this study did not examine reciprocity of sexual coercion within the couples.

Mutual sexual coercion or reciprocity has been rarely examined in empirical studies. In fact, reciprocity of violence has only been explored within the larger context of intimate partner violence, which includes physical and psychological violence. A recent study examining individual university students ($N = 609$) found that 87% of respondents reported some intimate partner violence in their relationship and within these violent relationships, 86.3% of the participants reported that it was reciprocally violent (Próspero, 2008). They reported experiencing varying degrees of psychological violence (86%), physical aggression (47%) and sexual coercion (30%). Unfortunately, this study only obtained responses from one member of the couple and the rate of reciprocity specific to sexual coercion was not examined.

In summary, results from previous individual and couple studies highlight the need to obtain the perspective of both members of couples to truly achieve a comprehensive view of sexual coercion. Likewise, gaining a better understanding of sexual coercion within the context of a relationship between two partners could lead to more effective prevention and treatment programs. From a conceptual standpoint, sexually coercive behaviours can be generally understood within the theoretical framework of traditional sexual scripts (Byers, 1996; Simon & Gagnon, 1986) and the cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957).

Traditional Sexual Scripts

Traditional sexual scripts refer to the socially expected gender roles. In the traditional sexual script, men are presented as the persistent initiators of sex, always searching for new and frequent sexual opportunities (Byers, 1996; O'Sullivan & Byers, 1993). In contrast, women are expected to not want sex and have the mission of preventing or decreasing the men's access to sex (Metts & Spitzberg, 1996; O'Sullivan & Byers, 1992). From this perspective, men trying to obtain consent or coercing women for sex seems almost acceptable because these behaviours correspond to the man's role in the traditional script. Likewise, the woman has to resist the man's advances so that she will not appear promiscuous. Thus, men may not perceive their sexual advances as being truly unwanted, but merely resisted by women who want to seem proper (Hamby & Koss, 2003). Indeed, traditional sex roles have been associated with a higher acceptance of rape myths (Spitzberg, 1998). Conversely, these gender stereotypes also allow for women to coerce men (Anderson & Savage, 2005) because men are perceived as always wanting sex. Consequently, men cannot refuse any opportunity to engage in sexual activities with a woman (Anderson & Sorensen, 1999) and therefore they can never have *unwanted sex*. Given the belief that men always want sex, there is no reason to even try to ask for their consent – their gender implies it. This suggests that the traditional sexual scripts may also make unwilling men prone to sexual coercion from women. Thus, sexual coercive perpetration and victimization can be present in sexual interactions for both men and women.

Another outcome of the traditional sexual scripts is that the traditional sexual assault scenario is expected to involve a stranger attacking a woman in a dark alley while she tries to fight him off, rather than a situation that can occur between two people who know each other or who are in a relationship. As a result, sexually coercive behaviours within couples may not be perceived as problematic by one or both partners. This may explain in part why these behaviours are under-investigated.

The sexual script model has been frequently used as a backdrop to understand sexually coercive experiences and behaviours of women and men. Empirically, it has been supported, but other intra-individual factors must be taken into account in order to examine numerous facets of sexual coercion in romantic relationships from multiple standpoints.

Cognitive Dissonance Theory

Cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) postulates that people may modify their thoughts or behaviours if these do not coincide with their self-perceptions. Men and women may change their self-perception, the situation or their perception of the situation to decrease the lack of congruency between their experience and their self-image. In other words, if a person sees himself/herself as a non-coercive partner, he or she may perceive their partner's actions as consent or token resistance rather than resistance. Similarly, refusals from a partner with whom sexual activity has already occurred or during passionate sexual activities may not be respected as easily as refusals displayed at the beginning of a new relationship or a sexual encounter. Likewise, if a person feels that they would never stay in an abusive relationship, they may minimize their victimization. Thus, men and women alike would minimize the occurrence of a negative and coercive experience if it does not coincide with their image of a loving relationship.

Cognitive dissonance theory may help explain why some partners within a sexually coercive couple may not perceive the behaviours as coercive. Within a current relationship, partners are more likely to downplay the coercion so their choice of staying in the relationship can be compatible with their perception of themselves. Similarly, cognitive dissonance may vary depending on the proximity of a situation: when a coercive relationship is discontinued, the same coercive behaviours may be perceived or remembered as being more coercive because the person has distanced themselves from the relationship and their partner. Thus, it would be anticipated that the SC would be more openly and readily admitted to after the relationship has ended.

Consequently, individuals in current relationships that are coercive may report less coercion than they would with regard to their previous coercive relationships.

Although traditional sexual scripts and cognitive dissonance theory provide frameworks for understanding sexual coercion, specific variables may also play a role in its occurrence. The following section will examine a number of factors derived from empirical work conducted in the past two decades that may be used to predict sexually coercive behaviours.

Predictors of Sexually Coercive Behaviours

Numerous theories have been proposed to explain the phenomenon of sexual coercion, and more specifically to predict revictimization and reperpetration. The traditional sexual script suggests that many social and individual expectations, such as gender roles, can influence sexual behaviours. Men may be more likely to be coercive in their sexual initiations, whereas reluctant women may be more likely to be sexually coerced. Moreover, the social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) posits that people may learn how to behave in various situations by observing the behaviors of others or through direct experiences. For instance, a victim of sexual coercion may learn that using coercive tactics will help in obtaining sexual activities from others, and/or that coercion victimization is part of the "normal" sexual script. Likewise, perpetrators of sexual coercion may learn that SC tactics help them obtain sexual activities, and thus continue such behaviours and become more vulnerable to being victimized through normalization of sexual coercion (Enosh, 2007). Consequently, the variables suspected to be the strongest predictors of coercive sexuality are childhood sexual abuse and previous experiences of sexual coercion victimization and perpetration. Research also suggests that sexual motives, or the reasons people engage in sexual activities, may predict sexual behaviours (Cooper, Shapiro, & Powers, 1998; Hill, 2003). Indeed, a recent study by Hill (2003) demonstrates that sexual motivations may explain sexually coercive interactions. Consequently, these variables need to be considered and investigated within the context of both male and

female victimization as well as perpetration to gather a better understanding of sexual coercion in its relational dimension.

Childhood sexual abuse. Childhood sexual abuse generally refers to unwanted sexual activity with an adult or an older child occurring in childhood. CSA may involve touching, such as molestation, as well as intercourse (Arata, 2000; Banyard, Arnold, & Smith, 2000). Numerous studies have examined CSA as a risk factor for sexual revictimization and sexually offending during adulthood (for a review, see Classen, Palesh, & Aggarwal, 2005). While results suggest that past sexual abuse can be a predictor for future revictimization, it is not a consistent predictor of sexual coercion perpetration. Survivors of CSA may become more vulnerable to sexual coercion through oversexualization of relationships or their reliance on inadequate coping skills.

Koss and Dinero (1989) found that women who had experienced CSA had a greater chance of experiencing sexual coercion. Likewise, in a study of female college students, Gidycz, Coble, Latham and Layman (1993) found that victims of CSA were more than twice as likely to be sexually revictimized as adults than non-victims (32% vs. 14%). However, Banyard et al. (2000) found no significant link between CSA and later SC within their sample of collegiate women.

In a study of male adults, King and Woollett (1997) found that 60% of the male respondents who reported experiencing sexual coercion, had also been victims of CSA. Likewise, a similar study found that CSA increased by four times men's risk of being sexually assaulted by women in adulthood (King, Coxell, & Mezey (2000). In contrast, a study of risk factors for male sexual coercers found that a history of CSA did not predict perpetration of coercion as an adult (Carr & VanDeusen, 2004). However, Senn, Desmarais, Verberg and Wood (2000) found that men with a history of sexual victimization were more likely to become sexually coercive as adults. These inconsistent results suggest that other factors may be affecting the associations

between CSA and sexual coercion, such as type of CSA and frequency of SC perpetration in various relationships.

In a recent multinational study of 7,667 female and male university students within 38 culturally diverse sites worldwide, Hines (2007) examined revictimization for men and women. She found that both genders, regardless of nationality, were at greater risk of sexual coercion victimization in their current or most recent relationship if they had previously experienced CSA.

In summary, although some studies have established links between CSA and sexual coercion victimization or perpetration, the associations have not been consistently found. The conflicting results may be due to the absence of studies examining both victimization and perpetration of sexual coercion for both partners in relationships in association with CSA experiences, as well as factors regarding intentions. These limitations clearly argue for the need to pursue this line of inquiry. The current study aimed to identify factors which may better explain the role of sexual abuse history in the occurrence of adult sexual coercion. Two such potential factors will be explored: previous sexual coercion experiences and sexual motivation.

Previous experiences of sexual coercion. Previous sexual coercion can encompass experiences of victimization and/or perpetration. Generally, studies on sexual revictimization tend to focus on CSA as a predictor of future sexual victimization. Of those studies that do examine adolescent or adult sexual coercion revictimization, many focus on female victims and male perpetrators only. Similarly, perpetration studies often focus on male perpetrators and female victims.

Studies and empirical reviews have found that previous SC victimization is an important risk factor for subsequent SC victimization for women (Gidycz et al., 1993; Gidycz, Hanson, & Layman, 1995; Himelein, 1995; Rich, Gidycz, Warkentin, Loh, & Weiland, 2005; Turchik, Probst, Irvin, Chau, & Gidycz, 2009; Vézina & Hébert, 2007). Women who experience SC in their early relationships may not develop the skills to negotiate sexual interactions, or they may inadvertently learn that they cannot

refuse sexual advances (Himelein, 1995), thus making them more vulnerable to SC. Using prospective designs examining female victimization, Gidycz and colleagues (1993, 1995) found that women were more at risk of experiencing sexual coercion victimization during follow-ups at nine weeks and up to nine months later. Rich et al. (2005) assessed sexual abuse histories and psychosocial functioning at two times in a sample of 551 female college students. They found that sexual victimization in adolescence predicted sexual victimization during the two month follow-up period. Moreover, the severity of the earlier sexual assault predicted the similar severity of the sexual assault reported at follow-up. Likewise, in a longitudinal study of 100 women, Himelein (1995) found that precollege sexual victimization in dating situations significantly predicted sexual victimization during dating in college. Thus, in summary, these studies have all found that prior sexual coercion victimization in adolescence significantly predicted SC victimization in later years for women.

A longitudinal study examining college men found that CSA doubled the risk of perpetrating SC, but that adolescent SC perpetration increased the risk of reperpetration in college by up to four times (White & Smith, 2004). Moreover, SC perpetration in adolescence was a significantly greater predictor for college SC in men who had not experienced CSA, whereas CSA victims who had not perpetrated SC in adolescence were less likely to perpetrate SC in college. These results suggest that previous sexual coercion experiences may be important risk factors of current SC experiences independent of CSA histories. Indeed, previous SC may provide a viable explanation for the inconsistent findings to date. In addition, examining prior SC may also improve understanding regarding the developmental course of sexually coercive behaviours. Examining SC in previous relationships may indeed shed light on whether the SC behaviours are specific to certain partners or whether it develops into a consistent behaviour pattern within all romantic relationships.

Sexual motivation. Motivation is the drive to do something. Human behaviour is rarely without motive and sexual behaviour is no exception (Boul,

Hallam-Jones, & Wylie, 2009). In sexual motivation, it is the reason for wanting or accepting to have sexual relations (Impett & Peplau, 2003) or the increased interest in fulfilling a goal through sexual behaviour (Hill & Preston, 1996). Sexual motivation is a fairly new concept in the domain of sexual negotiation, yet it seems very promising for understanding sexual coercion and consent. For instance, a person having sex can be motivated by a desire to feel physical pleasure, whereas another person can engage in the same behaviour and be motivated by a need to feel emotionally attached. The displayed sexual behaviours are identical, but the need fulfilled is different in each case. Accordingly, recent studies suggest that sexual motivation may be useful for understanding sexually coercive behaviours (Hill, 2003).

Impett and Peplau (2002) investigated the reasons why women consent to unwanted sexual activity with their partners, and the relation of consent with both attachment style and relationship commitment. They asked 125 women who reported having previously consented to unwanted sex, why they chose to do so. The 12 possible reasons were : 1) to promote intimacy, 2) to satisfy partner, 3) to avoid tension, 4) felt obligated because already had sex , 5) pattern of regular sex, 6) curiosity, 7) did not want to reject partner, 8) to gain experience, 9) fear that partner would end relationship, 10) worried that partner would not be interested in her anymore, 11) easier than saying no, and 12) did not want to spoil the mood. They found that anxiously attached women tended to feel more committed to their relationship and correspondingly, were more willing to consent to unwanted sex. Conversely, the more avoidant women felt less committed and therefore less willing to consent to unwanted sex. The most common reasons to consent to unwanted sexual activity were to satisfy partner, to promote intimacy, to avoid rejecting partner and to avoid tension. However, the more anxious a woman was, the more she consented to avoid tension, keep her partner's interest, and because of feelings of obligation. On the other hand, avoidance was related to consenting out of obligation, as a regular pattern of sex, or because it was easier than saying no. Thus sexual

motivation is not only related to the behaviours themselves, but also to the consequences of that behaviour.

In a related study on types of sexual motivation, Impett et al. (2005) found that people who had sex to enhance their relationships rather than to avoid negative consequences reported more positive emotions and satisfaction with their relationships. Conversely, those having sex because of avoidant motives reported more negative emotions, which increased the probability of the couple separating. Interestingly though, approach and avoidant motives affected the relationships independently, in that there was no direct link between both dimensions. One limitation of this study is that it did not use any of the existing sexual motivation questionnaires, but rather asked a limited number of unvalidated questions regarding each of the two types of motives. Consequently, motives of power, pleasure, stress relief, as well as partner focused versus self-focused motives were not examined. A second limitation is that motives were not examined in relation to the use of coercive sexual behaviours. Furthermore, motives of both partners were not measured to investigate possible correlations.

Cooper et al. (1998) developed a measure of sexual motivation in a series of studies using university and community samples. The subscales included: 1) pleasure (enhancement of pleasure), 2) intimacy (to get closer to partner), 3) coping (to deal with distress), 4) self-affirmation (to prove one's self), 5) partner pressure (to avoid rejection), and 6) peer pressure (to avoid rejection). Using a sample of 1666 young adults, they found that men endorsed all motives more strongly than women, with the exception of intimacy which was equally endorsed by both genders. Moreover, participants in exclusive relationships were more likely motivated by intimacy rather than coping and partner pressure. Cooper and colleagues also examined the role of sexual motives on the occurrence of risky sexual behaviours and hypothesized that sexual behaviours would be best understood in terms of needs they fulfilled. The researchers found that enhancement of pleasure, coping, and partner pressure motives were associated with more negative outcomes (ie. unplanned pregnancies) and greater

risk-taking, whereas peer pressure and self-affirmation motives were related to less frequent and a later onset of sexual experiences. In addition, sexual motives were significant predictors of risky sexual behaviours and accounted for more than double the variance as did the demographic variables (gender, age, race and socioeconomic status) in regression analyses. The results also suggested that partners in relationships may both influence each other's sexual behaviours through their individual goals and motives.

Hill (2003) also examined sexual motivation in relation to reported sexual coercion perpetration by men and women. He found that contrary to results from sex-offender studies, sexual desire and hostile sexual beliefs were not associated with increased SC perpetration, but that sexual motives were significant predictors of SC perpetration. It was postulated that power motives would be related to SC perpetration for both genders, however the results indicated that only coercive men endorsed more motives of power, whereas sexually coercive women tended to endorse more motives of stress relief. These differences may reflect the traditional sexual scripts for both genders, although it was not specifically addressed in the study.

Sexual motives are generally understood as a drive to perform a behavior, thus it follows that they have been examined in association with active perpetration of sexual coercion. Although sexual motives cannot cause sexual victimization, it is possible that certain types of motives may increase the risk of SC. More specifically, despite the lack of previous studies, it is hypothesized that men and women who report being sexually motivated by partner pressure would be more likely to report sexual coercion victimization. This may be a possible consequence of precedence, in that an initiating partner who obtains sexual consent from a less than eager partner may not perceive a refusal from the same partner. Moreover, traditional sexual scripts may influence reluctant women and men to acquiesce to sexual demands from their partners, thus increasing the risk of sexual coercion victimization when they refuse.

In summary, our review of the literature suggests that there is an important gap in the study of sexual coercion in its relational dimension. More specifically, there is a need to examine SC within couples from the perspective of both members as possible victims and perpetrators to truly ascertain the rate of occurrence and degree of reciprocity of SC. Similarly, studies on CSA, previous sexual coercion experiences and sexual motivation all suggest that these factors may play an important role in predicting, and consequently preventing further SC. Accordingly, the current study will consider these variables while addressing the limitations of previous studies.

Objectives and Hypotheses

Drawing its participants from a university sample, this thesis had two main objectives: 1) to investigate the rate and perception of sexual coercion in heterosexual couples as reported by both members of the dyad; 2) to develop a predictive model of sexually coercive victimization and perpetration for both women and men in heterosexual relationships, by examining the predictive value of CSA, SC in previous relationships, and sexual motivation. More specifically, the objectives of this thesis are presented in detail in two articles.

The first article entitled "Sexual Coercion Victimization and Perpetration in Heterosexual Couples: A Dyadic Investigation" (Brousseau, Bergeron, Hébert & McDuff, 2011) has been published in the journal *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. This study, presented in chapter 2, examined and compared the reported rates of victimization and perpetration of SC, and its degree of reciprocity from the perspective of both partners in current romantic relationships. The rates were also compared with the participants' reports of SC in previous relationships. It was postulated that there would be differences in reports of SC of both members of couples. Based on studies of SC victimization in individuals, we predicted that women and men would report experiencing more SC than their partners would report perpetrating, regardless of gender. It was also expected that the majority of coercive

couples would report reciprocal sexual coercion, similar to results found in studies of intimate partner violence (O'Leary, Slep, Avery-Leaf, & Cascardi, 2008; Próspero, 2008). Furthermore, it was hypothesized that participants would report more coercion within previous relationships as opposed to within their current one. This hypothesis was based on the cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) which postulates that men and women would minimize the occurrence of a bad experience if it does not coincide with their image of a loving relationship. Consequently, individuals in current relationships that are coercive may report less coercion than in their previous coercive relationships.

The goal of the second article, entitled "Sexual Coercion Within Mixed-Sex Couples: The Roles of Sexual Motives, Revictimization, and Reperpetration" (Brousseau, Hébert, & Bergeron, in press), was to examine the predictive factors related to the couple's experience of sexual coercion. This paper has been provisionally accepted for publication by the *Journal of Sex Research*. More specifically, using hierarchical logistic regressions, we examined the roles of CSA, SC experiences in previous relationships, and sexual motivation, in the occurrence of sexual coercion within intact mixed-sex couples. It was predicted that CSA and experiences of SC in previous relationships would increase the likelihood of SC in current relationships. Moreover, we explored whether sexual motivation of each member of a dyad contributed to the prediction of SC perpetration and victimization, above and beyond the possible contributions of CSA and previous SC experiences. More specifically, it was anticipated that the partner pressure motive would predict sexual coercion victimization, whereas power and stress relief motives would predict SC perpetration.

Method

The methodology for the study is explained in detail in the articles 1 and 2 of the thesis. The data collection was conducted as part of a larger study on sexual negotiation within couples. Although the sample size for study 1 consisted of 222

mixed-sex couples, for study 2 we chose to limit the sample to couples in which at least one partner was 35 years old or younger. This inclusion criterion enabled us to have a more homogenous sample in order to examine sexually coercive behaviours in younger couples before the behaviours have become entrenched in their interactions. This research was made possible by a research fellowship from the *Centre de Recherche Interdisciplinaire sur les Problèmes Conjugaux et les Agressions Sexuelles* financed by *le Fonds de recherche sur la société et la culture* (FQRSC).

Measures

The testing was performed using a battery of self-report questionnaires. The questionnaire booklet included measures of three different variables: 1) Demographic Data, 2) Sexual Motives, and 3) Sexual Coercion Victimization and Perpetration. All measures were administered in French.

Translation of questionnaires. The measure of sexual coercion victimization and perpetration had an existing validated French version that was used for this study. However, the other measures needed to be translated. Questionnaires were translated from English using the back translation method to ensure content and conceptual equivalence when used with a French-Canadian population (Brislin, 1970; Geisinger, 1994). English versions of the questionnaires were first translated into French by a bilingual person, and the French translation was then translated back into English by a second person. Thereafter, the two English versions were compared to examine if the comprehension and content were the same. Any discrepancies between the versions were discussed and rectified if necessary. Furthermore, the French versions of the questionnaires were then discussed with a committee comprised of doctoral students and experts in the field of sexuality research. Any additional inconsistencies or difficulties were changed to improve the comprehension or the content of the questions. Lastly, the French questionnaires were submitted to a dozen students (male and female) in a pilot study to get their feedback on these

measures. To ensure that the French translations of the questionnaires maintained their good psychometric properties, factor analyses were performed using the full sample ($N = 222$) to ensure that conceptual structures were maintained, and each measure's reliability (internal consistency) was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha.

Sexual motivation. Various dimensions of sexual motives were measured using adaptations of two measures: the Affective and Motivational Orientation Related to Erotic Arousal (AMORE; Hill & Preston, 1996) and the Sex Motives Scale (SMS; Cooper et al., 1998). Although the AMORE has good psychometric properties, items on this scale are often redundant. During our pilot work, respondents often complained about the length of this questionnaire. Considering the fact that the AMORE and the SMS measure some similar motives and some different motives, it was decided to include only the self-power, partner power and stress relief subscales from the AMORE. Furthermore, these 10-item subscales were reduced to five items each to lighten the reading and comprehension of the questionnaire. Factor analysis allowed us to select the items that loaded best for each subscale without reducing their validity and reliability. Cronbach's alphas for the self-power, partner power, and stress relief subscales were .90, .93, and .94 for the ten item scales. When reduced to five items, Cronbach's alphas became .83, .92, and .91. These values are very similar to the values obtained with the original English scale (Hill & Preston, 1996).

Research Design and Data Analyses

Considering that the main objectives of the present study were to examine the rate of coercion perpetration and victimization in couples and to develop a predictive model of sexual coercion, a correlational design using self-report questionnaires was chosen. This design was deemed the most appropriate to answer our research questions. Correlational studies allow to examine relations between variables as well as to identify whether specific independent variables can predict outcome variables.

Moreover, this study was cross-sectional as it collected retrospective data from the childhood and previous adult experiences at only one point in time. The results from these analyses can provide a useful empirical base for future prospective studies regarding sexual coercion within couples.

CHAPTER II: STUDY 1
SEXUAL COERCION VICTIMIZATION AND PERPETRATION IN HETEROSEXUAL COUPLES: A DYADIC INVESTIGATION

Submitted for publication in Archives of Sexual Behavior on June 19 2009
Provisionally accepted on November 30 2009
Re-submitted with corrections on February 16 2010
Accepted for publication on February 20 2010
Published in Archives of Sexual Behavior in the April 2011 issue

Sexual Coercion Victimization and Perpetration in Heterosexual Couples: A Dyadic Investigation

Mélanie M. Brousseau, M.A.,[1] Sophie Bergeron, Ph.D.,[2,4] Martine Hébert, Ph.D.,[3] and Pierre McDuff, M.Sc.[2]

[1] Department of Psychology, Université du Québec à Montréal, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

[2] Department of Psychology, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

[3] Department of Sexology, Université du Québec à Montréal, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

[4] To whom correspondence should be addressed at Department of Psychology, Université de Montréal, C.P. 6128, succursale Centre-Ville, Montréal, Québec, Canada, H3C 3J7; e-mail: sophie.bergeron.2@umontreal.ca.

RUNNING HEAD: Sexual Coercion in Heterosexual Couples

Correspondence:

Mélanie M. Brousseau, M.A.
370 Enfield Ave.
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K1L 7L3
(613) 867-7396
E-mail: melanie.brousseau@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Sexual coercion (SC), or making another person engage in sexual activity despite his or her unwillingness to do so, has been shown to have negative consequences for victims, namely depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, and a negative view of one's sexual self. The goals of the present study were to investigate the rate of SC victimization and perpetration, inter-partner agreement concerning its occurrence, in addition to its degree of reciprocity within a sample of 222 heterosexual couples. SC within previous romantic relationships was also examined. Results showed that less than 30% of couples agreed on the occurrence of sexual coercion within their ongoing relationship. Moreover, dyadic responses rather than individual responses provided a more accurate estimation of the frequency of SC. Over one in two couples reported experiencing some SC. More specifically, 45% of couples reported female victimization, 30% reported male victimization, and 20% reported reciprocal SC. Conversely, both men and women reported more SC victimization within previous relationships than in their current one. Findings suggest that SC is a common, pervasive problem within couples and that it is underreported by both victims and perpetrators, regardless of gender. Consequently, more systematic research, prevention and intervention efforts are warranted.

KEY WORDS: Sexual coercion; couples; inter-partner agreement; reciprocity.

INTRODUCTION

Whether for emotional or reproductive purposes, sexual interactions have always constituted an integral part of the lives of couples. The type and quality of these interactions and the negotiation that surrounds them have been shown to influence relationship adjustment and satisfaction (Impett, Peplau, & Gable, 2005; Lawrance & Byers, 1995; Williams & Frieze, 2005). More specifically, sexual coercion (SC), or making another person engage in sexual activity despite his or her unwillingness to do so (e.g., by using verbal pressure or physical force) (Hartwick, Desmarais, & Hennig, 2007; Spitzberg, 1998), has been shown to have negative consequences for victims. Indeed, research has documented that victims experience reactions ranging from moderately upsetting to extremely distressing. Adjustment difficulties such as depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, and negative sexual self-perceptions (De Visser, Rissel, Richters, & Smith, 2007; Offman & Matheson, 2004) often prevent victims from functioning adequately in their day-to-day lives and engaging in healthy interpersonal relationships. These significant repercussions underscore the need to broaden our understanding of the actual frequency of SC and its impact. Despite the fact that coercive sexuality most often occurs in couples as opposed to between strangers (Koss, Dinero, Siebel, & Cox, 1988; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Struckman-Johnson, Struckman-Johnson, & Anderson, 2003), research to date has focused almost exclusively on one member of the dyad rather than involving both.

Generally speaking, men tend to be more sexually aggressive than women–a statement that is supported by numerous studies (e.g., Christopher, Madura, & Weaver, 1998; Hamby, 2005). Sexually coercive men tend to use both consensual and coercive tactics to obtain access to sex (Harney & Muehlenhard, 1991). Correspondingly, sexual precedence plays a role in verbal coercive strategies; men tend to use threats to leave when sexual access has already been established, whereas they tend to use positive pressure, such as professing affection or complimenting

regardless of their true emotions, when a sexual relation has not yet been established (Livingston, Buddie, Testa, & VanZile-Tamsen, 2004).

In a national survey conducted in the United States in 1997, a random sample of 602 adult women was questioned about unwanted sexual experiences. Of this sample, 34% of females had been victims of sexual coercion by their partners (Basile, 2002). O'Sullivan, Byers, and Finkelman (1998) examined the prevalence of SC by sending anonymous questionnaires to a random sample of university students. Their final sample size comprised 346 never-married students (216 women and 130 men). Results showed that 42.5% of the women had experienced some form of SC, and 20% of the men reported using sexually coercive tactics. Women reported that verbal pressure and arguments were the tactics most often used by their male partners to obtain sex play and intercourse. Moreover, 18.5% of the male participants reported having experienced unwanted sexual intercourse with a woman. Similarly, Larimer, Lydum, Anderson, and Turner (1999) reported an overall 20.7% victimization rate for males. In both studies, verbal pressure and attempted sexual intercourse following the use of drugs or alcohol were the coercive tactics most often reported to be used by women. In a recent study, Krahé, Scheinberger-Olwig, and Bieneck (2003) examined the prevalence of non-consensual sexual interactions and their impact on male victims within a sample of community males in Germany. The researchers found that 25.1% to 30.1% of the 400 heterosexual male participants reported experiencing non-consensual sexual activity with a woman at least once in their lifetime. The men also reported a similar prevalence rate (23.5-23.9%) for attempts at making them unwillingly engage in sexual activities. Also worth noting is that 13% of men reported being victims of non-consensual sex by a female friend or acquaintance, 11% by a current or ex-partner, but only 6% reported SC from a stranger. In a similar study in Germany, Krahé, Waizenhöfer, and Möller (2003) investigated women's reports of sexual coercion perpetration against men. Within their community sample of 248 women, they found that 9.3% of the women reported using some SC against men. When compared to the males' victimization rate, it is clear that females'

reported perpetration rates were much lower. This variation in rates may be due to the fact that the women and men were not in relationships together, or that perpetrators in general report less use of coercion. Consequently, further research on both partners' perceptions is needed to examine and compare the severity of experienced coercion in men and women.

A study by Meyer, Vivian, and O'Leary (1998) examined men's sexually aggressive behavior in 252 heterosexual couples seeking marital therapy and 53 community control couples, by collecting data from both partners on the use of sexual coercion by the husband towards the wife (male perpetrators and female victims). Results showed that clinical wives and husbands reported similar rates of husbands' SC (36% vs. 35%) in the previous year; however, correlations between both partner's reports were low. In comparison, the wives in the control couples reported a rate of 13.5% of SC by the husband, and the husbands reported a rate of 23%. Thus, it may be that more severe SC is harder to deny or ignore for either partner in aggressive couples, whereas milder SC can be overlooked in non-violent couples (Perry & Fromuth, 2005). Although this study was helpful in examining reported rates of sexual violence, it neglected to measure the level of sexual coercion used by the woman, as well as her partner's perception of it.

In one of the rare studies investigating both partners within married couples with children, O'Leary and Williams (2006) found that up to 42.8% of the couples reported female SC victimization and up to 21.4% reported male SC victimization. These rates were based on the maximum dyadic report, such that at least one partner had to report its occurrence. O'Leary and Williams (2006) also ascertained that there was very low inter-partner agreement on the occurrence of sexual coercion (kappa, .11-.24). A similar study by Ramisetty-Mikler, Caetano, and McGrath (2007) examining both partners within White, Black, and Hispanic married couples found that 11-23% of couples reported female SC victimization, and 5.5-13.5% reported male SC victimization. The SC rates were also based on the reports of at least one partner, and varied according to the ethnic backgrounds of the couples, with Whites

reporting its occurrence the least and Blacks reporting the most. However, inter-partner agreement was not investigated. In addition, none of the aforementioned studies examined whether there was reciprocal SC within the couples. Lastly, the victimization and perpetration of SC was only investigated in the current relationship of participants.

Very little is known about the reciprocity of sexual coercion within couples. More often than not, studies have examined it within the larger context of intimate partner violence (IPV), which includes physical and psychological violence within relationships. A study by Próspero (2008) examining individual university students ($N = 609$) found that 87% of participants reported some perpetration of IPV in their relationship. Moreover, 86.3% of the participants reported being in a reciprocally violent relationship. Within the sample, participants reported experiencing varying degrees of psychological violence (86%), physical aggression (47%), and sexual coercion (30%). Unfortunately, the study did not specifically examine whether SC was reciprocal in couples or whether victims retaliated with another form of IPV. Furthermore, responses were obtained from only one member of the couple.

While research conducted in the past 20 years has provided some understanding of sexual coercion, it is characterized by several limitations. First, the majority of studies have investigated SC experiences from the perspective of only one partner. When inter-partner comparisons have been made, it has often involved unidirectional sexual violence only (female victim with male perpetrator) (e.g., Meyer et al., 1998). Moreover, of the few studies that have examined SC within couples, all of them have used the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) SC subscale (O'Leary & Williams, 2006; Ramisetty-Mikler et al., 2007), which has fewer items and has demonstrated less reliability than the Sexual Experience Survey (SES; Koss & Gidycz, 1985; Koss et al., 1987)--a measure designed specifically for the assessment of SC. Furthermore, prior studies on dyadic SC have solely investigated married or cohabitating couples (Caetano, Schafer, Field, & Nelson, 2002; Meyer et al., 1998; O'Leary & Williams, 2006; Ramisetty-Mikler et al., 2007). Thus, there is a need to

investigate young adult couples instead of older married/cohabitating couples before violent behaviors become entrenched in their interactions. Another limitation of previous research is that rates of sexual coercion often vary depending on who is asked. Regardless of gender, victims generally report more coercion than the perpetrators (Anderson & Sorensen, 1999; Johnson & Sigler, 2000; Kolivas & Gross, 2007; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003). In addition, female victimization rates are generally higher than male victimization rates. Some researchers may interpret this result as meaning that few men coerce a greater number of women or that men underreport the perpetration of coercion (Kolivas & Gross, 2007; Spitzberg, 1999). Another possible explanation is that women and men interpret behaviorally worded SC questionnaire items differently (Kolivas & Gross, 2007) or they label the actual behaviors differently according to their own sexual scripts (Hartwick et al., 2007). Theoretically, it is also possible that cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957) would prevent people from identifying SC as such within their relationships. Thus, reports of SC may vary according to whether couples are still together or separated. These assumptions need to be verified in order to assess more accurately the extent of the frequency and reciprocity of SC, and its implications for couples.

The purpose of the present research was to address the above limitations by examining and comparing the reported rates of victimization and perpetration of sexual coercion, and its degree of reciprocity from the perspective of both partners in current romantic relationships. In addition, the rates were also compared with the participants' reports of SC with previous partners.

It was hypothesized that there would be a divergence between partners of a given couple in their reports of sexually coercive behaviors. Based on previous studies of SC victimization focusing on individuals, we predicted that women and men would report experiencing more SC than their partners would report perpetrating, independent of gender. It was also expected that the majority of coercive couples would include both members as perpetrators and victims, highlighting the potentially reciprocal nature of SC, similar to results found in studies of intimate

partner violence (O'Leary, Slep, Avery-Leaf, & Cascardi, 2008; Próspero, 2008). Moreover, it was predicted that participants would report more coercion within previous relationships as opposed to within their current one. This hypothesis was based on the cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) which postulates that men and women would minimize the occurrence of a bad experience if it does not coincide with their image of a loving relationship. Consequently, individuals in current relationships that are coercive may report less coercion than in their previous coercive relationships.

METHOD

Participants

Student participants were recruited from undergraduate and graduate courses in a public metropolitan Canadian university at the beginning of the summer and fall semesters of 2005. Student participants who were currently in a relationship were asked to invite their partners to participate in the study. Eighty-seven professors from various departments such as mathematics, marketing, political science, and psychology were solicited. Recruitment took place in 46 courses, representing a 52.9% acceptance rate from the professors. Overall, we succeeded in recruiting 1214 participants out of a possible 1522 (based on the course enrollment numbers), which represents a 79.8% response rate from individual students. Follow-up visits were made one month later to encourage participants to recruit their partners. Seventy percent of the total sample of participants reported being in a relationship (n = 850), and our couple response rate was 27.9%. This reduced response rate may be due to the fact that we had to rely on student participants to recruit their partners for this study; thus some may have chosen not to solicit them or partners may have chosen not to participate. The initial sample for the present study consisted of 237 couples. Because analyses were conducted within couples based on gender (males vs. females), we had to exclude same-sex couples (n = 15) for this study. Our final sample size was 222 heterosexual couples.

Within the couple sample, 97.7% (n = 217) of the females and 99.5% (n = 220) of the men were heterosexual; the rest identified themselves as bisexual. The mean age for women was 23.73 years (SD=6.04; 18 - 54), whereas the mean age for men was 25.80 years (SD = 6.85; 18 - 59). Almost all couples (98%) identified themselves as being in exclusive relationships; of those, 36% were cohabiting and 5% were married. The mean length of relationship was 32 months (range 3-300 months) and the average frequency of sexual activity was once a week (76.0 - 77.1%). The majority of men and women reported 4 to 10 lifetime sexual partners. Participant characteristics are shown in Table I.

---

insert Table I about here

Procedure

The first author provided an overview of the study to students in their classrooms and explained that its purpose was to examine sexual negotiation within relationships. They were advised that they were free to choose to participate and that there were no penalties if they decided not to take part in the study. Participating students were asked to read and sign a consent form and to return it separately from the completed questionnaire. Lastly, students were advised that as a compensation for their participation, they could fill out a ballot for a draw to win one of three prizes of $500, $200, or $100 dollars. Each individual participant also received a list of community resources and counselling centers that deal with sexual violence in the event that the testing caused them some distress. Finally, they were informed that the first author was also available for a debriefing session upon request.

Students were explained that their questionnaire package contained an identical questionnaire for their partner. They were asked to give the questionnaire package to their partner if they thought he/she would be interested in participating and were instructed to refrain from discussing their answers with each other. Partners were asked to mail back their signed consent form and their draw ballot separately

from their completed questionnaires in the pre-addressed postage-paid envelopes provided. Each pair of couple questionnaire packages was numbered identically (e.g., 101 and 101B) prior to distribution so as to facilitate the comparison of answers within couples. This study was approved by our university's Institutional Review Board.

Measures

Each questionnaire booklet included measures of sociodemographic information, as well as sexual coercion victimization and perpetration.

Sociodemographic information

This section included general questions concerning gender of the respondent, sexual orientation, age, culture, relationship status, length of current relationship, age at first sexual intercourse, current and desired frequency of sexual activities, and number of sexual partners.

Sexual coercion victimization and perpetration

The experience of SC victimization and perpetration was measured using the Sexual Experience Survey (SES; Koss & Gidycz, 1985; Koss et al., 1987). This questionnaire was originally created by Koss and Oros (1982), but has since been modified (Koss & Gidycz, 1985; Koss et al., 1987). The SES is a widely used self-report questionnaire focusing on sexually coercive experiences. It contains behaviorally worded questions to enable researchers to measure SC without labelling it as sexual violence. Answers were provided in a yes-no format. The SES has demonstrated good validity, internal consistency and test-retest reliability (Koss & Gidycz, 1985; Koss et al., 1987; Testa, VanZile-Tamsen, Livingston, & Koss, 2004). The 15-item French translation of the SES, as used by Poitras and Lavoie (1995), was chosen because of its language and its modification which includes women and men as both possible victims and perpetrators of SC. In this format, the 15 items were administered twice, once to measure victimization and once to measure perpetration. Furthermore, the item which measured the use of threat or force to obtain oral or anal

intercourse was modified so that oral and anal sexual violence were measured as separate items, thus creating a 16-item scale. A similar separation of the two items was used in a recent study involving the SES (Abbey, Parkhill, & Koss, 2005).

In order to measure sexual coercion within participants' current relationship and in other possible relationships since the age of 14 years old, the SES items were presented in a table format. For each item, participants were asked to respond to two questions: (1) Has the behavior occurred with their current partner? and (2) Has the behavior occurred with other partners since the age of 14?

Data Analytic Strategy

For both males and females, the SES victimization and perpetration data were computed in three ways. Aside from the score for each item, we calculated dichotomous subscale scores and a dichotomous total scale score to reflect whether the respondent had reported the occurrence of any of the coercive behaviors with their current partner and within previous relationships. Furthermore, couple coerciveness was computed using the reports from at least one partner. The categories were: no coercion reported by either partner, only female victimization reported, only male victimization reported, and reciprocal SC.

Frequency analyses were conducted to examine prevalence rates of SC within couples and since the age of 14. Chi-squares and *t*-tests were used to identify any group differences. Moreover, chi-squares were performed to investigate inter-partner agreement for within-couple data. Kappas and the percentage of agreement are reported because the kappa is a measure that can be biased when investigating situations of low rates of report (Feinstein & Cicchetti, 1990).

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Paired *t*-tests were performed to evaluate gender differences on sexual and demographic variables. Results indicated no significant gender differences in reported

frequency of sexual relations with the partner. However, gender differences were noted in the participants' age (for women, M = 23.71, SD = 6.05; for men, M = 25.80, SD = 6.87, $t(219) = -7.75$, $p < .001$), and the *desired* frequency of sexual relations (for women, M = 2.42, SD = .66; for men, M = 2.17, SD = .71, $t(218) = 4.37$, $p < .001$; a greater score indicates less desire). Moreover, women reported having their first sexual intercourse at a younger age than the men (for women, M = 16.64, SD = 2.66; for men, M = 17.26, SD = 2.43, $t(219) = -2.89$, $p < .01$).

Rate of Sexual Coercion Within Couples

The reported frequency rates for sexual coercion victimization within the heterosexual couples were similar for both genders. The rate of overall female victimization was 30.6% according to the reports of the women, and 27.0% according to the men. When asked about overall male victimization, men reported a rate of 20.3%, whereas women reported a rate of 17.1%. Inspection of subscale scores suggests that unwanted sexual contact and verbal SC were the two most common types of SC reported by both male and female victims and perpetrators, as opposed to the rape and attempted rape subscales. Moreover, examination of item endorsement revealed that: (1) unwanted kissing and touching because of verbal pressure and arguments, and (2) unwanted sexual intercourse because perpetrator was too excited to stop were the most reported events for both men and women (see Table II).

---

insert Table II about here

Reciprocity of Sexual Coercion Within Couples

Results showed that almost one in four couples (24.8%) reported only female victimization by the male partner, and 9.5% reported only male victimization by the female partner. Reciprocal SC, that is victimization and perpetration by both the male and female partner, was reported by 20.3% of the couples. In total, 54.5% ($n = 121$) of the 222 couples reported experiencing some sexual coercion.

Inter-partner Agreement on Sexual Coercion Within their Relationship

While the rates of sexual coercion were similarly reported by both male and female participants, we needed to verify whether partners actually agreed on the occurrence of sexual coercion within their couple. As a baseline, we examined the extent to which couples agreed whether consensual sexual activities had ever occurred within their relationship. There was very good agreement from both partners on consensual sexual activity and sexual intercourse (94.5% and 98.2%, respectively). However, when examining each SC item individually, partner agreement was much lower. Six of the men's items and two of the women's items could not be analyzed because they were not endorsed often enough. Consequently, significant couple agreement was found for only one of the possible 16 SES items for each gender: 1) male victim of unwanted sexual contact by means of verbal pressure (6/38 = 15.8%, kappa = .20, p = .003), and 2) female victim of unwanted intercourse because partner was too excited to stop (12/58 = 20.7%, kappa = .22, p = .001).

Since specific events or occurrences can be recalled differently by partners within a couple (Moffitt, Caspi, Krueger, Magdol, Margolin, Silva, et al., 1997), an analysis of agreement was performed using the SES subscale scores as well as the dichotomized total score. Results of these analyses are presented in Tables III and IV. For the overall occurrence of any sexually coercive behavior, there was a moderate but significant level of agreement between partners within a same couple (28.0% for female victimization, 25.8% for male victimization). Moreover, when examining rates of SC reported from either partner (column 4 in Tables III and IV), the female victimization rate increased from 30.6%, as reported by the women, to 45.0%, and male victimization rate increased from 20.3%, as reported by the men, to 29.8%.

---

insert Table III about here

---

insert Table IV about here

Underreporting of Sexual Coercion

Compared to the overall rates reported by the couples, both victims and perpetrators underreported SC. When comparing the dyadic rates with the individual reports of both partners, we used the correction factor proposed by Szinovacz and Egley (1995). To calculate the extent of the underreporting, we divided the overall couple SC incidence rate by the individual (victim and/or perpetrator) rates. Correction factors above 1.00 indicate a greater level of underreporting. Thus, the female and male victimization correction factors would both be 1.47 (45.0/30.6 and 29.8/20.3, respectively). Likewise, perpetration correction factors would be 1.74 for women and 1.67 for men.

Incidence of Sexual Coercion in Previous Relationships

Frequency analyses were conducted to obtain the men and women's rates of sexual coercion victimization and perpetration in previous relationships since the age of 14 (see Table V). The overall female victimization rate was almost double that of the men's victimization rate. Conversely, men's overall perpetration rate was almost double of that reported by women. Chi-square analyses were performed to investigate differences between rates of SC reported in previous relationships as opposed to current relationships. Results demonstrated that SC victimization rates for both genders were significantly greater in previous relationships ($\chi^2(1) = 43.15, p < .001$ for female and $\chi^2(1) = 11.57, p < .001$ for males). However, perpetration rates were only significantly greater in previous relationships for men ($\chi^2(1) = 7.95, p < .001$).

Frequencies analyses to examine reciprocal SC in previous relationships showed that, within the female sample, 43.4% (95) reported being victims only, 1.4% (3) reported being perpetrators only, and 19.2% (42) reported being both. Within the male sample, the rates were 10.1% (22), 15.6% (34), and 24.8% (54), respectively.

---

insert Table V about here

DISCUSSION

The present study sought to examine the rate of sexual coercion in ongoing heterosexual relationships based on both partners' reports, as well as its occurrence in previous relationships. The level of agreement between partners was also investigated, as was the reciprocity of coercion. Findings suggest that over 50% of couples reported experiencing some type of SC within their current relationship. Although female victimization was the most common form of coercion within couples, 20% of the couples reported reciprocal SC. Despite the high rate of SC, less than 30% of couples agreed on its occurrence and it was generally underreported by both victims and perpetrators. Conversely, when investigating sexual coercion experiences in previous relationships, both women and men reported a significantly greater rate of victimization and perpetration as compared to the rates they reported for their ongoing romantic relationship. Moreover, women reported more victimization and men reported more perpetration or reciprocal SC.

Sexual Coercion Within Couples

When examining prevalence rates within ongoing relationships, close to a third of women and one out of five men reported being victims of SC from their partners, whereas one out of five women and one out of four men reported perpetrating SC. There was some divergence between partners' reports of sexual coercion within their couple, but the difference was not significant. Therefore, the findings did not support the hypothesis that victims disclose more coercion than the perpetrators divulge within couples. Moreover, when combining reports from both partners within a given couple, the rates of SC victimization increased to 45.0% for the females and 29.7% for the males. This suggests that even in early adulthood, an important number of couples are experiencing SC. These dyadic results were similar to those of O'Leary and Williams' (2006) for the female victimization rate (42.8%), but not for the male victimization rate (21.4%). This difference regarding male victimization results may be due to the fact that our sample was for the most part

drawn from a university population whereas theirs was a community sample, or related to the different measures used to assess SC. Nevertheless, the dyadic results of the present study suggest that individual measures of sexual coercion may be biased towards underestimating the extent of its occurrence. Consequently, obtaining the perspective of both partners may be important when evaluating inter-partner coercion within experimental and clinical settings. The participants' awareness that their partner is also answering the same questionnaires may encourage or influence individuals to be more honest.

Although individual sexual coercion rates were similar between victims and perpetrators in this study, agreement analysis revealed that less than a third of couples who experienced SC agreed on its occurrence in their romantic relationship. This low agreement rate may be due to the fact that the couples in our sample tended to report milder coercive behaviors such as unwanted sexual contact or verbal coercion as opposed to more serious offences like rape or attempted rape. Less severe coercion may be susceptible to more ambiguous interpretation by both partners in that one may perceive it as coercive whereas the other may perceive it and label it as sexual negotiation. Consequently, each partner may interpret the ambiguous sexual events according to their own sexual scripts, its impact on them, and the context of the situation. Participants may also remember events that were disturbing to them more than their partners who may not feel an event was necessarily coercive or upsetting. Indeed, Meyer et al. (1998) found that couples who were more physically and sexually violent had a higher rate of inter-partner agreement than less violent couples, suggesting that more extreme violence may be harder to misinterpret than less severe coercion.

The investigation of reciprocal sexual coercion revealed that over half of the couples in our sample reported some SC in their relationship, but only one in five reported mutual SC. Within our sample, unilateral female victimization was more prevalent, affecting one out of four couples. The hypothesis of reciprocity within most sexually coercive couples was, therefore, not supported. This suggests that SC is

still a greater concern for women than men, and sexually coercive couples are not as prone to reciprocity as physically or psychologically violent couples (O'Leary et al., 2008; Próspero, 2008). It is plausible that a victim of SC, especially female, would not necessarily react or defend herself by being sexually coercive, but rather by using psychological or physical aggression. Another possible interpretation is that sexual scripts still encourage male initiation of sex, which may make them vulnerable to being perceived as a perpetrator in ambiguous situations of mild SC.

Despite discrepancies in agreement, findings also suggest that sexual coercion is underreported by individuals. Overall, victims and, to a larger extent, perpetrators, underreported coercive incidents. Indeed, the dyadic victimization rates were, on average, 1.5 times greater and the dyadic perpetration rates were 1.7 times greater than individual reported rates. Therefore, the perpetrators underreported SC to a greater extent than victims. Using the same calculation method, O'Leary and Williams (2006) found a similar correction factor for male perpetration rates (1.51) with their sample of community couples. However, unlike our study, they found that female perpetration rates should be corrected by a factor of 2.43. Their large correction factor for female perpetrators may be due to the fact that the community couples had children; thus, there may be a stronger desire to minimize and underreport coercion by these mothers than within our sample of women. Nevertheless, these findings suggest that both victims and perpetrators may be reluctant to label themselves as coercive or victimized. Cognitive dissonance may prevent participants from objectively identifying their relationship with their partner as coercive. In light of these findings, it may be prudent to consider that rates of SC obtained from previous studies investigating individuals may be underestimations of the actual prevalence. Correspondingly, in the absence of data from both partners, the individual respondent rates could be multiplied by the above correction factors to obtain more accurate prevalence rates in future studies.

Sexual Coercion in Previous Relationships

Sexual coercion victimization rates in previous relationships were significantly greater for both genders, as were perpetration rates for men, than the rates reported within their current relationship. These findings support our hypothesis that participants would report more coercion within previous relationships than within their current romantic relationship. One possibility is that participants who have experienced SC within previous relationships may choose to avoid coercive partners in their current relationship. Another possibility is that participants may reinterpret SC within their current relationship as less serious as a means to justify why they were still engaged in a relationship with their partner (Arriaga, 2002). Conversely, they may be more willing to acknowledge and report sexually coercive incidents when a relationship is terminated. In such situations, participants may feel less obligated to minimize incidents of SC and they may experience less cognitive dissonance associated with it. Thus, participants may be more capable and/or willing to label coercive behaviors as such only once the relationship is over. Lastly, it is possible that rates of sexual coercion increase near the end or during the breakdown of a relationship. In this case, partners may become less emotionally attached and use less healthy communication and sexual negotiation skills during conflicts. Considering that our sample involved intact couples, this is also a possible explanation for lower rates of coercion within current couples.

Interestingly, although we found that both victims and perpetrators, regardless of gender, reported similar rates of sexual coercion within their ongoing relationship, this finding was not replicated for measures of SC since adolescence. Indeed, females reported being victims of SC (62.8%) more than perpetrators (20.5%), whereas males reported more perpetrating (40.4%) than victimization (35.2%). These results were similar to those of previous studies measuring individuals' past experiences with SC. The gender differences in prevalence rates may be due to the participants' greater objectivity associated with their distancing of the events, as mentioned previously. It may also reflect the participants' sexual scripts. It is possible that women may be

more apt to remember unwanted sexual activities they were unable to prevent, whereas men may remember more sexual "conquests." Future studies should examine couple and past SC within the context of sexual scripts (Simon & Gagnon, 1986) to explore this possibility.

One finding that did remain fairly consistent with regard to sexual coercion in current and past relationships was its reciprocal nature. Similarly to the ongoing couples' data, about one in four women and men reported being both victims and perpetrators of SC (19.2% and 24.8%). However, these results need to be interpreted with caution because they do not necessarily reflect mutual SC within specific previous relationships. Consequently, it is possible that the participants were victims in some relationships and perpetrators in others. Ideally, future studies would examine whether mutually coercive partners persistently enter into reciprocally coercive relationships.

Limitations and Implications

The present research was not without limitations. Because the administration of the partner questionnaires was not done simultaneously, it is not possible to ascertain whether confounding factors might have influenced their responses. Indeed, partners may have discussed their answers together. Another limitation is that past sexual coercion rates may be greater due to the number of previous relationships considered and the length of time involved. Ideally, future studies should examine SC within each one of the participants' relationships to get a clearer picture of their experiences. Lastly, the use of a university sample as opposed to a clinical or community sample may limit the extent of our understanding of more severe forms of SC.

Despite these limitations, the findings of the current study have important theoretical implications. Firstly, the finding that participants reported less frequent and severe sexual coercion within their current relationships than in terminated relationships lends support to the cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957).

Minimization or reinterpretation of SC as coaxing or seductive behaviors may help victims cope with otherwise negative situations. However, this may also prevent them from leaving their partner or getting help (Arriaga, 2002). Moreover, participants may be more tolerant of milder SC and interpret it as "normal" and reportable, whereas cognitive dissonance and social desirability may prevent them from reporting severe SC. Likewise, the low rates of agreement on the occurrence of SC suggest that neither member of a couple can truly objectively report or recall SC in their relationship, but rather presents their interpretation of it according to their beliefs, sexual scripts, and need for low cognitive dissonance. Furthermore, results indicated that the majority of couples were not reciprocally sexually coercive. The implication of this finding is that SC may be better understood within the more global intimate partner violence or common couple violence context (Johnson, 1995, 2001). Indeed, women are still at greater risk of being victims of SC in their relationships and they may retaliate or attempt to defend themselves using psychological or physical aggression rather than reciprocate sexual coercion.

Further studies need to continue to involve both partners within couples to better understand the extent of SC. Moreover, a longitudinal study examining coercive tactics during the courting, the committed, and the dissolution stages of relationships would allow for a better understanding of whether SC is consistent within some relationships or whether situational factors increase its occurrence. Observational studies could also shed light on these issues. Finally, future studies should examine the factors associated with mutually sexually coercive couples versus unidirectional coercive couples.

Clinically, findings show that sexual coercion was underreported by both victims and perpetrators, thereby underscoring the need for clinicians to assess and intervene with both members of the couple experiencing SC. More specifically, sexual negotiation tactics of couples need to be addressed systematically in therapy so as to identify underreported sexual coercion.

REFERENCES

Abbey, A., Parkhill, M. R., & Koss, M. P. (2005). The effects of frame of reference on responses to questions about sexual assault victimization and perpetration. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*, 364-373.

Anderson, P. B., & Sorensen, W. (1999). Male and female differences in reports of women's heterosexual initiation and aggression. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 28*, 243-253.

Arriaga, X. B. (2002). Joking violence among highly committed individuals. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 591-610.

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*, 511-524.

Caetano, R., Schafer, J., Field, C., & Nelson, S. M. (2002). Agreement on reports of intimate partner violence among white, black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 1308-1322.

Christopher, F. S., Madura, M., & Weaver, L. (1998). Premarital sexual aggressors: A multivariate analysis of social, relational, and individual variables. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60*, 56-69.

De Visser, R. O., Rissel, C. E., Richters, J., & Smith, A. M. A. (2007). The impact of sexual coercion on psychological, physical, and sexual well-being in a representative sample of Australian women. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 36*, 676-686.

Feinstein, A. R., & Cicchetti, D. V. (1990). High agreement but low kappa: I. The problems of two paradoxes. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 43*, 543-549.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hamby, S. L., (2005). Measuring gender differences in partner violence: Implications from research on other forms of violent and socially undesirable behavior. *Sex Roles, 52*, 725-742.

Harney, P. A., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (1991). Rape. In E. Grauerholz & M. A. Koralewski (Eds.), *Sexual coercion: A sourcebook on its nature, causes, and prevention* (pp. 3-15). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Hartwick, C., Desmarais, S., & Hennig, K. (2007). Characteristics of male and female victims of sexual coercion. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 16*, 31-44.

Impett, E. A., Peplau, L. A., & Gable, S. L. (2005). Approach and avoidance sexual motives: Implications for personal and interpersonal well-being. *Personal Relationships, 12*, 465-482.

Johnson, I. M., & Sigler, R. T. (2000). Forced sexual intercourse among intimates. *Journal of Family Violence, 15*, 95-108.

Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchical terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*, 283-294.

Johnson, M. P. (2001). Conflict and control: Symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. In A. Booth, A. C. Crouter, & M. Clements (Eds.), *Couples in conflict* (pp. 95-104). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kolivas, E. D., & Gross, A. M. (2007). Assessing sexual aggression: Addressing the gap between rape victimization and perpetration prevalence rates. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12*, 315-328.

Koss, M. P., Dinero, T. E., Siebel, C. A., & Cox, S. L. (1988). Stranger and acquaintance rape: Are there differences in victim's experience? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12*, 1-24.

Koss, M. P., & Gidycz, C. A. (1985). Sexual Experiences Survey: Reliability and validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53*, 422-423.

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55*, 162-170.

Koss, M. P., & Oros, C. J. (1982). Sexual Experiences Survey: A research instrument

investigating sexual aggression and victimization. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50*, 455-457.

Krahé, B., Scheinberger-Olwig, R., & Bieneck, S. (2003). Men's report of nonconsensual sexual interactions with women: Prevalence and impact. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 32*, 165-175.

Krahé, B., Waizenhöfer, E., & Möller, I. (2003). Women's sexual aggression against men: Prevalence and predictors. *Sex Roles, 49*, 219-232.

Larimer, M. E., Lydum, A. R., Anderson, B. K., & Turner, A. P. (1999). Male and female recipients of unwanted sexual contact in a college student sample: Prevalence rates, alcohol use, and depression symptoms. *Sex Roles, 40*, 295-308.

Lawrance, K.-A., & Byers, E. S. (1995). Sexual satisfaction in long-term heterosexual relationships: The interpersonal exchange model of sexual satisfaction. *Personal Relationships, 2*, 267-285

Livingston, J. A., Buddie, A. M., Testa, M., & VanZile-Tamsen, C. (2004). The role of sexual precedence in verbal sexual coercion. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28*, 287-297.

Meyer, S.-L., Vivian, D., & O'Leary, K. D. (1998). Men's sexual aggression in marriage: Couples' reports. *Violence against Women, 4*, 415-465.

Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Krueger, R. F., Magdol, L., Margolin, G., Silva, P. A., & Sydney, R. (1997). Do partners agree about abuse in their relationship? A psychometric evaluation of interpartner agreement. *Psychological Assessment, 9*, 47-56.

Offman, A., & Matheson, K. (2004). The sexual self-perceptions of young women experiencing abuse in dating relationships. *Sex Roles, 51*, 551-560.

O'Leary, K. D., Slep, A. M. S., Avery-Leaf, S., & Cascardi, M. (2008). Gender differences in dating aggression among multhiethnic high school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 42*, 473-479.

O'Leary, K. D., & Williams, M. C. (2006). Agreement about acts of aggression in

marriage. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20*, 656-662.

O'Sullivan, L. F., Byers, E. S., & Finkelman, L. (1998). A comparison of male and female college students' experiences of sexual coercion. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*, 177-195.

Perry, A. R., & Fromuth, M. E. (2005). Courtship violence using couple data: Characteristics and perceptions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*, 1078-1095.

Poitras, M., & Lavoie, F. (1995). A study of the prevalence of sexual coercion in adolescent heterosexual dating relationships in a Quebec sample. *Violence and Victims, 10*, 299-313.

Próspero, M. (2008). The effect of coercion on aggression and mental health among reciprocally violent couples. *Journal of Family Violence, 23*, 195-202.

Ramisetty-Mikler, S., Caetano, R., & McGrath, C. (2007). Sexual aggression among White, Black and Hispanic couples in the U.S.: Alcohol use, physical assault and psychological aggression as its correlates. *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 33*, 31-43.

Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. (1986). Sexual scripts: Permanence and change. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 15*, 97-120.

Spitzberg, B. H. (1998). Sexual coercion in courtship relations. In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.), *The dark side of close relationships* (pp. 179-232). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spitzberg, B. H. (1999). An analysis of empirical estimates of sexual aggression victimization and perpetration. *Violence and Victims, 14*, 241-260.

Struckman-Johnson, C., Struckman-Johnson, D., & Anderson, P. B. (2003). Tactics of sexual coercion: When men and women won't take No for an answer. *Journal of Sex Research, 40*, 76-86.

Szinovacz, M. E., & Egley, L. C. (1995). Comparing one-partner and couple data on sensitive marital behaviours: The case of marital violence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*, 995-1010.

Testa, M., VanZile-Tamsen, C., Livingston, J., & Koss, M. (2004). Assessing women's experiences of sexual aggression using the sexual experiences survey: Evidence for validity and implications for research. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28, 256-265.*

Williams, S. L., & Frieze, I. H. (2005). Patterns of violent relationships, psychological distress, and marital satisfaction in a national sample of men and women. *Sex Roles, 52*, 771-784.

Table I

Participant Characteristics (N = 222 couples)

	Women		Men	
Characteristics	*n*	%	*n*	%
Age				
18-20	66	29.9	33	14.9
21-30	135	61.1	154	69.7
31-40	12	5.4	22	9.9
41-60	8	3.6	12	5.4
Student Status				
1st year undergraduate	91	41.0	26	11.8
2nd -3rd year undergraduate	79	35.6	44	19.9
4th year undergraduate-M.A.	26	11.7	15	6.8
Non-student	26	11.7	136	61.5
Frequency of sex				
Once a day	21	9.5	23	10.4
Once a week	168	76.4	172	77.5
Once a month	26	11.8	20	9.0
Less than once a month	5	2.3	7	3.1
Desired frequency of sex				
Much more	14	6.4	40	18.1
A bit more	105	47.7	104	47.1
Same	96	43.6	77	34.8
Less	5	2.3	0	0.0
Age of first sexual intercourse				
11-15	77	34.8	44	19.9
16-17	80	36.2	84	38.0
18-19	36	20.9	62	28.0
20-24	16	7.2	28	12.7
25 and over	2	0.9	3	1.4

Number of sexual partners				
One	47	21.3	41	18.5
2-3	55	24.9	51	23.0
4-10	75	33.9	84	37.8
11-20	31	14.0	26	11.7
More than 20	13	5.9	20	9.0

Table II

Prevalence of Sexual Coercion Within Current Couples per Item

Sexual Experience Survey items	Female victim	Female perpetrator	Male victim	Male perpetrator
Unwanted Sexual Contact Subscale				
Unwanted sexual activity due to arguments	42 (18.9%)	18 (8.1%)	26 (11.7%)	27 (12.2%)
Unwanted sexual activity due to threats of leaving	1 (0.5%)	2 (0.9%)	2 (0.9%)	1 (0.5%)
Unwanted sexual contact due to lies or false statements	7 (3.2%)	11 (5.0%)	13 (5.9%)	14 (6.3%)
Unwanted sexual contact using authority	2 (0.9%)	2 (0.9%)	2 (0.9%)	1 (0.5%)
Unwanted sexual contact using physical force	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%)	1 (0.5%)
Attempted Rape Subscale				
Attempted penetration using physical force	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)
Attempted penetration using alcohol or drugs	4 (1.8%)	4 (1.8%)	1 (0.5%)	6 (2.7%)
Verbal Sexual Coercion Subscale				
Unwanted sexual intercourse because initiator was too excited	35 (15.8%)	14 (6.3%)	18 (8.1%)	35 (15.8%)
Unwanted sexual intercourse because initiator threatened to leave	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%)
Unwanted sexual intercourse because initiator used lies or false statements	8 (3.6%)	9 (4.1%)	4 (1.8%)	13 (5.9%)
Unwanted sexual intercourse because initiator used arguments	23 (10.4%)	6 (2.7%)	7 (3.2%)	13 (5.9%)
Unwanted sexual intercourse because initiator used his/her authority	2 (0.9%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%)

Rape Subscale				
Unwanted sexual intercourse because initiator used alcohol or drugs	3 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.4%)
Unwanted sexual intercourse using force	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)
Unwanted anal sex using force	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)
Unwanted oral sex using force	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)

Note. Subscale scores are presented in the first two columns of Tables III and IV.

Table III

Agreement Concerning Female Victimization Within Couples by Subscale and Total Score on SES

Type of Coercion	Female report of victimization	Male report of perpetration	Reported by either partner for female victimization	Agreement on occurrence of female victimization	Kappa
Unwanted Sexual Contact	45 (20.3%)	35 (15.8%)	68 (30.7%)	12/68 (17.6%)	.15*
Attempted Rape	5 (2.3%)	7 (3.2%)	11 (5.0%)	1/11 (9.1%)	NV
Verbal Sexual Coercion	53 (23.9%)	47 (21.2%)	80 (36.4%)	20/80 (25%)	.23***
Rape	5 (2.3%)	4 (1.8%)	8 (3.7%)	1/8 (12.5%)	NV
Total report of at least one incident of sexual coercion	68 (30.6%)	60 (27.0%)	100 (45.0%)	28/100 (8.0%)	.21**

Note. SES = Sexual Experience Survey.

NV = Not valid because some cells had a count less than 5.

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

Table IV

Agreement Concerning Male Victimization Within Couples by Subscale and Total Score on SES

Type of Coercion	Male report of victimization	Female report of perpetration	Reported by either partner for male victimization	Agreement on occurrence of male victimization	Kappa
Unwanted Sexual Contact	33 (14.9%)	28 (12.6%)	50 (22.6%)	11/50 (22.0%)	.26***
Attempted Rape	1 (0.5%)	5 (2.3%)	6 (2.8%)	0 (0.0%)	NV
Verbal Sexual Coercion	25 (11.3%)	23 (10.4%)	41 (18.5%)	7/41 (17.1%)	.21**
Rape	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	-----
Total report of at least one incident of sexual coercion	45 (20.3%)	38 (17.1%)	66 (29.8%)	17/66 (25.8%)	.28***

Note. SES = Sexual Experience Survey.

NV = Not valid because some cells had a count less than 5.

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

Table V

Prevalence of Sexual Coercion Within Previous Relationships

Type of Coercion	Female report of victimization	Female report of perpetration	Male report of victimization	Male report of perpetration
Unwanted Sexual Contact	123 (56.4%)	36 (16.4%)	56 (25.6%)	78 (35.8%)
Attempted Rape	44 (20.2%)	7 (3.2%)	7 (3.2%)	14 (6.4%)
Verbal Sexual Coercion	108 (49.5%)	28 (12.8%)	50 (22.8%)	68 (31.2%)
Rape	33 (15.1%)	8 (3.7%)	4 (1.8%)	5 (2.3%)
Total (Any sexual coercion)	137 (62.8%)	45 (20.5%)	77 (35.2%)	88 (40.4%)

CHAPTER III: STUDY 2
SEXUAL COERCION WITHIN MIXED-SEX COUPLES: THE ROLES OF SEXUAL MOTIVES, REVICTIMIZATION, AND REPERPETRATION

Submitted to The Journal of Sex Research for publication on March 30 2010.
Re-submitted to The Journal of Sex Research for publication on December 30 2010.
Provisionally accepted for publication on February 17 2011.
Re-submitted to The Journal of Sex Research for publication on March 18 2011.
Accepted for publication on March 20 2011.

Running head: SEXUAL MOTIVATION AND COERCION

Sexual Coercion Within Mixed-Sex Couples: The Roles of Sexual Motives, Revictimization, and Reperpetration

Mélanie M. Brousseau and Martine Hébert
Université du Québec à Montréal
Sophie Bergeron
Université de Montréal

Author Note

Mélanie M. Brousseau, Department of Psychology, Université du Québec à Montréal; Martine Hébert, Department of Sexology, Université du Québec à Montréal; Sophie Bergeron, Department of Psychology, Université de Montréal.

This research was supported in part by a fellowship awarded to Mélanie M. Brousseau and a research grant from the *Centre de Recherche Interdisciplinaire sur les Problèmes Conjugaux et les Agressions Sexuelles* (CRIPCAS). The authors wish to thank Pierre McDuff for his assistance with data analysis.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mélanie M. Brousseau and Martine Hébert, Department of Sexology, Université du Québec à Montréal, C.P. 8888, succursale Centre-Ville, Montréal, Québec, Canada, H3C 3P8. Phone: (514)-987-3000 #5697, Fax: (514) 987-6787.
E-mail: melanie.brousseau@gmail.com; hebert.m@uqam.ca

Keywords: couples, perpetration, sexual coercion, sexual motivation, victimization

Abstract

Research suggests that a history of childhood sexual abuse, and previous experiences of sexual coercion, may predict sexual coercion victimization and perpetration. More recently, sexual motivation has been found to correlate with both consensual and non-consensual sexual activity. However, sexual motivation has not been examined in association with previous experiences of abuse and sexual coercion. The current study aimed to investigate childhood sexual abuse, previous sexual coercion experiences and sexual motives of both partners as possible risk factors for current sexual coercion victimization and perpetration within a sample of 209 mixed-sex couples. We examined whether power, stress relief, partner pressure and imposition motives contributed unique variance to the prediction of sexual coercion beyond that accounted for by past CSA and sexual coercion events. Using hierarchical logistic regressions, four predictive models were examined for both male and female sexual coercion perpetration and victimization. Results show that childhood sexual abuse was only a significant predictor of female sexual coercion perpetration, whereas male sexual coercion victimization and perpetration were predicted by sexual coercion victimization and perpetration in previous relationships. Findings also demonstrate that power motives were significant predictors of sexual coercion perpetration, and imposition was a significant predictor of sexual coercion victimization for both genders. Theoretical and intervention implications of these results are discussed.

Keywords: couples, perpetration, sexual coercion, sexual motivation, victimization

Sexual Coercion Within Mixed-Sex Couples: The Roles of Sexual Motives, Revictimization, and Reperpetration

Sexual interactions are generally an integral part of romantic relationships. Partners may choose to engage in sexual activities for a variety of reasons and to fulfill different needs, whether it is for intimacy, pleasure or to avoid rejection. Unfortunately, sexual negotiation between committed partners may be fraught with conflict. In fact, up to 50% of couples may experience some form of sexual coercion (Brousseau, Bergeron, Hébert, & McDuff, 2011; O'Leary & Williams, 2006). In recent years, sexual coercion has been shown to be associated with many negative physical and psychological consequences for the victims, such as unplanned pregnancies, post-traumatic stress symptoms and depression (Arata & Burkhart, 1996; De Visser, Rissel, Richters, & Smith, 2007; Gidycz, Coble, Latham, & Layman, 1993; Zweig, Barber, & Eccles, 1997). Although childhood sexual abuse and previous experiences of sexual coercion have been linked with sexual coercion victimization or perpetration, studies still present conflicting results (e.g., Classen, Palesh, & Aggarwal, 2005; Gidycz, Hanson, & Layman, 1995; Hines, 2007; Testa & Dermen, 1999). The dearth of research examining sexually coercive behaviors and victimization simultaneously, from the perspective of both partners, and within the context of sexual intentions, may be responsible for the inconsistent relations found between childhood sexual abuse and past and current sexual coercion experiences. Indeed, studies indicate that sexual motivation, or the reasons people engage in sexual activities, may predict distinct sexual behaviors and their consequences (Cooper, Shapiro, & Powers, 1998; Hill, 2003). More specifically, a study by Hill (2003) investigated how sexual motives correlated with perpetration of sexual coercion and found that male perpetrators of sexual coercion reported more motives of power and female perpetrators were more likely to report motives of stress relief. However, this study was limited by the fact that it did not control for known antecedents of sexual coercion – childhood sexual abuse and previous sexual coercion experiences.

Consequently, the current study aimed to address the above limitations by investigating current sexual coercion victimization and perpetration from the perspective of both partners within mixed-sex couples. More specifically, childhood sexual abuse, sexual coercion experiences in previous relationships and sexual motives of both partners were examined as possible risk factors of current sexual coercion. In the present study, sexual coercion referred to any occurrence of unwanted sexual activity with a romantic partner since the age of 14.

Sexual Coercion Within Couples

Sexual coercion is generally defined as making another person engage in sexual activity despite his or her unwillingness to do so. The sexual activity may include kissing, fondling, and/or penetrative sex (oral, vaginal or anal). Sexually coercive tactics may vary from psychological pressure and manipulation, such as insisting, continual argument, and lying, to physical pressure, such as pinning a person down, using physical force or threatening harm to one's partner (Spitzberg, 1998). They may also include taking advantage of an intoxicated partner who is unable to resist sexual advances. These tactics are used to obtain compliance from the victims. Thus, sexual coercion is not limited to unwanted kissing or forced intercourse, but rather encompasses the spectrum of all coercive sexual behaviors and tactics from unwanted sex play to severe sexual assault.

Sexual coercion by males often seems to be accepted as part of sexual relationships (Spitzberg, 1998) because traditional sexual scripts (Simon & Gagnon, 1986) often present men as sexual predators and women as resistors. In this perspective, men trying to obtain consent or coercing women for sex seems almost acceptable because these behaviors correspond to the man's role in the traditional script. Conversely, these gender stereotypes also allow for women to coerce men, regardless of the degree of violence used (Anderson & Savage, 2005). In this perspective, if men always want sex, then they cannot logically refuse any opportunity to have sex with a woman and thus they can never have *unwanted sex*

(Anderson & Sorensen, 1999). Based on the traditional sex scripts, it seems logical that sexual coercive behaviors and victimization can be present in sexual negotiation for both men and women in romantic relationships. Indeed, recent studies have demonstrated that sexual coercion may be reciprocal between partners (Brousseau et al., 2011; O'Leary & Williams, 2006). Moreover, sexual coercion victimization is often predicted by sexual coercion perpetration and vice versa for both men and women (Harned, 2002; Muñoz-Rivas, Graña, O'Leary, & González, 2009).

Sexual Motivation

Sexual motivation, or the reasons for having sex (Impett & Peplau, 2003), can be conceptualized as the interest in fulfilling a need or obtaining a goal through sexual behavior (Hill & Preston, 1996). Considering that most romantic relationships involve sexual interactions, it seems important to examine what motivates partners to engage in sexual behaviors. Two theories have been developed to understand motivations for sexual behaviors: approach-avoidance motives (Cooper et al., 1998) and dispositional sexual motives (Hill & Preston, 1996). Within an approach-avoidance theoretical framework, the various sexual motives may be understood in terms of approaching positive, or avoiding negative, consequences which may be internal or external (Impett & Peplau, 2003; Impett, Peplau, & Gable, 2005). For instance, a person having sex without a condom can be motivated by a desire to increase his/her own physical pleasure, whereas another person can engage in the same behavior and be motivated by a need to avoid rejection from a partner. The overt behaviors are identical, but the need fulfilled is different in each case. The dispositional theoretical framework, on the other hand, casts sexual motives as intrinsic, which means sexual behaviors are pursued to obtain psychological gratification or incentives related to their motives (Hill & Preston, 1996). For example, a person sexually motivated by power may experience increased sexual arousal and pleasure when exerting control over a partner in sexual interactions. However, this psychological gratification is not necessarily obtained by exerting

control in other general types of interactions; the gratification comes from having the opportunity to express power and dominance during *sexual* interactions with the partner.

A study by Impett et al. (2005) examined the role of sexual motives in romantic relationships within a university sample. Students who were in a relationship completed daily surveys on their sexual interactions and sexual motives. The authors found that when participants reported engaging in sex for approach motives (i.e. intimacy, pleasure), they reported feeling positive emotions and more relationship satisfaction, whereas if they reported having sex for avoidance motives (i.e. to avoid conflict), they reported more negative feelings and less relationship satisfaction.

Using a sample of 1,666 young adults, Cooper et al. (1998) examined the role of sexual motives in the occurrence of risky behaviors and postulated that sexual behaviors would be best understood in terms of goals or needs they serves. They found that enhancement of pleasure, coping, and partner pressure motives were associated with more negative outcomes (e.g., unplanned pregnancies) and greater risk-taking, whereas peer pressure and self-affirmation motives were related to less frequent and a later onset of sexual experiences. Indeed, sexual motives were significant predictors of sexual risk behaviors and accounted for more than double the variance compared to the demographic variables. Moreover, results suggested that partners in relationships may influence each other's sexual behaviors through their individual goals and motives. However, this study did not examine sexual motivation in association with previous experiences of childhood sexual abuse or sexual coercion.

Studies suggest that sexual motivation may also be useful for understanding sexually coercive behaviors (Cooper et al., 1998; Hill, 2003; Impett & Peplau, 2002, 2003). Hill (2003) used the Affective and Motivational Orientation Related to Erotic Arousal Scale (AMORE; Hill & Preston, 1996) to examine intrinsic sexual motives in relation to reported sexual coercion perpetration by men and women. He found that

sexual desire and hostile sexual beliefs were not associated with increased sexual coercion, but that sexual motives were significant predictors of sexual coercion perpetration. Although it was hypothesized that power motives would be related to sexual coercion perpetration for both genders, the results indicated that this was only true for men and that sexually coercive women were more likely to report motives of stress relief. Moreover, Hill suggested that for both women and men, proclivity to sexual coercion was not necessarily related to intentions to cause harm or humiliation to a partner, but rather motivated by a need to feel in control or reduce distress in sexual interactions. Nevertheless, this study did not examine sexual motives in relation to sexual coercion victimization.

Childhood Sexual Abuse

Childhood sexual abuse generally refers to unwanted sexual activity occurring in childhood with an adult or older child, which may involve touching, such as molestation, up to and including intercourse (Arata, 2000; Banyard, Arnold, & Smith, 2000). Various studies have examined childhood sexual abuse as a risk factor for revictimization and sexual violence during adulthood (for a review, see Classen et al., 2005; Hines, 2007); however, results are not consistent across genders. Survivors of CSA may become more vulnerable to sexual coercion through oversexualization of relationships or their reliance on inadequate coping skills. Moreover, gender differences may be due to the survivors' perceived gender roles or sexual scripts.

The bulk of studies have focused on female childhood sexual abuse and sexual revictimization in adulthood. Recent reviews suggest that childhood sexual abuse is generally associated with sexual revictimization for women (Classen et al., 2005) but some exceptions have been found. In a study of 219 female university students, Banyard et al. (2000) found no significant link between childhood sexual abuse and sexual coercion victimization in the past year. The conflicting data may be due to the timeline used for measuring sexual coercion, as some studies used lifetime sexual coercion rates, whereas Banyard et al. measured sexual coercion within the

previous year. Indeed, childhood sexual abuse may be associated with more proximal sexual coercion victimization, such as in earlier romantic relationships, whereas current sexual coercion victimization may be better predicted by previous sexual coercion.

Few studies have examined childhood sexual abuse as a risk factor for male victimization. King and Woollett (1997) found that more than half (60%) of the male respondents who reported experiencing sexual coercion as adults, had also been sexually victimized during childhood. In another study of males in the general population, King, Coxell and Mezey (2000) found that 3% of the men in their sample had experienced sexual assault as an adult, and almost half of the perpetrators were women. Results also indicated that childhood sexual abuse increased by four times the men's likelihood of being sexually assaulted as adults, and that younger rather than older men were more likely to report being victims of sexual assault (King et al., 2000). Socially and empirically, male victims of childhood sexual abuse have often been considered to be at greater risk for perpetrating sexual coercion (Thomas & Fremouw, 2009). A study by Senn, Desmarais, Verberg and Wood (2000) found that men with a history of sexual victimization had a greater chance of being sexually coercive as adults. However, in another study of risk factors for male sexual coercion, a history of childhood sexual abuse did not predict perpetration of coercion as an adult (Carr & VanDeusen, 2004).

Sexual Coercion in Previous Relationships

Numerous theories have been proposed to explain the phenomenon of sexual coercion, and more specifically to predict revictimization and reperpetration. The social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) posits that people may learn how to behave in various situations by observing the behaviors of others and the associated consequences. Learning can also be achieved through direct experiences. For instance, a victim of sexual coercion may learn that using coercive tactics will help in obtaining sexual activities from others, and/or that coercion victimization is part of

the "normal" sexual script. Likewise, perpetrators of sexual coercion may learn that sexual coercion tactics help them obtain sexual activities, and thus continue such behaviors and become more vulnerable to being victimized through normalization of sexual coercion (Enosh, 2007). Victimization, thus, may teach perpetration, whereas perpetration may desensitize people to sexual coercion, and reduce their own personal boundaries.

Previous studies examining sexual coercion revictimization and reperpetration have generally focused on female victims and male perpetrators only. In an empirical review, Vézina and Hébert (2007) reported that previous sexual coercion victimization was an important risk factor for subsequent sexual coercion victimization for women. This conclusion was further corroborated by two prospective studies examining female sexual coercion victimization (Rich, Gidycz, Warkentin, Loh, & Weiland, 2005; Turchik, Probst, Irvin, Chau, & Gidycz, 2009). Both studies found that prior sexual coercion victimization in adolescence significantly predicted sexual coercion victimization at follow-up. Furthermore, Rich and colleagues (2005) found that the severity and type of previous sexual coercion tended to be similar to the sexual coercion severity at a 2-month follow-up. Thus, verbal sexual coercion predicted verbal sexual coercion, and physical sexual coercion predicted physical sexual coercion.

In a longitudinal study examining college men, White and Smith (2004) found that childhood sexual abuse doubled the risk of perpetrating sexual coercion, and that adolescent sexual coercion perpetration increased the men's risk of perpetrating sexual coercion in college by up to 4 times. Moreover, adolescent sexual coercion perpetration was a significantly better predictor for college sexual coercion in both childhood sexual abuse survivors and non-childhood sexual abuse victims. This suggests that previous sexual coercion experiences may be important risk factors for current sexual coercion experiences independent of childhood sexual abuse histories, thus providing a possible explanation for the inconsistent associations to date. Furthermore, examining prior sexual coercion may also provide an opportunity to

investigate the course of sexual coercion and whether it is specific to certain partners or whether it develops into a consistent behavior pattern within all romantic relationships.

Current Study

In summary, although some studies have established relations between childhood sexual abuse and sexual coercion victimization or perpetration, inconsistencies remain. This can be attributed in part to the diversity in definitions of childhood sexual abuse used, as well as the varying time frames for measuring sexual coercion. Moreover, the lack of studies examining both women and men as victims and perpetrators of sexual coercion in relationships precludes gaining a broader understanding of sexual abuse as a risk factor for sexual coercion within relationships.

The goal of the current study was to examine the roles of childhood sexual abuse, sexual coercion experiences in previous relationships, and sexual motivation, in the occurrence of sexual coercion within intact mixed-sex couples. It was hypothesized that childhood sexual abuse and previous experiences of sexual coercion would increase the likelihood of sexual coercion in current relationships. Furthermore, considering the explanatory value of sexual motives in sexual interactions, we examined whether sexual motives of each participant contributed to the prediction of sexual coercion perpetration and victimization, above and beyond the possible contributions of childhood sexual abuse and previous sexual coercion experiences. More specifically, based on previous studies, it was anticipated that the partner pressure motive would predict sexual coercion victimization, whereas power and stress relief motives would predict sexual coercion perpetration.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Participants were both members of 209 heterosexual couples recruited within a larger study on sexual negotiation. At least one member was a university student, 35 years old or younger. Questionnaire booklets were distributed to undergraduate and graduate students during classes. They were told that the study examined sexual negotiation within couples and were asked to read and sign a consent form if they chose to participate. Student participants who were currently in a romantic relationship were also encouraged to invite their partners to participate, and were given identical booklets and consent forms for their partners to complete and return by mail. The mean age of our sample was 22.6 years (SD 3.52, 18-37) for women and 24.6 years (SD 4.46, 18-42) for men. The mean relationship duration was 28 months (SD 22.8, range 3-108), and 98% of the couples described their relationships as exclusive.

Measures

Demographic data. The demographic questionnaire included general questions on gender of respondent, sexual orientation, age, relationship status, duration of current relationship, age at first sexual intercourse, current and desired frequency of sexual activities, and total number of sexual partners.

Childhood sexual abuse. Two items measured whether participants had ever been victims of unwanted sexual touching or intercourse by an adult or older child, before the age of 14. For the purpose of analyses, the responses were dichotomized to reflect the presence of at least one incident of childhood sexual abuse or its absence.

Sexual motivation. Various dimensions of sexual motives were measured using adaptations of two measures: the Affective and Motivational Orientation Related to Erotic Arousal Scale (AMORE; Hill & Preston, 1996) and the Sex Motives

Scale (SMS; Cooper et al., 1998). Select subscales from both questionnaires were administered to measure different aspects of sexual motivation.

The AMORE is a 62-item self-report questionnaire which was developed within the theoretical framework of dispositional motives. This theory posits that different types of psychological gratification are obtained from sexual interactions with a partner. The AMORE measures eight categories of intrinsic sexual motives: 1) feeling valued by the partner; 2) showing value for one's partner; 3) stress relief; 4) nurturing the partner; 5) feeling powerful, 6) feeling the partner's power; 7) experiencing pleasure; and 8) procreating (Hill & Preston, 1996). Respondents must indicate how true each statement is for them, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all true) to 5 (completely true). The questionnaire is scored using the mean score for each subscale. These subscales have demonstrated good convergent and discriminant validity, as well as good reliability (Hill & Preston, 1996; Schachner & Shaver, 2004).

The SMS is a 29-item survey which loads on six types of motives, divided into approach (AP) and avoidance (AV) motives, as well as categorized as self-focused (S) or other-focused (O): 1) Intimacy (OAP), 2) Pleasure (SAP), 3) Self-Affirmation (SAV), 4) Coping (SAV), 5) Peer Pressure (OAV), and 6) Partner Pressure (OAV). Respondents must indicate how often they engage in sexual activities because of each of the motives. Possible answers are on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never or almost never) to 5 (always or almost always). The SMS has demonstrated good reliability and validity (Schachner & Shaver, 2004).

The AMORE and SMS subscales have a number of similar and highly correlated subscales (Schachner & Shaver, 2004). For this reason, redundant subscales between the AMORE and the SMS were eliminated. The final measure of motives included only the self-power, partner power and stress relief subscales from the AMORE (α .80 - .93), as well as the SMS approach motives subscale of pleasure, and the avoidance motives subscales of self-affirmation and partner pressure (α .70 -

.87). The AMORE procreation motive was not administered because it was not deemed pertinent to the research goals and SMS peer pressure subscale was removed after pilot testing because items were rarely endorsed within this university sample.

One dimension that seemed to be missing from both surveys was imposition, such as having sexual relations out of obligation (Impett & Peplau, 2002; Zweig, Crokett, Sayer, & Vicary, 1999) or because one feels that it is one's duty as a partner in a couple. Because guilt and imposition may be used in sexual coercion, a 5-item subscale was created to reflect such avoidant motives. An example of this imposition subscale is: "*How often do you have sex because you feel guilty if you refuse your partner's request?*" Factor analysis demonstrated that the five items loaded well on this new imposition subscale and had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.70.

Sexual coercion victimization and perpetration. The experience of sexual coercion victimization and perpetration was measured using a 16-item gender-neutral version of the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES; see Brousseau et al., 2011; Koss & Gidycz, 1985; Koss, Gidycz & Wisniewski, 1987; Poitras & Lavoie, 1995). The SES has been widely used and has demonstrated good psychometric properties (Koss & Gidycz, 1985; Koss et al., 1987; Testa, VanZile-Tamsen, Livingston, & Koss, 2004). The SES measures four types of sexual coercion: 1) unwanted sexual contact, 2) verbal sexual coercion, 3) attempted rape, and 4) rape. The tactics assessed include the use of physical pressure and verbal pressure, as well as taking advantage of the victim's intoxication to obtain sexual activities or intercourse with an unwilling partner. The SES also includes two items that assess the use of a position of authority as a coercive tactic. For this study, the measure was modified to encompass taking advantage of the victim's dependence on the perpetrator, to reflect possible relationship imbalances (i.e. financial dependence) in couples. Examples of items include: 1) *Have you ever given in to sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because you were overwhelmed by the other person's arguments and pressure?* 2) *Have you ever had sexual intercourse when you*

didn't want to because the other person threatened to leave? 3) *Have you ever had the other person attempt sexual intercourse (get on top of you, attempt penetration) when you didn't want to by taking advantage of your intoxication, or giving you alcohol or drugs, but intercourse did not occur?*, and 4) *Have you ever had sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because the other person threatened you or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you?* For the current study, women and men reported separately whether they had ever experienced or perpetrated behaviors of sexual coercion within past relationships since the age of 14 years old, and within their current relationship. Women and men's victimization and perpetration scores were dichotomized to reflect whether sexual coercion was reported.

Data Analyses

For the purpose of this study, women and men's self-reports were used to assess their sexual coercion victimization and perpetration rates. Frequency analyses were conducted to examine rates of childhood sexual abuse and sexual coercion experiences. Bivariate correlations were performed to examine the degree of association between variables and to verify for multicollinearity. Finally, hierarchical logistic regressions[1] were performed to investigate the value of sexual motives, childhood sexual abuse and previous experiences of sexual coercion, as well as reciprocal sexual coercion, within a predictive model of sexual coercion victimization and perpetration within current relationships.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

On average, the couples engaged in sexual intercourse once a week (range = once a day to never). The mean age for the men and women's first sexual intercourse experience was 17 years old (SD = 2.36, and 2.19, respectively). Over a third of women and men (33.9 and 37.8%, respectively) reported having had 4-10 sexual

partners, whereas almost a quarter of them (24.9% and 23.0%) reported 2-3 partners in their lifetime.

Childhood Sexual Abuse and Sexual Coercion Experiences

Analyses of frequencies showed that 18% (37) of the women reported experiencing childhood sexual abuse, as opposed to 9.6% (20) of the men. When examining sexual coercion experiences in previous relationships, 62.0% of women and 35.0% of men reported being victims, whereas 20.9% of women and 40.5% of men reported perpetrating sexual coercion. In contrast, 31.1% of women and 19.6% of men reported sexual coercion victimization within their current relationship. Reported perpetration rates in their current relationships were 16.7% and 27.8%, respectively.

In general, victims and perpetrators reported less severe sexual coercion within their current relationship, such as unwanted sexual contact and intercourse due to arguments and verbal pressure, rather than attempted or completed sexual intercourse due to threat or use of physical force (for a detailed description see Brousseau et al., 2011) . Indeed, 30.6% of women and 19.6% of men reported mild sexual coercion victimization, whereas 15.8% of women and 27.8% of men reported mild sexual coercion perpetration. In contrast, less than 5% of participants reported severe sexual coercion victimization and perpetration (0.5% to 4.3%) in their current relationship. Within previous relationships, 57.9% of women and 34.0% of men reported being victims of mild sexual coercion, whereas 23.4% of women and 4.8% of men reported severe sexually coercive experiences. Past mild and severe sexual coercion perpetration rates were 19.1% and 4.8% for women, and 39.7% and 6.2% for men, respectively.

Correlations

Bivariate correlations among the motives, childhood sexual abuse and the measures of sexual coercion in previous relationships and within the current

relationship are presented in Table 1. Self-power and partner power were highly correlated (.64, $p < .000$) with each other, and both correlated positively with perpetration of coercion for both genders. To prevent multicollinearity problems, scores for both power motives were combined into a single power motive score before performing logistic regressions for both men and women. Intercorrelations between demographic variables and the dependant variables were also calculated, but no significant associations were found.

Predictive Models of Sexual Coercion

Hierarchical logistic regressions were performed to investigate whether childhood sexual abuse, previous sexual coercion and sexual motives would contribute to the prediction of sexual coercion victimization and perpetration in current relationships (Tables 2-5). The regressions were conducted separately for women and men. In each model, four blocks of variables were entered. The first block included childhood sexual abuse, while the second block included sexual coercion victimization and perpetration in previous relationships since the age of 14. Childhood sexual abuse was entered separately from sexual coercion history to identify the possible influence of each different experience. The third block consisted of coexisting sexual coercion within the current relationship; when predicting sexual coercion victimization, perpetration was included as a predictor and vice versa. This block was added to control for the fact that sexual coercion within relationships can sometimes be reciprocal between partners (Brousseau et al., 2011), and that recent studies have found that perpetration of sexual coercion is predicted by victimization from the partner and vice versa for both genders (Enosh, 2007; Harned, 2002; Muñoz-Rivas et al., 2009). The fourth block included the sexual motives: stress relief, pleasure, self-affirmation, imposition, partner pressure, and the combined power motives, in order to examine their predictive value and whether they explained a unique portion of the variance, over and above that explained by previous abusive experiences.

Female sexual coercion victimization. A hierarchical logistic regression demonstrated that the first two blocks (childhood sexual abuse and previous sexual coercion) did not contribute significantly to the predictive model of female sexual coercion victimization (Table 2). Women's perpetration of sexual coercion in their relationship (Block 3) was associated with an increased risk of victimization and accounted for 8% of the variance. At the final step, current perpetration, as well as the motives of partner pressure, imposition and stress relief independently contributed to the prediction of female sexual coercion victimization. The odds ratios suggest that women's perpetration of sexual coercion in their relationship is associated with an increased risk of female victimization by almost six times. Moreover, imposition and partner pressure motives are associated with an increased risk of victimization, whereas stress relief motives decreased the risk of victimization. Furthermore, adding the sexual motives variables in the block represented a significant contribution and explained an additional 22% of the variance in the predictive models, over and above the other factors.

Female sexual coercion perpetration. The hierarchical logistic regression for female perpetration of sexual coercion demonstrated that all four blocks contributed significantly to the predictive model. Block 1 (childhood sexual abuse) accounted for 6% of the variance while variables relating to sexual coercion in previous relationships (added in block 2) accounted for 6% of the variance. Variables regarding coexisting sexual coercion added in block 3 accounted for 9 % of the variance, whereas the final block (sexual motives) accounted for an additional 12% of the variance in female perpetration of sexual coercion (Table 3). At the final step, childhood sexual abuse and current sexual coercion victimization were significant risk factors for women being sexually coercive. Furthermore, motives of power were associated with an increased risk of perpetration whereas pleasure motives decreased perpetration.

Male sexual coercion victimization. The hierarchical logistic regression demonstrated that the first block (childhood sexual abuse) did not contribute significantly to the predictive model of male sexual coercion victimization (Table 4). Previous sexual coercion (block 2) accounted for 23% of the variance, whereas variables relating to coexisting sexual coercion entered in block 3 accounted for 9% of the variance. Moreover, the sexual motives (block 4) explained an additional 14% of the variance in this model, over and above that explained by the other variables. At the final step, previous sexual coercion, current perpetration, as well as the motive of imposition, independently contributed to the prediction of male sexual coercion victimization. The odds ratios suggest that sexual coercion victimization in previous relationships increased the risk of current male victimization by 20, whereas current perpetration increased it by a factor of three. Perpetration within previous relationships, however, was linked to a reduced risk. Moreover, the imposition sexual motive increased the risk of male sexual coercion victimization, whereas the partner pressure motive was not a significant predictor.

Male sexual coercion perpetration. The predictive model for male perpetration of sexual coercion was significant and accounted for 28% of the variance, with 11% of it explained by the sexual motives (see Table 5). The hierarchical logistic regression demonstrated that childhood sexual abuse in the first block did not contribute significantly to the predictive model of male sexual coercion perpetration. Previous sexual coercion (block 2) accounted for 6% of the variance, whereas the variable related to coexisting sexual coercion in block 3 accounted for 10% of the variance. At the final step, previous sexual coercion perpetration, current sexual coercion victimization, and the motive of power independently contributed to the prediction of male sexual coercion perpetration. The odds ratios suggest that perpetration of sexual coercion in previous relationships and current victimization were associated with a greater risk of perpetrating in the current relationship. The

sexual motive of power increased men's risk of behaving coercively, whereas the stress-relief motive was not a significant predictor.

Discussion

The current study examined four predictive models of sexual coercion within current relationships, namely female and male victimization and perpetration. The aim of the study was to investigate the role of childhood sexual abuse, sexual coercion histories and sexual motivation in predicting the occurrence of sexual coercion within mixed-sex relationships. The study provides an important contribution as it focused on individual as well as relational risk factors associated with current sexual coercion. Results suggest that, contrary to our hypotheses, childhood sexual abuse was only a significant predictor of female sexual coercion perpetration, whereas previous sexual coercion experiences predicted current sexual coercion for men only. Indeed, current male victimization and perpetration were predicted by similar experiences in previous relationships. Results from this study also suggest that sexual motives are significant predictors of sexual coercion victimization and perpetration for both women and men, and explain a unique portion of the variance over and above childhood sexual abuse and antecedents of sexual coercion factors. Indeed, the power motives were significant predictors of perpetration, and imposition was a significant predictor of sexual coercion victimization for both genders. Partner pressure, however, was only a significant predictor for female sexual coercion victimization, and stress relief was not a significant predictor of sexual coercion perpetration.

Predictive Models of Sexual Coercion within Current Relationships

All predictive models in this study were significant, explaining an average of 28-46% of the variance in sexual coercion outcomes, which suggests that these variables can be considered as risk factors for current sexual coercion victimization and perpetration within mixed sex couples. Moreover, sexual motives provided a

unique contribution explaining between 11-23% of the variance, over and above childhood sexual abuse and sexual coercion experiences.

The female sexual coercion models presented interesting results regarding victimization, perpetration and sexual motives. The reported rate of childhood sexual abuse for women (18%) was similar to that found in other studies (Hébert, Tourigny, Cyr, McDuff, & Joly, 2009; Pereda, Guilera, Forns, & Gómez-Benito, 2009). For women, childhood sexual abuse was associated with an increased risk of perpetrating sexual coercion within current relationships. These findings are consistent with social learning theory, in that women victims may come to learn to use sexually coercive behaviors and they may react to experiences of childhood sexual abuse by viewing sexual relationships as adversarial (Anderson, 1996; Krahé, Waizenhofer, & Möller, 2003). Moreover, consistent with the results of Banyard et al. (2000), childhood sexual abuse was not associated with an increased likelihood of current sexual coercion victimization. Nevertheless, previous studies have found an association (Classen et al., 2005). A possible explanation for the inconsistencies is that more severe childhood sexual abuse may be more predictive of revictimization; however, our limited sample size prevented us from performing analyses based on severity of abuse. In contrast to Banyard et al., previous sexual coercion did not predict current sexual coercion experiences in the current relationship. Considering the high prevalence of previous sexual coercion victimization (62.0%) for women, the experience may be too frequent to be of predictive value for current sexual coercion. Indeed, sexual coercion victimization may be less predictable and more "random" for women (Harned, 2002). Nevertheless, current sexual coercion experiences were predicted by coexisting sexual coercion in the relationship, such that current victimization predicted perpetration and vice versa. This could imply that sexual coercion may be reciprocal in coercive couples (Brousseau et al., 2011).

Sexual motives, for their part, were significant predictors of current sexual coercion experiences. Having sexual relations because of partner pressure and imposition was associated with an increased the risk of sexual coercion victimization

for women. In relationships in which the man frequently pressures the woman to have sex, she may be more likely to be motivated to frequently agree to sex in order to reduce the pressure; when she does refuse sex, the man may go further in his attempts to convince her and engage in sexual coercion. Consequently, women may fear greater repercussions or more severe sexual coercion if they refuse sexual advances from their partner. Therefore, avoidant sexual motives are associated with sexual coercion victimization for women. Women experiencing sexual coercion may tend to feel obligated to engage in sexual activities with their partner to avoid conflict or negative consequences. However, their need to please their partner and fulfill their perceived "duty" may put them at greater risk of unwanted sex. This is further reflected in the finding that stress relief motives decreased the risk of sexual coercion victimization. Thus, self-focused and intrinsic motives may put women in a less submissive role. As for female perpetrators, they were likely to endorse more power and less pleasure motives. These results are contrary to Hill (2003), who found coercive women reported more stress relief motives. However, they are in line with previous findings obtained for men which support the notion that their proclivity to sexual coercion may be related to a drive to fulfill their need for control in sexual interactions (Hill, 2003).

Although the rate of childhood sexual abuse for men was also similar to that found in other studies (Hébert et al., 2009; Pereda et al., 2009), male childhood sexual abuse was not a significant predictor for sexual coercion victimization or perpetration within the couple. This result is contrary to the findings for women and to findings from other studies (King et al., 2000; King & Woollett, 1997; Schatzel-Murphy, Harris, Knight, & Milburn, 2009; Senn et al., 2000). This may be due to the fact that the rate of reported childhood sexual abuse was too low in the current sample. Previous studies have also found that childhood sexual abuse alone is not directly predictive, but rather that the childhood sexual abuse – sexual coercion perpetration and victimization link may be moderated by other variables such as family factors and other types of abuse, as well as the developmental stage of the men

(Daigneault, Hébert, & McDuff, 2009; Schatzel-Murphy et al., 2009; Thomas & Fremouw, 2009). Moreover, as with the findings for women, the predictive value of childhood sexual abuse may be more pronounced in cases of more severe CSA.

When examining sexual coercion in previous relationships, men's victimization and perpetration of sexual coercion were associated with an increased likelihood of experiencing the same type of sexual coercion within their current relationship. This finding suggests that men's coercive behavior or victimization tends to repeat itself throughout their relationships. Thus, in line with the theories of social learning and sexual scripts, their sexual coercion experiences may strengthen their sexual scripts, which encourage male sexual experiences, and reinforce their sexual behaviors. This is further supported by the finding that male sexual coercion victims were more likely than male non-victims to report having sex because of imposition, or self-imposed obligation, rather than partner pressure, which partly supports our hypotheses for sexual victimization. This seems to substantiate the traditional sexual script theory that men should always be ready and willing to have sex; therefore being sexually victimized would decrease their perceived self-value as a sexual partner and increase the pressure they place on themselves to prove their masculinity in a sexual manner. Likewise, when examining male perpetration, the full model was similar to the results of Hill (2003) and Zurbriggen (2000) in that the coercive men endorsed more power motives. Thus, coercive men may intrinsically be aroused by controlling their partner during sexual interactions. Within the context of traditional sexual scripts, this behavior may be perceived as congruent with a masculine self-identity. However, similar to results found by Gidycz, Warkentin, and Orchowski (2007), the risk of sexual coercion perpetration was also increased in men who reported sexual coercion perpetration in previous relationships. Within the current relationships, male victimization was also predicted by current perpetration, and vice versa, which also suggests that sexual coercion tends to be reciprocal within couples.

In summary, the results suggest that the operation of avoidant motives (i.e. imposition and partner pressure) is associated with an increased risk of victimization for men and women. Previous studies have demonstrated that engaging in sexual activities due to avoidant motives may reduce relationship well-being (Impett et al., 2005), which may further reduce the resisting partners' desire for sexual interactions and possibly increase the initiating partners' use of coercive tactics, thus creating a vicious cycle of sexual coercion. Nevertheless, due to the correlational nature of the present data, we cannot infer whether experiences of sexual coercion influenced the avoidant sexual motives or whether avoidant motives possibly create a vulnerability to sexual coercion.

Limitations and Implications

The present study involves some limitations that must be taken into account when interpreting the results. First, women and men were not directly compared in the analyses; therefore no clear conclusions can be drawn about gender differences. Secondly, the frequency analyses suggest that the women and men tended to experience mild non-physical sexual coercion in their current relationship, rather than severe physical sexual coercion. This is consistent with other studies which have found that the majority of participants report more verbal sexual coercion than physical sexual coercion (Struckman-Johnson, Struckman-Johnson, & Anderson, 2003; VanderLaan & Vasey, 2009). Findings must be interpreted within this context, bearing in mind that research on intimate partner violence has found that minor coercion can lead to more severe abuse. Therefore, mild sexual coercion needs to be examined not only as a problematic phenomenon per se, but also as a possible precursor to more severe intimate partner violence. Likewise, considering that participants were in ongoing relationships, the partners may have more expectations of sexual interactions than newly dating partners (Enosh, 2007) and partners who resist sexual overtures may have been less direct in refusing sexual advances in order

to maintain the integrity of the relationship. Consequently, sexual negotiation in established relationships may be prone to miscommunication.

Another limitation of this study is that the measure of past sexual coercion examined sexual coercion in previous relationships rather than consider all sexual coercion experiences since the age of 14. As such, participants may not have reported all significant sexually coercive experiences that they may have experienced or perpetrated with strangers or acquaintances.

Moreover, considering the number of factors included in the models, the sample size is relatively small. Ideally, these models should be retested with a larger sample size and possibly using strategies such as structural equation modeling that can better identify the associations between the factors. We chose to include couples in which at least one partner was 35 years old or younger to obtain a more diverse sample. Consequently, recruiting partners enabled us to have access to respondents who were not university students. This may be a limitation for comparison purposes, but it is also a strength in that it allows for more generalization to a broader span of younger couples.

Nevertheless, our findings suggest that sexual coercion is a complex phenomenon which is influenced by a number of factors such as childhood sexual abuse, sexual coercion in previous relationships and sexual motivation. Moreover, the results lend support to the theory of traditional sexual scripts, for both male and female participants. The women experiencing sexual coercion reported more partner pressure and imposition as their sexual motives than female non-victims. Female sexual coercion perpetrators, on the other hand, reported more sexual motives of power and less motives of pleasure, again demonstrating that female perpetrators may be drawn to sexual interactions with a partner as an opportunity to express power sexually, rather than physical sexual pleasure. Within the sexual script theory, these coercive women may even view their sexual coercion behaviors as a "favor" to their partners (Hill, 2003), regardless of their partners' willingness. Alternatively, women may behave sexually coercively as a way of trying to connect emotionally with their

partners (Schatzel-Murphy et al., 2009). The victimized men, on the other hand, were more motivated by self-imposed sexual obligation, and the male perpetrators reported more motives of power, thus reflecting the stereotypes of females as gatekeepers and males as sexual predators.

Finally, above and beyond previously investigated factors, sexual motivation was a significant predictor of sexual coercion victimization and perpetration within current relationships for both women and men. For the men, only imposition was a significant predictor for sexual coercion victimization, whereas imposition and partner pressure were associated with sexual coercion victimization for the women. This study suggests that male victims may impose sexual pressure on themselves whereas women victims may tend to have sex because of partner pressure and because of a sense of duty. Indeed, men and women may interpret sexual interactions and experiences differently; thus, a single model for victimization and perpetration of coercion is not sufficient to account for gender specificities. Moreover, the current models suggest that previous sexual coercion victimization and perpetration experiences for men are predictive of future sexual coercion victimization and perpetration. Therefore, it seems crucial to develop early intervention initiatives designed for adolescents engaging in their very first romantic relationship. Intervention and prevention programs focusing on sexual motivation and on dismantling sexual stereotypes could help young women and men understand what drives them to have sex and to explore other outlets to fulfill their needs in order to reduce the risk of sexual coercion in their romantic relationships.

References

Anderson, P. B. (1996). Correlates of college women's self-reports of heterosexual aggression. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 8*, 121-131.

Anderson, P. B., & Savage, J. S. (2005). Social, legal, and institutional context of heterosexual aggression by college women. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 6*, 130-140.

Anderson, P. B., & Sorensen, W. (1999). Male and female differences in reports of women's heterosexual initiation and aggression. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 28*, 243-253.

Arata, C. M. (2000). From child victim to adult victim: A model for predicting sexual revictimization. *Child Maltreatment, 5*, 28-38.

Arata, C. M., & Burkhart, B. R. (1996). Post-traumatic stress disorder among college student victims of acquaintance assault. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 8*, 79-92.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Banyard, V. L., Arnold, S., & Smith, J. (2000). Childhood sexual abuse and dating experiences of undergraduate women. *Child Maltreatment, 5*, 39-48.

Brousseau, M. M., Bergeron, S., Hébert, M., & McDuff, P. (2011). Sexual coercion victimization and perpetration in heterosexual couples: A dyadic investigation. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 40,* 363-372. doi 10.1007/s10508-010-9617-0

Carr, J. L., & VanDeusen, K. M. (2004). Risk factors for male sexual aggression on college campuses. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*, 279-289.

Classen, C. C., Palesh, O. G., & Aggarwal, R. (2005). Sexual revictimization: A review of the empirical literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 6*, 103-129.

Cooper, M. L., Shapiro, C. M., & Powers, A. M. (1998). Motivations for sex and risky sexual behavior among adolescents and young adults: A functional perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 1528-1558.

Daigneault, I., Hébert, M., & McDuff, P. (2009). Men's and women's childhood sexual abuse and victimization in adult partner relationships: A study of risk factors. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 33*, 638-647.

De Visser, R. O., Rissel, C. E., Richters, J., & Smith, A. M. A. (2007). The impact of sexual coercion on psychological, physical, and sexual well-being in a representative sample of Australian women. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 36*, 676-686.

Enosh, G. (2007). Cognition or involvement? Explaining sexual-coercion in high-school dating. *Journal of Sexual Abuse, 19*, 311-329.

Gidycz, C. A., Coble, C. N., Latham, L., & Layman, M. J. (1993). Sexual assault experience in adulthood and prior victimization experiences: A prospective analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 17*(2), 151-168.

Gidycz, C. A., Hanson, K., & Layman, M. J. (1995). A prospective analysis of the à relationships among sexual assault experiences: An extension of previous findings. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19*, 5-29.

Gidycz, C. A., Warkentin, J. B. & Orchowski, L. M. (2007). Predictors of perpetration of verbal, physical, and sexual violence: A prospective analysis of college men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 8*, 79-94.

Harned, M. S. (2002). A multivariate analysis of risk markers for dating violence victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 1179-1197.

Hébert, M., Tourigny, M., Cyr, M., McDuff, P., & Joly, J. (2009). Prevalence of childhood sexual abuse and timing of disclosure in a representative sample of adults from Québec. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 54*, 631-636.

Hill, C. A. (November, 2003). Sexual coercion as a function of gender, gender-related aggression beliefs, and sexual motives. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality, San Antonio, TX.

Hill, C. A., & Preston, L. K. (1996). Individual differences in the experience of sexual motivation: Theory and measurement of dispositional sexual motives. *The Journal of Sex Research, 33*, 27-45.

Hines, D. A. (2007). Predictors of sexual coercion against women and men: A multilevel, multinational study of university students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 36*, 403-422.

Impett, E. A., & Peplau, L. A. (2002). Why some women consent to unwanted sex with a dating partner: Insights from attachment theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26,* 360-370.

Impett, E. A., & Peplau, L. A. (2003). Sexual compliance: Gender, motivational, and relationship perspectives. *The Journal of Sex Research, 40*, 87-100.

Impett, E. A., Peplau, L. A., & Gable, S. L. (2005). Approach and avoidance sexual motives: Implications for personal and interpersonal well-being. *Personal Relationships, 12*, 465-482.

King, M., Coxell, A., & Mezey, G. (2000). The prevalence and characteristics of male sexual assault. In G. C. Mezey & M. B. King (Eds.), *Male victims of sexual assault* (2nd Ed.) (pp. 1-15). New York: Oxford University Press.

King, M., & Woollett, E. (1997). Sexually assaulted males: 115 men consulting a counseling service. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 26*(6), 579-588.

Koss, M. P., & Gidycz, C. A. (1985). Sexual Experiences Survey: Reliability and validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53*, 422-423.

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence And prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55*(2), 162-170.

Krahé, B., Waizenhöfer, E., & Möller, I. (2003). Women's sexual aggression against men: Prevalence and predictors. *Sex Roles, 49*(5/6), 219-232.

Muñoz-Rivas, M. J., Graña, J. L., O'Leary, K. D., & González, M. P. (2009). Prevalence and predictors of sexual aggression in dating relationships of adolescents and young adults. *Psicothema, 21*, 234-240.

O'Leary, K. D., & Williams, M. C. (2006). Agreement about acts of aggression in marriage. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20*, 656-662.

Pereda, N., Guilera, G., Forns, M., & Gómez-Benito, J. (2009). The prevalence of child sexual abuse in community and student samples: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review, 29*, 328-338.

Poitras, M. & Lavoie, F. (1995). A study of the prevalence of sexual coercion in adolescent heterosexual dating relationships in a Quebec sample. *Violence and Victims, 10*, 299-313.

Rich, C. L., Gidycz, C. A., Warkentin, J. B., Loh, C. & Weiland, P. (2005). Child and adolescent abuse and subsequent victimization: A prospective study. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 29*, 1373-1394.

Schachner, D. A., & Shaver, P. R. (2004). Attachment dimensions and sexual motives. *Personal Relationships, 11,* 179-195.

Schatzel-Murphy, E. A., Harris, D. A., Knight, R. A., & Milburn, M. A. (2009). Sexual coercion in men and women: Similar behaviours, different predictors. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 38,* 974-986.

Senn, C. Y., Desmarais, S., Verberg, N., & Wood, E. (2000). Predicting coercive sexual behavior across the lifespan in a random sample of Canadian men. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 17*, 95-113.

Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. (1986). Sexual scripts: Permanence and change. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 15*, 97-120.

Spitzberg, B. H. (1998). Sexual coercion in courtship relations. In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.), *The Dark Side of Close Relationships* (pp. 179-232). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum associates.

Struckman-Johnson, C., Struckman-Johnson, D., & Anderson, P. B. (2003). Tactics of sexual coercion: When men and women won't take no for an answer. *The Journal of Sex Research, 40*, 76-86.

Testa, M. & Dermen, K. H. (1999). The differential correlates of sexual coercion and rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*, 548-561.

Testa, M, VanZile-Tamsen, C., Livingston, J., & Koss, M. (2004). Assessing

women's experiences of sexual aggression using the Sexual Experiences Survey: Evidence for validity and implications for research. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28, 256-265.*

Thomas, T. A., & Fremouw, W. (2009). Moderating variables of the sexual "victim to offender cycle" in males. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 14*, 382-387.

Turchik, J. A., Probst, D. R., Irvin, C. R., Chau, M., & Gidycz, C. A. (2009). Prediction of sexual assault experiences in college women based on rape scripts: A prospective analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 77*, 361-366.

VanderLaan, D. P., & Vasey, P. L. (2009). Patterns of sexual coercion in heterosexual and non-heterosexual men and women. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 38*, 987-999.

Vézina, J., & Hébert, M. (2007). Risk factors for victimization in romantic relationships of young women: A review of empirical studies and implications for prevention. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 8*, 33-66.

White, J. W., & Smith, P. H. (2004). Sexual assault perpetration and reperpetration: From adolescence to young adulthood. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 31*, 182-202.

Zurbriggen, E. L. (2000). Social motives and cognitive power-sex associations: Predictors of aggressive sexual behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 559-581.

Zweig, J. M., Barber, B. L., & Eccles, J. S. (1997). Sexual coercion and well-being in young adulthood: Comparisons by gender and college status. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*, 291-308.

Zweig, J. M., Crockett, L. J., Sayer, A., & Vicary, J. R. (1999). A longitudinal examination of the consequences of sexual victimization for rural young adult women. *The Journal of Sex Research, 36*, 396-409.

Footnotes

[1]Post-hoc mediation models were tested for both women and men sexual coercion victimization and perpetration, to examine whether early coercion experiences mediated the relationship between motives and current coercion experiences. No significant mediation effects were found; therefore the mediation models are not presented.

Table 1

Correlations between sexual motives, childhood sexual abuse, sexual coercion victimization and perpetration within past and current relationships by gender

Measure	1. Self power	2. Partner power	3. Stress relief	4. Imposition	5. Partner pressure	6. Self-affirmation	7. Pleasure	8. CSA	9. Past SC victim	10. Past SC perpetrator	11. Current SC victim	12. Current SC perpetrator
1. Self power	—	.58***	.30***	.20**	.11	.41***	.02	.07	.06	.20**	.03	.21**
2. Partner power	.64***	—	.30***	.28***	.17**	.28***	-.04	.02	.05	.16*	.09	.24***
3. Stress relief	.32***	.32***	—	.16*	.14*	.29***	.03	.05	.01	.13	-.02	.13
4. Imposition	.16*	.09	.03	—	.60***	.34***	-.49***	-.02	.03	.13	.35***	.17*
5. Partner pressure	.08	.11	.02	.57***	—	.36***	-.46***	-.02	-.01	.09	.37***	.10
6. Self-affirmation	.42***	.25***	.25***	.44***	.39***	—	.04	.07	.02	.11	.06	.08

7.	Pleasure	-.08	-.10	.12	-.19**	-.27***	.01	__	.01	.01	-.10	-.26***	-.23***
8.	CSA	.11	.11	.11	.10	.09	.02	-.13	__	.15*	.13	.07	.20**
9.	Past SC victim	.09	.18*	.16*	.04	.04	-.02	-.12	.03	__	.35***	-.01	.08
10.	Past SC perpetrator	.15*	.18**	.14	.02	.03	.04	.01	-.04	.47**	__	.15*	.24***
11.	Current SC victim	.17**	.15*	.13	.29***	.25***	.25***	-.07	-.04	.40***	.12	__	.31***
12.	Current SC perpetrator	.21**	.27***	.19**	.20**	.16*	.28***	-.04	.09	.10	.16*	.26***	__

Note. Intercorrelations for female participants are presented above the diagonal, and intercorrelations for male participants are presented below the diagonal. Items 1 to 3 are sexual motivation subscales from the Affective and Motivational Orientation Related to Erotic Arousal Scale (AMORE) and items 5 to 7 are from the Sex Motives Scale (SMS). Self-power = having sex to feel powerful or in control; Partner power = feeling the partner's power; Stress relief =coping with distress; Imposition = having sex because you feel that it is your duty or obligation; Partner pressure = to avoid rejection; Self-affirmation = to prove one's self; Pleasure = enhancement of pleasure; CSA = Childhood sexual abuse; Past SC victim = Reported sexual coercion victimization in previous relationships since the age of 14; Past SC perpetrator = Reported perpetration of sexual coercion in previous relationships since the age of 14; Current SC victim = Reported sexual coercion victimization in the current relationship; Current SC perpetrator = Reported perpetration of sexual coercion in the current relationship.
*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 2
Hierarchical Logistic Regression Predicting Female Sexual Coercion Victimization by Partner

Predictor	β	*S.E.*	Odds Ratio	Block χ^2	Block *df*	Block *sig.*	Model χ^2	Model *df*	Model *sig.*	Model Variance
Block 1—Sexual abuse history				0.70	1	.41	0.70	1	.41	.01
CSA	.33	.39	1.38							
Block 2—Previous SC				4.46	2	.11	5.16	3	.16	.04
CSA	.29	.40	1.34							
Past SC victimization	-.34	.35	.71							
Past SC perpetration	.83*	.39	2.28							
Block 3—Reciprocal SC				12.31	1	.00	17.47	4	.00	.12
CSA	.03	.43	1.03							
Past SC victimization	-.33	.36	.72							
Past SC perpetration	.58	.42	1.78							
Current SC perpetration	1.48***	.43	4.38							
Block 4—Sexual motives				38.99	6	.00	56.45	10	.00	.34
CSA	.30	.50	1.35							
Past SC victimization	-.41	.40	.67							
Past SC perpetration	.69	.49	1.99							
Current SC perpetration	1.76***	.51	5.79							
Stress relief	-.49*	.24	.62							
Pleasure	.41	.36	1.51							
Self-affirmation	-.56	.33	.57							
Partner pressure	2.13***	.67	8.40							
Imposition	1.29**	.48	3.62							
Power	-.22	.26	.80							

Note. $n = 205$. CSA = Childhood sexual abuse; Past SC victimization = Reported sexual coercion victimization in previous relationships since the age of 14; Past SC perpetration = Reported perpetration of sexual coercion in previous relationships since the age of 14; Current SC perpetration = Reported perpetration of sexual coercion in the current relationship; Stress relief = coping with distress; Pleasure = enhancement of pleasure; Self-affirmation = to prove one's self; Partner pressure = to avoid rejection; Imposition = having sex because you feel that it is your duty or obligation; Power = the combined AMORE subscales of Self-Power and Partner Power.
*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 3
Hierarchical Logistic Regression Predicting Female Sexual Coercion Perpetration with Partner

Predictor	β	*S.E.*	Odds Ratio	Block χ^2	Block *df*	Block *sig.*	Model χ^2	Model *df*	Model *sig.*	Model Variance
Block 1—Sexual abuse history				6.96	1	.01	6.96	1	.01	.06
CSA	1.19**	.43	3.28							
Block 2—Previous SC				7.53	2	.02	14.48	3	.00	.12
CSA	1.10*	.45	3.00							
Past SC victimization	-.15	.49	.86							
Past SC perpetration	1.26**	.47	3.51							
Block 3—Reciprocal SC				12.16	1	.00	26.64	4	.00	.21
CSA	1.08*	.48	2.95							
Past SC victimization	-.05	.51	.95							
Past SC perpetration	1.05*	.50	2.87							
Current SC victimization	1.47***	.43	4.35							
Block 4—Sexual motives				16.11	6	.01	42.75	10	.00	.33
CSA	1.14*	.52	3.14							
Past SC victimization	.04	.54	1.04							
Past SC perpetration	.72	.55	2.05							
Current SC victimization	1.73***	.52	5.62							
Stress relief	.34	.28	1.40							
Pleasure	-1.10**	.40	.33							
Self-affirmation	.18	.41	1.20							
Partner pressure	-1.03	.75	.36							
Imposition	-.35	.54	.71							
Power	.69*	.31	2.00							

Note. $n = 205$. CSA = Childhood sexual abuse; Past SC victimization = Reported sexual coercion victimization in previous relationships since the age of 14; Past SC perpetration = Reported perpetration of sexual coercion in previous relationships since the age of 14; Current SC victimization = Reported victimization of sexual coercion in the current relationship; Stress relief = coping with distress; Pleasure = enhancement of pleasure; Self-affirmation = to prove one's self; Partner pressure = to avoid rejection; Imposition = having sex because you feel that it is your duty or obligation; Power = the combined AMORE subscales of Self-Power and Partner Power.
$^*p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{***}p < .001$

Table 4
Hierarchical Logistic Regression Predicting Male Sexual Coercion Victimization by Partner

Predictor	β	*S.E.*	Odds Ratio	Block χ^2	Block *df*	Block *sig.*	Model χ^2	Model *df*	Model *sig.*	Model Variance
Block 1—Sexual abuse history				.20	1	.65	.20	1	.65	.00
CSA	-.29	.65	.75							
Block 2—Previous SC				31.50	2	.00	31.70	3	.00	.23
CSA	-.48	.70	.62							
Past SC victimization	2.35***	.48	10.50							
Past SC perpetration	-.51	.46	.60							
Block 3—Reciprocal SC				13.80	1	.00	45.50	4	.00	.32
CSA	-.89	.77	.41							
Past SC victimization	2.52***	.50	12.37							
Past SC perpetration	-.81	.49	.44							
Current SC perpetration	1.59***	.44	4.93							
Block 4—Sexual motives				21.74	6	.00	67.24	10	.00	.46
CSA	-1.60	.94	.20							
Past SC victimization	2.99***	.61	19.90							
Past SC perpetration	-1.12*	.55	.33							
Current SC perpetration	1.19*	.51	3.30							
Stress relief	.17	.27	1.18							
Pleasure	-.03	.40	.97							
Self-affirmation	.47	.35	1.60							
Partner pressure	.64	.67	1.89							
Imposition	1.02*	.48	2.78							
Power	.10	.34	1.11							

Note. $n = 204$. CSA = Childhood sexual abuse; Past SC victimization = Reported sexual coercion victimization in previous relationships since the age of 14; Past SC perpetration = Reported perpetration of sexual coercion in previous relationships since the age of 14; Current SC perpetration = Reported perpetration of sexual coercion in the current relationship; Stress relief = coping with distress; Pleasure = enhancement of pleasure; Self-affirmation = to prove one's self; Partner pressure = to avoid rejection; Imposition = having sex because you feel that it is your duty or obligation; Power = the combined AMORE subscales of Self-Power and Partner Power.
$^*p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{***}p < .001$

Table 5
Hierarchical Logistic Regression Predicting Male Sexual Coercion Perpetration with Partner

Variables	β	*S.E.*	Odds Ratio	Block χ^2	Block *df*	Block *sig.*	Model χ^2	Model *df*	Model *sig.*	Model Variance
Block 1—Sexual abuse history				1.97	1	.16	1.97	1	.16	.01
CSA	.70	.49	2.02							
Block 2—Previous SC				7.59	2	.02	9.56	3	.02	.07
CSA	.78	.50	2.18							
Past SC victimization	.19	.38	1.21							
Past SC perpetration	.80*	.37	2.22							
Block 3—Reciprocal SC				15.14	1	.00	24.70	4	.00	.17
CSA	1.00	.52	2.72							
Past SC victimization	-.53	.45	.59							
Past SC perpetration	1.04**	.40	2.83							
Current SC victimization	1.70***	.44	5.45							
Block 4—Sexual motives				17.67	6	.01	42.38	10	.00	.28
CSA	.71	.55	2.03							
Past SC victimization	-.37	.47	.69							
Past SC perpetration	.92*	.42	2.51							
Current SC victimization	1.22*	.49	3.39							
Stress relief	.28	.22	1.32							
Pleasure	-.07	.34	.93							
Self-affirmation	.48	.28	1.61							
Partner pressure	.29	.62	1.34							
Imposition	.04	.42	1.04							
Power	.53*	.27	1.69							

Note. $n = 201$. CSA = Childhood sexual abuse; Past SC victimization = Reported sexual coercion victimization in previous relationships since the age of 14; Past SC perpetration = Reported perpetration of sexual coercion in previous relationships since the age of 14; Current SC victimization = Reported victimization of sexual coercion in the current relationship; Stress relief = coping with distress; Pleasure = enhancement of pleasure; Self-affirmation = to prove one's self; Partner pressure = to avoid rejection; Imposition = having sex because you feel that it is your duty or obligation; Power = the combined AMORE subscales of Self-Power and Partner Power.
$^*p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{***}p < .001$

CHAPTER IV
GENERAL DISCUSSION

Sexual coercion, defined as using manipulative psychological and physical tactics to obtain sexual activities from an unwilling partner, is a prevalent problem affecting women and men alike. Previous studies have investigated sexual coercion victimization and perpetration as perceived by individuals, but rarely from the perspective of both partners involved. Consequently, the reported prevalence rates may have been biased according to the respondents' gender as well as his or her role in the interaction (victim versus perpetrator). Moreover, numerous studies have examined risk factors associated with sexual coercion, but results have been inconsistent. These inconsistencies were further exacerbated by the fact that studies often only investigated one gender, victims only, or perpetrators only. This gap in empirical studies clearly needed to be addressed.

The present doctoral research examined the rate of, and risk factors associated with, sexual coercion in a sample of heterosexual couples. Specifically, this research investigated the perception of both partners as victims and perpetrators of sexual coercion within their current relationships, in addition to examining childhood sexual abuse, sexual coercion experiences in previous relationships, and sexual motivations as potential predictors of sexual coercion victimization and perpetration.

This chapter will offer a summary and a discussion of the main results of the two studies in relation to the objectives of the research: 1) to investigate the rate and perception of sexual coercion in heterosexual couples as reported by both members of the dyad; and 2) to develop a predictive model of sexual coercion victimization and perpetration for both women and men in heterosexual relationships, by examining the predictive value of childhood sexual abuse, sexual coercion in previous relationships, and sexual motivation. This will be followed by a discussion of the theoretical and clinical implications of the findings, as well as the strengths and limitations of the studies. Lastly, suggestions for future studies will be presented.

Study 1: Sexual Coercion Within Couples

In study 1, the rate of SC victimization and perpetration was investigated, as well as its reciprocity and the level of inter-partner agreement within 222 mixed-sex couples recruited in a university setting. Individual reports of SC were examined, and then compared to rates obtained when combining reports from either partner within couples. It was postulated that women and men would report experiencing more SC victimization than their partners would report perpetrating, regardless of gender. Moreover, it was hypothesized that the majority of coercive couples would report reciprocal sexual coercion. It was also anticipated that women and men would report more sexual coercion within previous relationships as opposed to within their current one.

In general, the results demonstrated that the majority of couples reported less severe sexual coercion within their current relationship, such as unwanted sexual contact or verbal sexual coercion, as opposed to forced intercourse or attempted rape (0% - 3.2%). The individual results showed that 30% of women and 20% of men reported experiencing sexual coercion in their current relationship, and that the associated perpetrators reported similar rates of SC. Therefore the hypothesis that victims would report more SC was not confirmed. This suggests that perpetrators do not necessarily downplay SC and victims do not necessarily over-report its occurrence. Thus variations in prevalence rates reported in previous individual studies may be more due to samples or measures of SC. Nevertheless, this result is similar to that found in a study of intimate partner violence within couples by Caetano, Field, Ramisety-Mikler and Lipsky (2009), in which men did not report less perpetration than female victims reported experiencing in their relationships.

When taking into account the reports from either partner, sexual coercion victimization rates almost doubled to 45% for women and 30% for men. This suggests that sexual coercion was underreported by both victims and perpetrators, regardless of gender. Thus, men and women may minimize SC in their current relationships. Another possibility is that due to the less severe nature of SC reported

within couples, the discrepancies may simply reflect the ambiguity of the reported incidents. Indeed, some partners may acquiesce to sexually coercive behaviours to avoid more severe coercion. In such a case, their fear of greater sexual coercion may inadvertently produce more SC if the coercive partner does not recognize his or her behaviours as coercive. Likewise, one person may perceive mild sexually coercive behaviours as sex play, whereas their partner experiences them as SC. Thus, depending on their perceptions and intentions, partners may both report different experiences of sexual coercion. Nevertheless, the results do demonstrate that some partners perceive coercive sexual behaviours in their relationships.

When examining reciprocity of sexual coercion within couples, we found that only 20% of the intact couples were mutually coercive, such that both the woman and the man reported being victims and perpetrators of SC in their relationship. Indeed, 25% of couples reported female victimization only. Thus our hypothesis that the majority of currently coercive couples would be reciprocally coercive was not substantiated. This may be due to different interpretations of situations by partners, or more precisely, a tendency to report SC according to sexual scripts such that female victimization and male perpetration may be easier to identify or acknowledge. Despite the low frequency rate, women and men reported similar rates of reciprocity of SC (19%-25%) in their previous relationships, suggesting a possible pattern: Some men and women who are sexually coercive or who experience SC may increase the risk of further SC in their relationships, which may lead to a cycle of intimate partner violence in some couples. In a study of men, Russell and Oswald (2002) found that 13% of their sample reported being perpetrators and victims of SC within their relationships, which suggests that SC victimization and perpetration in couples may be associated. Another possible interpretation for the lower rate of reciprocity is that victims of SC may not retaliate with sexual coercion, but rather comply with sexual requests as a means to reduce coercive strategies (Davis, Shaver, & Vernon, 2004). Moreover, female SC victims may retaliate with psychological or physical violence instead. Indeed, a study of 1,861 Philippino women found that in reciprocally violent

couples, 18% of the women reported that they were physically aggressive out of retaliation, and 39% of them had been sexually coerced by their husband (Ansara & Hindin, 2009). Thus, victims may use other means to counter their SC victimization which may lead to more general intimate partner violence which includes physical and psychological abuse.

Results from the first study also revealed that over 50% of the couples in the sample reported some SC in their current relationship. Despite this high rate, less than a third of the couples agreed on its occurrence. This again may be due to less severe incidents of SC not necessarily being interpreted similarly by both partners. Although we did not measure the frequency of the coercive incidents, our data suggests that SC is quite prevalent for adult couples recruited within a university setting. Accordingly, sexual coercion in relationships may be less random than stranger rape, which may make it more predictable and possibly preventable (Himelein, 1995). Indeed, a stranger attacking a woman is rarely anticipated, but it is quite easily identified as rapeforced intercourse. On the other hand, a mildly coercive partner who increases his/her sexually coercive tactics may be more predictable, but whether it is labelled as SC is another issue. The results of the first study suggest that SC behaviours are not necessarily identified as such by both partners, as evidenced by the low inter-partner agreement rate. This result may be due to the relatively mild SC being reported by the couples. More frequent or severe SC may be more accurately recalled by both partners (Caetano et al., 2009) because of its possibly greater impact on the participants' lives and its reduced ambiguity. Similarly, cognitive dissonance may reduce the participants' perception of SC, if the coercive behaviours do not coincide with their perceptions of a loving romantic relationship. Men and women may minimize the coercion and interpret the incidents as token resistance or negotiation. Likewise, sexual scripts may also play an important part in understanding SC experiences and perceptions. A study by Turchik, Probst, Irvin, Chau, and Gidycz (2009) found that women who had previous experiences of SC and had hypothetical rape scripts more consistent with stranger rapes (outdoors, violent, with a person who

is not well known) were at a greater risk of reporting revictimization at a 2-month follow-up. Thus, previous SC experiences and sexual scripts may prevent participants from identifying risk factors or cues for relationship SC. Similarly, men are often socialized to initiate sexual activities whereas women are socialized to impede or respond to sexual advances. These traditional sexual scripts may lead men to impose sexual activities upon themselves and to pursue all sexual opportunities that arise, regardless of their personal or their partners' desire. Likewise, women may not perceive their own advances as coercive. Thus traditional sexual scripts may influence sexual interactions for both genders (Dworkin & O'Sullivan, 2005), as well as increase the risk of SC.

Reports of SC in previous relationships suggested that a staggering proportion of men and women experienced or perpetrated SC in prior relationships. Similarly to Muñoz-Rivas, Graña, O'Leary, and González (2009), individual rates of previous SC experiences suggested that men perpetrated more than women, and women were victimized more than men. Indeed, over 62% of women and 35 % of men reported victimization in their past relationships, whereas 21% of women and 40% of men reported perpetrating SC in their previous relationships. Of even greater concern was the fact that over 15% of the women reported experiencing forced intercourse. If victims and perpetrators indeed underreport SC, then this trend is even more alarming. This finding further supports our hypothesis that men and women would report more sexual coercion in their previous relationships, although perpetration rates for women were not significantly different between previous and current relationships. The generally higher prevalence of SC in previous relationships may be understood within the framework of the cognitive dissonance theory. This theory postulates that people may downplay or reinterpret situations that do not coincide with their self-perceptions. Thus, when in a coercive relationship, they may minimize its severity, whereas when the relationship is terminated, they may more easily identify it as SC. This may have serious implications for prevention and intervention within intact couples that do not separate. Indeed, if victims and perpetrators are not

able to identify the SC, they may not seek the help they need or leave the relationship despite its violent aspects. Another possible explanation could be that sexual coercion was more reported in previous relationships because it was examined using a cumulative measure of SC within all past relationships, rather than each previous relationship separately while controlling for the length of the relationships. This may have inadvertently increased the report of SC, especially if it was the cause of the break-up in previous dyads. Nevertheless, findings suggest that SC is a common, pervasive problem in couples and that it is underreported by both victims and perpetrators, regardless of gender.

Study 2: Predictive Models of Sexual Coercion

In our second study, hierarchical logistic regressions were performed to identify and develop predictive models of sexual coercion victimization and perpetration for both women and men. More specifically, the predictive value of CSA, SC in previous relationships and sexual motivations were examined as possible risk factors for sexual coercion. It was hypothesized that CSA and experiences of SC in previous relationships would increase the likelihood of SC in current relationships. Moreover, we investigated whether the sexual motives of each member of the dyad contributed to the prediction of SC perpetration and victimization, above and beyond the possible contributions of CSA and previous SC experiences. Based on previous studies (Cooper, Shapiro, & Powers, 1998; Hill, 2003), it was expected that the partner pressure motive would predict sexual coercion victimization, whereas power and stress relief motives would predict SC perpetration.

Our results show that the four models contributed significantly to the prediction of SC victimization and perpetration for men and women. Sexual motivation explained a unique portion of the model variance, over and above CSA and SC experiences in previous relationships. More specifically, as hypothesized, power motives were significant predictors of SC perpetration for both genders. Women and men who are motivated by power may coerce more, or it may be that

perpetration conditions them to enjoy or seek out more feelings of power. Another possible interpretation is that coercive men and women may be motivated by power as a means of obtaining intimacy through physical contact. Indeed, sexual interactions may provide a means to stay emotionally connected to the partner or reduce distress (Davis et al., 2004). Previous studies have found that anxiously attached individuals may use sex to keep partners close to them, whereas avoidant individuals may use sex to reduce conflict and stress (Davis et al., 2004). Thus sex may be a means to manipulate the partner, to get what one wants from them or to avoid negative repercussions.

Partner pressure motives were significant for female SC victimization only, whereas imposition, or self-imposed obligation, motives were significant predictors of sexual coercion victimization for both men and women. Our hypothesis regarding partner pressure motives was therefore only partially supported. This finding suggests that men and women in relationships may not always engage in sexual activities because of overt pressure but rather because of an internal sense of pressure. Unfortunately, this may have a detrimental effect on their relationship and sexual satisfaction. A study by Impett, Peplau, and Gable (2005) found that participants who engaged in sex to avoid negative outcomes were less satisfied with their relationships. Moreover, participants who report more imposition and/or partner pressure motives may be at an increased risk of victimization and may be complying sexually to avoid negative outcomes. Another possibility is that SC victims may perhaps only have sex because of partner pressure or imposition motives as a means to reduce future SC. They may no longer wish to engage in sexual activities to fulfill other motives with their coercive partners. Thus, they might perceive most sexual interactions as being coercive. Participants reporting more motives of imposition may also be more sensitive to interpreting sexual interactions as coercive, especially if the partner is not aware of their lack of other, more positive sexual motives.

Childhood sexual abuse was not a consistent predictive factor of SC, thus our hypothesis was only partially supported. In fact, CSA was only significant in the

predictive model of female perpetration, suggesting that women who experience CSA may come to learn to use sex as a means to regain control. The inconsistency of CSA-related findings may also be due to the influence of adolescent or previous SC experiences. Indeed, more proximate experiences of sexual violence may play a more prominent role in predicting current SC. Nevertheless, this is not to say that CSA does not increase vulnerability to SC and/or teach survivors how to use coercive tactics to obtain sex. CSA may have a cumulative effect on women and men when paired with previous experiences of SC, rather than a direct effect (Gidycz, Hanson, & Layman, 1995). Indeed, CSA victims may have difficulty with sexual boundaries or be prone to use sexual behaviour to gain attention from partners, which may increase the risk of SC (Himelein, 1995). Another possibility is that our sample size did not provide enough power to detect a significant effect in the hierarchical logistic regressions. It may be that larger samples of participants, such as that used in the study by Hines (2007), may reflect the truer reality of CSA increasing the risk of sexual coercion victimization for both men and women. Likewise, the severity of the CSA experienced may be an important factor in predicting SC. For this study, our measure of CSA included mild and severe CSA combined. It may be that more severe CSA (involving penetration, the use of force, a close perpetrator or chronic abuse) has a greater impact and thus is more predictive of SC for men and women. Indeed, Lemieux and Byers (2008) did find such an association between CSA severity (fondling versus penetration) and revictimization in their sample of women. Unfortunately, due to the sample size and prevalence rate of CSA in the current study, it was not possible to conduct analyses according to CSA severity.

Although we hypothesized that previous SC would predict current SC, our results indicated that SC experiences in previous relationships were only predictive of current sexual coercion for men, but not for women. This result is contrary to the findings of a longitudinal study which examined female victimization (Himelein, 1995). Himelein found that precollege sexual victimization was positively associated to sexual coercion victimization within a 32-month follow-up period. Indeed, 38% of

the women had experienced precollege SC and 29% of them had experienced SC in the follow-up period. Regardless, our study did find that over 62% of the women did experience some SC in previous relationships as opposed to 31% of women reporting victimization in their current relationship. Thus, although previous SC victimization for women in our study may be too prevalent to be of predictive value, it may be difficult to completely ignore the influence of previous SC on current SC experiences for women. Indeed, consequences of adolescent or early SC victimization may play a part in future vulnerability (Himelein, 1995). Likewise, experiences with non-coercive relationships may also reduce this vulnerability by teaching proper negotiation skills.

Lastly, a consistent finding in all the models was that, similarly to results of a study by Muñoz-Rivas et al. (2009), the risk of victimization and perpetration was increased if the SC was reciprocal within the relationship. Thus victimization increased the risk of perpetration within couples and vice versa for both men and women. This suggests that incidents of sexual coercion within couples must be addressed as early as possible by mental health professionals in order to prevent further exacerbation of the problem.

Theoretical and Clinical Implications of the Thesis

From a theoretical standpoint, this thesis lends support to the sexual script and cognitive dissonance theories. More precisely, results from our first study have demonstrated that women are still more at risk of SC victimization than men, thus continuing the traditional sexual scripts of men as aggressors and women as resistors/victims. CSA and previous SC experiences for men and women may also solidify beliefs that males are obsessed with sex, whereas women are powerless to resist or must feign resistance (Byers, 1996). These beliefs may be further substantiated by experiences of SC in their current relationship and influence women and men's sexual motives. Although sexual scripts may change and vary between people, men may make more efforts to obtain sex and may tire from having their

sexual advances rejected (Dworkin & O'Sullivan, 2005). Indeed, men still tend to initiate more, and thus run the risk of being rejected or being perceived as coercive. Moreover, male initiation is more frequent than female initiation, thus giving the impression that men want sex all the time. To confound issues further, studies show that men consistently demonstrate a greater interest in sex than women (Baumeister, Catanese, & Vohs, 2001). Interestingly, studies on sexual scripts and sexual negotiation have found that egalitarian initiation makes both partners feel desired sexually (Dworkin & O'Sullivan, 2005) which can improve relationships and sexual dynamics. Theoretically, this would also decrease the risks of sexual coercion. Results from our second study highlight the need for prevention and interventions to address sexual stereotypes and scripts for both genders. Both women and men must learn that their genders should not dictate their sexual roles or rights within relationships. Women and men should be free to initiate or refuse sexual advances as well as respect their partners to ensure healthier sexual lives and reduce the cycle of SC.

Likewise, the fact that both victims and perpetrators, regardless of gender, underreported SC underlines the possibility of cognitive dissonance playing an important role in the reported prevalence rates of SC. Indeed, whether studying couples or individuals, researchers must take into account that reports are underestimations of the true problem and that social desirability is tought to be an important confounding factor in sex research (Bell & Naugle, 2007). Further, results from our study of risk factors associated with SC suggest that single predictive models for both women and men are not necessarily appropriate. Indeed, we found that predictive models of SC victimization and perpetration varied by gender. Women and men may react differently to CSA and previous SC experiences, which in turn mitigates their behaviours in their current relationships.

Within a clinical perspective, the results from our studies suggest that SC is underreported by victims and perpetrators, regardless of gender. This suggests that there may be other factors influencing perception of SC. Indeed, severity and

repetition of SC, as well as personal sexual scripts may influence couples' perceptions. This also implies that perpetrators may not necessarily try to conceal SC, but they may genuinely not perceive their behaviours as coercive. The implication of this for prevention and interventions is that programs should perhaps further challenge the gender stereotypes of SC victimization and perpetration so that women and men may be aware of various SC situations. This may facilitate the identification of sexually coercive behaviours in themselves and others, and facilitate the development of more effective targeted intervention and prevention efforts

Results from both studies also demonstrate that reperpetration and revictimization are important concerns related to sexual coercion. CSA increased the risk of perpetration of SC for women, and previous SC experiences for men increased the risk of SC within current romantic relationships. Indeed, our findings indicate that SC is not a problem related only to acquaintances or dating relationships. From prevention and intervention standpoints, clinicians need to further examine the negotiation tactics of both partners to identify possible SC, and they need to intervene as soon as possible to prevent further victimization and perpetration cycles in future relationships. Results from this thesis suggest that previous experiences in adolescence and young adulthood may have serious repercussions on future sexual behaviours and romantic relationships. Even mild sexual coercion may put couples at risk for increased relationship violence. In a longitudinal study of men (N=201) that spanned 10 years, Teten, Hall and Capaldi (2009) found that men who use mild sexual coercion tactics may be at risk for other relationship violence. Platt and Busby (2009) also suggested that sexual coercion may indicate coercion in other realms of the relationship. Consequently, experiences of SC may create more victims and perpetrators, thus continuing a vicious cycle of intimate violence. In the case of men, SC victims may be prone to more victimization and SC perpetrators may be prone to more perpetration. For women, CSA may lead to inappropriate sexualized behaviours and difficulty establishing personal boundaries that render them more vulnerable to SC victimization and perpetration. Likewise, results also suggest that

both genders are at risk of experiencing reciprocal SC within their relationships when a coercive incident occurs. Thus intervention and prevention programs need to target men and women in early adolescence or adulthood, as well as target sexual coercion and physical aggression, to address the risks of mild and serious intimate partner violence. Sexual coercion can indeed be a proverbial slippery slope for intimate relationships.

Lastly, our results regarding sexual motivation suggest that motives may play an important role as predictors of SC experiences within couples. This may have important theoretical and clinical implications. First of all, sexual motives can provide a better understanding of reasons behind the occurrence of SC within couples. From a theoretical perspective, the results suggest that motives that are more avoidant of emotions and less nurturing to relationships tended to be associated with sexual coercion in the couples. Indeed, power motives were predictive of perpetration of SC, whereas imposition motives and partner pressure (for women) were predictive of victimization. Coercive partners may not necessarily seek out sexual opportunities for the physical pleasure, but rather the control. However, their coercive behaviours may be inadvertently reinforced by the sexual pleasure obtained by the sexual activity, thus increasing their likelihood of being coercive. Likewise, if coerced partners are motivated to have sex by imposition, and their partners are less resentful or angry after sexual activities, this may further encourage motives of imposition. Another possibility is that victims of coercion may be prone to having sex out of imposition or partner pressure as a means to avoid further SC victimization. The danger with these motives, is that they may increase the likelihood of coercion in couples. Indeed, a study examining sexual compliance (consent to unwanted sex) found that women who consented to unwanted sex with their partner increased their risk by threefold of being physically sexually coerced than women who had never complied (Krahé, Scheinberger-Olwig, & Kolpin, 2000). This may be due to the fact that the initiating partners may not recognize when they are being complied with and when they are being coercive. Indeed, when women and men have sex out of

compliance, rather than desire, they may seem less enthusiastic (Impett, et al., 2005). This in turn may create further misinterpretations within the couple. If a partner does not want to have sex and is being coerced into it, the incident can be construed by the initiating partner as compliance rather than coercion. Aside from the possibility of increased risk of SC associated with some motives, the impact on the relationships must also be considered. Although it was not measured in our study, types of motives for sexual behaviours in general may affect the quality and duration of relationships. Indeed, sexual motives associated with avoiding negative outcomes (ie. imposition, partner pressure) have been associated with lower relationship satisfaction, as opposed to motives that promote intimacy or positive outcomes in the relationship (Impett et al., 2005). In other words, when an individual has consensual sexual relations out of obligation to avoid conflict or sexual coercion, he/she may resent the initiating partner afterwards, whereas if he/she engages in sex to feel pleasure or love, it may generate feelings of closeness to their partner and more satisfaction in their relationship. The same holds true for the perceived sexual motives of the partner (Impett et al., 2005). Thus, if the influence of sexual motives is significant for consensual sex, then it may be even more substantial in coercive relationships. From a clinical standpoint, this suggests that sexual motives in couples need to be addressed, and interventions should focus on getting partners to examine what they want to achieve via sexual relations, rather than what they want to avoid. Moreover, couples need to learn that compliance to unwanted sex may decrease the compliant partner's desire for sex which may be even more detrimental to the couple's sexual satisfaction.

Strengths and Limitations

One of the important strengths of this doctoral research is that both members of intact couples were recruited, and therefore both of their perspectives on sexual coercion within their relationship were obtained, which facilitated the examination of predictive models for victimization and perpetration for both genders. Moreover,

obtaining data regarding previous relationships allowed for important comparisons between current and past SC experiences. Responses from both partners allowed us to discover that both victims and perpetrators, regardless of gender, underreported sexual coercion in their relationship. Thus the common assumption that perpetrators underreport and that victims overestimate SC was not supported. Indeed, as suggested by Szinovac and Egley (1995), underreporting of SC can be partially controlled by obtaining responses from both partners. Likewise, similarly to results from Caetano and colleagues (2009), rates of sexual coercion were almost doubled when obtaining responses from both partners as opposed to only one.

Unfortunately, obtaining couple data may also be a weakness of our studies. Participants who are in a relationship and who choose to participate may report less conflict, and this may be even truer for couples in which both partners participate. Indeed, couples who may have separated due to SC are not included in the sample; this sampling bias may reduce our estimate of SC prevalence (Caetano et al., 2009). Thus our sample may reflect the experiences of better adjusted couples, thus explaining the lower rate of sexual coercion reported. However, this limitation was partially countered by obtaining data regarding the participants' previous relationships.

The retrospective and cross-sectional design of our study precluded the inference of causality. Thus, sexual motives may be a cause or consequence of sexual coercion experiences: sexual motivations may increase the risk of SC, or SC experiences may cause a shift in the participants' sexual motivations. Future research would benefit from having prospective or diary studies to get more accurate observations of sexual motivations and whether they vary with time and contexts. A diary method was efficient in the analysis of sexual behaviours of university students in a recent study by Vannier and O'Sullivan (2008). With the use of handheld computers to administer daily brief questionnaire, Vannier and O'Sullivan obtained a 95.6% response rate and participants reported a positive experience with this prospective method. Moreover, a longitudinal or diary method may also allow

researchers to investigate the timing of sexual coercion within relationships. In our study, the mean duration of the romantic relationships was three years, however our measure of sexual coercion did not ask when and how often the coercion occurred, therefore we are unable to conclude whether SC is more prevalent during earlier stages of relationships, or whether it is consistently present throughout the relationship. Moreover, the frequency of the sexually coercive behaviours could have increased the recognition of the SC by either partner.

Lastly, our university sample precludes generalizability of results to all couples. Indeed, future studies should examine SC within a larger sample of community and clinical samples to obtain a broader range of ages, relationship durations, and relationship adjustment. Moreover, using larger samples could allow confirmation of our predictive models for SC within couples using more rigorous data analytic strategies.

Future directions

Research on sexual coercion would benefit from longitudinal studies of couples to examine causal relations and enable a better understanding of the associated risk factors. Likewise, sexual coercion in adolescent and young adult couples needs to be investigated to identify coercive incidents and correlates during their initial dating experiences. Perhaps sexually coercive couples experience SC at the beginning of their relationship or during difficult life events only, or consistently throughout the span of the relationship. Another possibility is that sexual coercion occurs or is identified as such during the termination phase of the relationships, thus explaining why prevalence of sexual coercion is higher in previous as opposed to current relationships. For these reasons, longitudinal studies would help shed some much needed light on the variables related to the onset, progression and variations of sexual coercion experiences in committed romantic relationships. Moreover, prospective designs would allow researchers to examine whether sexual motives change over time. Indeed, it would be important to clarify whether sexual motivation

is more a function of the romantic relationship and hence best conceptualized as a systemic construct, or whether inversely, it is a consistent, stable intra-individual variable. Future studies should also examine whether both partners in couples have compatible sexual motives, and whether they accurately perceive each other's motives.

Due to the limited sample size, the predictive models were not analyzed by type of coercive relationship (non-coercive, female only victim, male only victim, and reciprocally coercive couples), or by severity of the coercive tactics. Different coercive tactics may be associated with different motives (Abbey, McAuslan, Zawacki, Clinton, & Buck, 2001). Indeed, a study of men found that coercive men who used force reported less intimacy sexual motives, than verbally coercive or non-coercive men, although there were no significant difference between both types of coercive men on pleasure and dominance sexual motives (Lyndon, White, & Kadlec, 2007). Future studies would benefit from examining such predictive variables for various types of coercive couples with a larger sample of community and clinical couples. Ideally, the predictive models would be tested and confirmed using structural equation modeling to provide more insight on the association between predictive factors and the outcomes of SC perpetration and victimization. Moreover, the perceptions of sexual coercion should be examined in relation to the perceived impact or consequences of the SC incident as well as the severity of childhood sexual abuse. Another possibility would be to investigate sexual coercive and consensual behaviours within couples to examine the association between these two types of behaviour in line with sexual motivation. Lastly, we hope that future studies will continue to examine sexual coercion within mixed-sex and same-sex relationships to help shed light on women and men's labelling of incidents as sexual coercion within the framework of traditional sexual scripts and cognitive dissonance to allow us to better intervene and prevent SC in all romantic relationships.

Conclusion

The main objective of this doctoral research was to add to the empirical knowledge regarding sexual coercion by examining this phenomenon through the perspective of both partners involved and by developing predictive models for victimization and perpetration. The goal of the models was to identify possible associated factors in order to reduce vulnerability and decrease cycles of abuse, and not as a means of removing the responsibility from the perpetrators. Indeed, perpetrators of SC must still be held accountable for their actions.

This thesis represents an original scientific contribution not only in terms of the novel results it generated but also because of the new questions it posed. To our knowledge, this study is the first to examine reciprocity of sexual coercion within couples. Moreover, it has demonstrated the important value of obtaining data from both partners to provide a relational perspective of sexual coercion, as well as examining sexual motivation as a valuable predictive factor. Considering that only 30% of the couples agreed on the presence of SC in their relationships, findings suggest that men and women need to be more sensitized to recognizing sexually coercive behaviours. Finally, preventative measures need to be offered to youths involved in their first romantic relationships to reduce the risk of SC, and subsequent revictimization and/or reperpetration.

APPENDIX A

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR FOR ARTICLE 1

20 February 2010

Mélanie M. Brousseau, M.A.
370 Enfield Ave.
Ottawa, ON K1L 7L3

Dear Ms. Brousseau:

re: MS# ASEB-09-94R1 (Z-2009-094)

I have now had the opportunity to review your revised ms, now entitled "Sexual Coercion Victimization and Perpetration in Heterosexual Couples: A Dyadic Investigation."

The paper is now accepted for publication.

My only concern is the correspondence information. It seems a bit sketchy to have a personal home address for correspondence by mail (e.g., for old-fashioned reprint requests) and to use a g-mail account for electronic correspondence. My preference would be that a university address be used for both, even if that means that the second author would be the corresponding author. Please discuss with your co-authors.

Please send to me by e-mail an electronic file of the entire ms.

Do not resubmit the ms online.

Upon receipt, I will send the ms to the publisher for advance online publication.

Best regards

Kenneth J. Zucker, Ph.D.
Editor, Archives of Sexual Behavior
e-mail: Ken_Zucker@camh.net

APPENDIX B

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR FOR ARTICLE 2

20-Mar-2011

Dear Dr. Brousseau:

The review of the final revision of your manuscript entitled "Sexual Coercion Within Mixed-Sex Couples: The Roles of Sexual Motives, Revictimization, and Reperpetration" is now complete. Thank you for your careful attention to the revision. I am pleased to accept your manuscript for publication in The Journal of Sex Research.

Thank you for your fine contribution to The Journal of Sex Research. I hope you will consider the journal as an outlet for your work in the future.

Although the print version will be several months in appearance, JSR has initiated an electronic ahead of print version. That should allow you to cite the paper as published several months before appearance of the print journal. You should receive information about this as you go through the publication process. Some of this information is summarized below.

Please read the following text to familiarize yourself with the procedures that will be implemented to publish your article:

Keeping in Touch

The Editor of the journal is your primary source of information and advice. However, if you have a question the Editor is unable to answer, feel free to contact the Taylor & Francis Production Editor for the journal or the Taylor & Francis Electronic Journal Publishing Manager. (see contact details below)

The journal is on a tight production schedule, so . . .

1. If you move or are away for an extended period during the time your manuscript is in production, let the Editor and Production Editor know where you can be reached (postal and e-mail addresses; telephone and fax numbers). You can imagine the delays that occur when the Production Editor e-mails typeset proofs to an address or phones a contributor with an important question, only to learn that the contributor is on sabbatical and did not leave forwarding information.

2. Contact the Production Editor if you are unable to return page proofs corrections within 2 days.

Understanding the Publication Process

1. You have now submitted your accepted manuscript to the journal. You are required to complete a copyright transfer agreement form. This form can be obtained by logging into your Manuscript Central account (see log in details below). Go to your "Author Center" and

follow the link to the copyright form.

Please either email, fax, or mail (a) a signed copyright transfer agreement form and (b) any permissions to adapt or reprint tables, figures, and quotations to the Taylor & Francis Production Editor.

Email: jessica.thorn@taylorandfrancis.com
Fax: 215-625-8563
Address:
Attn.: Jessica Thorn
Production Editor
Taylor & Francis Group, LLC
325 Chestnut Street, Suite 800
Philadelphia, PA 19106

2. The Editor provides the Taylor & Francis Production Editor with articles from several contributors.

3. The Production Editor reviews the files. If your manuscript is not prepared correctly (see the Instructions for Authors link at http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/authors/hjsrauth.asp), the Production Editor notifies the Editor so you can revise it.

4. When all manuscripts are ready, the Production Editor oversees copyediting and typesetting of each article and sends via e-mail to each contributor the PDF files of (a) the page proofs of the respective article, (b) a list of queries concerning the article, and (c) a reprint request form.

5. You proofread the typeset article; record any changes; and return to the Production Editor your responses to the queries, any other corrections, and the reprint request form (with payment if ordering reprints).

6. Articles are corrected and checked by the Production Editor, and posted online in a section entitled "View new articles ahead of the print edition" on the journal's webpage: http://www.informaworld.com/0022-4499. An article that is posted online may be cited prior to its publication in an assigned issue by referencing its digital object identifier (DOI) number. These are found on the first page of the article, and listed near the title on the Informaworld site.

7. When the print issue has complete contents ready, the Production Editor finalizes the issue and sends it to the printer. Corresponding authors do receive a copy of the print edition in which their article appears.

Information regarding NIH Public Access Policy:

Taylor & Francis will deposit to PubMed Central (PMC) author manuscripts on behalf of Taylor & Francis, Routledge and Psychology

Press authors reporting NIH funded research. The Taylor & Francis statement about the NIH mandate is located here:

http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/iopenaccess_nih.asp

It is the author's responsibility to declare their funding source; this is done at the proofs stage, when articles are sent to the Production department. At that stage, you will receive an email from the Production department at Taylor and Francis, that contains login details for the Central Article Tracking system (CATS). In CATS, "Funding Source" appears as part of the Manuscript Options section. Authors can add one or more funding sources to their paper via the menu options. A grant ID should be specified for each funding source." As long as an author fills out the CATS funding source information, T&F will then deposit the author's manuscript to PubMed Central.

On behalf of the Editors of The Journal of Sex Research, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Sincerely,
Dr. Cynthia A. Graham
Editor
The Journal of Sex Research
Cynthia.Graham@brunel.ac.uk

APPENDIX C

AUTHORIZATION LETTER TO SUBMIT THESIS IN ENGLISH

Université du Québec à Montréal

Case postale 8888, succursale Centre-Ville
Montréal (Québec) Canada H3C 3P8

Département de psychologie
Études de cycles supérieurs

Le 25 mars 2004

Madame Mélanie Brousseau
8745, Marie-Lefranc
Laval, Québec
H7Y 2G1

Madame,

Par la présente, je vous informe que le Sous-comité d'admission et d'évaluation des programmes d'études de cycles supérieurs du département de psychologie a accordé une suite favorable à votre demande d'autorisation de rédiger votre thèse en anglais.

Vous devrez, cependant, répondre à quelques exigences supplémentaires. Votre thèse devra obligatoirement comporter un résumé, ainsi qu'une deuxième page titre, tous deux en français.

Espérant cette réponse à votre satisfaction, je vous prie d'agréer, Madame, l'expression de mes sentiments les meilleurs.

Louis Brunet, Ph.D.
Directeur intérimaire
Programmes d'études de cycles supérieurs
Département de psychologie

LB/hl

c.c. Madame SophieBergeron, directrice de recherche, département de sexologie
Martine Hébert, codirectrice de recherche
Madame Nicole Bibeau, commis senior, registraire, dossiers universitaires
Madame Réjeanne Cloutier, coordonnatrice, bureau des études

C:\mes documents\leo\lettre-type\these-anglais-ruif.doc

UQÀM

APPENDIX D

ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL LETTER

Université du Québec à Montréal

Case postale 8888, succursale Centre-ville
Montréal (Québec) Canada H3C 3P8
Comité institutionnel d'éthique de la recherche avec des êtres humains

No. 041932

Conformité à l'éthique en matière de recherche impliquant la participation de sujets humains

Le Comité d'éthique de la recherche avec des êtres humains de l'UQAM a examiné le protocole de recherche suivant :

Responsable(s) du projet : Sophie Bergeron
Département ou École : Sexologie
Titre du projet : *La coercition et le consentement sexuel chez les hommes et les femmes : Rôles de la motivation sexuelle, la compatibilité sexuelle et les antécédents d'agression sexuelle.*

Étudiant(s) réalisant leurs projets de mémoire ou de thèse dans le cadre du présent projet ou programme :
Mélanie Brousseau, étudiante au doctorat en psychologie.

Ce protocole de recherche est jugé conforme aux pratiques habituelles et répond aux normes établies par le «*Cadre normatif pour l'éthique de la recherche avec des êtres humains de l'UQAM*».

Le projet est jugé recevable au plan de l'éthique de la recherche avec des êtres humains.

Membres du Comité

Marc Bélanger, Professeur, Département de kinanthropologie
Henriette Bilodeau, Professeure, Département Organisation et ressources humaines
René Binette, Directeur, Écomusée du fier monde, Représentant de la collectivité
Shahira Fawzi, Enseignante retraitée de la CSDM, Représentante de la collectivité
Suzanne Lemerise, Professeure associée, École des arts visuels et médiatiques
Joseph Josy Lévy, Professeur, Département de sexologie et Institut Santé et Société
Francine M. Mayer, Professeure, Département des sciences biologiques
Christian Saint-Germain, Professeur, Département de philosophie
Jocelyne Thériault, Professeure, Département de sexologie

11 mars 2005
Date

Joseph Josy Lévy
Président du Comité

APPENDIX E

PRESENTATION SCRIPT FOR THE RECRUITMENT OF PARTICIPANTS

Lettre de présentation du projet (transmis verbalement)

Bonjour, mon nom est Mélanie Brousseau et je suis sexologue clinicienne et étudiante au doctorat en psychologie. Mes directrices de recherches sont les docteures Sophie Bergeron et Martine Hébert, professeurs en sexologie et professeurs associés au département de psychologie à l'UQAM. Je vous présente ma collègue, une sexologue.

Nous sommes ici aujourd'hui pour vous demander de participer à notre étude qui porte sur la négociation sexuelle chez le couple. Les partenaires d'un même couple ne sont pas toujours d'accord sur le plan sexuel, et chaque partenaire utilise des méthodes différentes pour avoir ou éviter des relations sexuelles. Par ailleurs, nous voulons examiner les comportements sexuels à l'intérieur des couples ainsi que leurs histoires sexuelles individuelles. Certaines questions pourront vous sembler intimes; quelques-unes des questions portent sur les antécédents d'abus ou d'agression sexuelle vécus, ainsi que la violence dans le couple. Ces questions pourraient entraîner une détresse chez certains sujets. Vous pouvez choisir de refuser de répondre à certaines questions, ainsi que terminer votre participation en tout temps sans répercussions négatives. Ce questionnaire prendra environ 30 minutes de votre temps, et vous courez la chance de gagner une de trois sommes d'argent. Le premier prix est de cinq cents dollars (500$), le deuxième prix est de deux cents dollars (200$), et le troisième prix est de cent dollars (100$). Par contre, votre participation est strictement volontaire.

Présentement, je vous demanderais de vous assurer qu'il y ait un banc libre de chaque coté de vous pour assurer la confidentialité lorsque vous remplissez les questionnaires. Nous allons passer les questionnaires à chaque étudiant(e) dans une enveloppe brune. Nous vous demanderons de bien lire le formulaire de consentement. Si vous acceptez de remplir le questionnaire, veuillez signer la lettre de consentement. Lorsque vous terminez de remplir le questionnaire, nous vous demandons de remettre les questionnaires remplis dans les enveloppes et les déposer dans une boîte. Les lettres de consentement et les bulletins de participation doivent être déposés dans la deuxième boîte scellée. Les lettres de consentement et les questionnaires seront conservés séparément pour assurer la confidentialité. S'il-vous-plaît, n'inscrivez pas vos noms sur les questionnaires. Nous demandons que ceux qui choisissent de ne pas remplir le questionnaire de remettre le questionnaire et la lettre de consentement de la même façon pour que cela ne paraisse pas et afin de ne pas vous occasionner de la gêne.

Lorsque vous allez recevoir le questionnaire, vous allez apercevoir une deuxième enveloppe à l'intérieur. Cette deuxième enveloppe contient un questionnaire identique pour votre partenaire. Si vous êtes en couple, et que vous pensez que votre partenaire serait intéressé à participer à cette étude, nous vous invitons à apporter ce questionnaire à votre partenaire. Les questionnaires pour vos partenaires inclus deux enveloppes pré-affranchies avec l'adresse du laboratoire de recherche de Dr. Bergeron, ainsi qu'une lettre de consentement et un billet de tirage. Vos partenaires devront signer le formulaire de consentement et remplir le questionnaire, s'il ou elle accepte de participer. La lettre de consentement signée et le billet de tirage doivent être postés dans une des enveloppes pré affranchie, et le questionnaire dans la deuxième. Les deux enveloppes sont déjà adressées au

chercheur principal, Dr. Sophie Bergeron. Les données collectées des deux membres des couples ne seront pas dévoilées aux partenaires. Les questionnaires des couples seront seulement identifiés par les numéros des questionnaires identiques. Toute information sera gardée confidentielle et anonyme.

En cas de détresse causée par les questions de nature intime, vous pouvez parlez avec moi ou ma collègue ici présente; nous sommes toutes deux sexologues. Il nous fera plaisir de répondre à vos questions ou de vous donner un rendez-vous à un moment qui vous convient pour discuter de vos inquiétudes. Vous pouvez aussi me rejoindre en tout temps à mon numéro de téléphone direct, soit le 514-793-7396. Vous allez aussi recevoir une liste de services d'aide et de ressources auquel vous pourriez vous référer au besoin.

Merci pour votre temps et collaboration.

APPENDIX F

CONSENT FORMS

FORMULAIRE DE CONSENTEMENT POUR LES PATICIPANT(E)S

FORMULAIRE DE CONSENTEMENT POUR LES PARTENAIRES

Université du Québec à Montréal

Case postale 8888, succursale Centre-Ville
Montréal (Québec) Canada H3C 3P8

FORMULAIRE DE CONSENTEMENT

La négociation sexuelle chez le couple

Projet subventionné par le Centre de recherche interdisciplinaire sur les problèmes conjugaux et les agressions sexuelles (CRIPCAS), un Regroupement stratégique du Fonds québécois de recherche sur la culture et la société (FQRSC)

Chercheurs principaux

Sophie Bergeron, Ph.D., et Martine Hébert, Ph.D., psychologues et professeures,

Université du Québec à Montréal

Mélanie Brousseau, M. A., sexologue clinicienne et étudiante au doctorat en psychologie,

Université du Québec à Montréal

Introduction

La présente étude est réalisée par un groupe de psychologues spécialisés en sexualité humaine. Les chercheurs principaux sont les psychologues Sophie Bergeron, Ph.D. et Martine Hébert, Ph.D., du Département de sexologie de l'Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM), situé au 455 est, boul. René Lévesque, 987-3000 poste 4181.

Objectif de l'étude

L'objectif de l'étude est d'examiner la négociation sexuelle dans le couple, soit l'initiation, le consentement et le refus. Un second objectif de l'étude est d'examiner les facteurs associés à la négociation sexuelle, tels que les antécédents d'agression sexuelle. Cette démarche vers une meilleure compréhension de la négociation sexuelle à l'intérieur des couples vise à aider les professionnels de la santé à développer des programmes de prévention de difficultés conjugales et des traitements plus efficaces pour les survivant(e)s d'agression sexuelle et des couples en détresse.

Nature de ma participation

Je comprend que ma participation est strictement volontaire. Si j'accepte de participer, je répondrai à des questionnaires portant sur mon histoire sexuelle, mes comportements de négociation de relations sexuelles, ma sexualité, ma relation de couple et mes attitudes envers la sexualité (durée totale = 30 minutes). Ces questionnaires seront distribués par un membre de l'équipe de recherche. De plus, j'aurai la possibilité d'inviter mon (ma) partenaire à participer à cette même étude.

Avantages personnels pouvant découler de ma participation

Je comprends que ma participation à la présente étude scientifique pourra me permettre de dévoiler et d'identifier mes comportements de négociation sexuelle. De façon plus générale, ma

Université du Québec à Montréal
Case postale 8888, succursale Centre-Ville
Montréal (Québec) Canada H3C 3P8

participation au projet pourrait me permettre de réfléchir à divers aspects de ma vie sexuelle et de ma vie de couple.
Cette étude bénéficiera aux couples qui présentent des difficultés au niveau de la négociation sexuelle.

Compensation
Je recevrai un billet de participation pour un tirage d'une de trois sommes d'argent : 500$, 200$, ou 100$. Ce tirage aura lieu à la fin de la collecte de données, soit en décembre 2005. Les gagnant(e)s seront contactés par courrier électronique ou par téléphone.

Risques potentiels pouvant découler de ma participation
Je comprends que certaines questions pourraient me paraître intimes. Quelques questions portent sur les antécédents d'abus ou d'agression sexuelle vécus ainsi que la violence dans le couple. Ces questions pourraient entraîner une détresse chez certains sujets ayant vécu ou vivant ces expériences, ou en ayant été témoins. Je comprends que ce questionnaire sera administré par un membre de l'équipe de recherche qui est spécialisé en intervention psychosexuelle. De plus, je pourrai toujours refuser de répondre à certaines questions. Je peux en tout temps me retirer de l'étude et refuser de répondre à certaines questions sans que j'aie des répercussions négatives. Si l'inconfort persiste, je pourrai en faire part à Mélanie Brousseau ou au membre de l'équipe de recherche ayant administré les questionnaires, toutes deux sexologues. De plus, je peux me référer à la liste de contacts pour les services d'aide (liste ci-jointe). Je peux aussi en tout temps contacter Mélanie Brousseau au 514-793-7396, à qui je pourrai parler de ma détresse et qui pourra me référer à un professionnel de la santé approprié.

Personnes-ressources
Je comprends que je peux en tout temps me retirer de l'étude et que je peux refuser de répondre à certaines questions sans que ma décision n'affecte mon succès académique dans le cours où l'on m'a demandé de participer à l'étude. Toute question sur ma participation peut être adressée à Sophie Bergeron (987-3000 poste 3031) ou Martine Hébert (987-3000 poste 5697). Si une plainte ne peut être réglée, je peux faire valoir mes droits auprès du comité institutionnel d'éthique de la recherche avec des êtres humains de l'UQAM au numéro 987-3000 poste 7753.

Confidentialité
Je comprends que toutes les informations recueillies pour cette étude seront gardées de façon confidentielle. Ma lettre de consentement sera conservée dans un dossier séparé de mon questionnaire complété. Mon nom n'apparaîtra pas sur le questionnaire. De plus, toutes les informations recueillies lors de ce projet seront conservées et entreposées de façon sécuritaire et confidentielle. Par la suite, ces informations seront détruites. Les questionnaires ainsi que les résultats de l'étude demeureront à la disposition de l'équipe de recherche seulement et seront identifiés uniquement par un numéro.

Clause légale
Votre participation ne libère ni les chercheurs ni l'établissement de leurs responsabilités civiles et personnelles.

Université du Québec à Montréal

Case postale 8888, succursale Centre-Ville
Montréal (Québec) Canada H3C 3P8

Signature du (de la) participant(e)
De façon générale, les procédures de l'étude ont été expliquées à ma satisfaction et on a répondu à toutes mes questions. Je suis d'accord pour prendre part à cette étude.

Signature (participant/e) _____

Nom _____

Date _____

Signature (chercheur) _____

Nom Sophie Bergeron, Ph.D.

Date 3 mai 2005

Signature (chercheur) _____

Nom Mélanie Brousseau, M.A.

Date 3 mai 2005

UQÀM

Université du Québec à Montréal

Case postale 8888, succursale Centre-Ville
Montréal (Québec) Canada H3C 3P8

FORMULAIRE DE CONSENTEMENT #2

La négociation sexuelle chez le couple

Projet subventionné par le Centre de recherche interdisciplinaire sur les problèmes conjugaux et les agressions sexuelles (CRIPCAS), un Regroupement stratégique du Fonds québécois de recherche sur la culture et la société (FQRSC)

Chercheurs principaux

Sophie Bergeron, Ph.D., et Martine Hébert, Ph.D., psychologues et professeurs,

Université du Québec à Montréal

Mélanie Brousseau, M. A., sexologue clinicienne et étudiante au doctorat en psychologie,

Université du Québec à Montréal

FORMULAIRE DE CONSENTEMENT POUR LES PARTENAIRES

Introduction

La présente étude est réalisée par un groupe de psychologues spécialisées en sexualité humaine. Les chercheurs principaux sont les psychologues Sophie Bergeron, Ph.D. et Martine Hébert , Ph.D., du Département de sexologie de l'Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM), situé au 455 est, boul. René Lévesque, 987-3000 poste 4181.

Objectif de l'étude

Votre partenaire fait partie d'une étude dont le but est d'examiner la négociation sexuelle dans le couple, soit l'initiation, le consentement et le refus. Dans le cadre de cette étude, nous examinerons aussi les facteurs associés à la négociation sexuelle, tels que les antécédents d'agression sexuelle, et la perception des comportements des deux partenaires. L'objectif de votre participation au présent projet de recherche est de recueillir de l'information à propos de la perception du partenaire dans l'expérience de négociation lors des activités sexuelles. Cette démarche vers une meilleure compréhension de la négociation sexuelle à l'intérieur des couples vise à aider les professionnels de la santé à développer des programmes de prévention des difficultés conjugales et des traitements plus efficaces pour les survivant(e)s d'agression sexuelle et les couples en détresse.

Nature de votre participation

Votre participation à la présente étude est volontaire. Si vous acceptez de participer, cela impliquera la complétion de questionnaires à propos de votre histoire sexuelle, vos comportements de négociation de relations sexuelles, votre sexualité, votre relation de couple et vos attitudes envers la sexualité (durée = 30 minutes). Une fois les questionnaires remplis, vous devrez les envoyer par courrier à Mélanie Brousseau – coordonnatrice de recherche de l'étude – dans l'enveloppe de retour pré-affranchie que nous vous avons fournie. Nous avons aussi inclus une enveloppe de retour pré-affranchie pour votre lettre de consentement signé et votre bon de participation au tirage.

Université du Québec à Montréal

Case postale 8888, succursale Centre-Ville
Montréal (Québec) Canada H3C 3P8

Avantages personnels pouvant découler de votre participation
Votre participation à cette étude bénéficiera aux couples qui vivent de la difficulté au niveau de la négociation sexuelle, en aidant les chercheurs à clarifier le rôle des deux partenaires dans l'expérience de la négociation sexuelle chez le couple.

Compensation
Inclus avec cette lettre de consentement, vous trouverez un billet de participation pour un tirage d'une de trois sommes d'argent : 500$, 200$, ou 100$. Ce tirage aura lieu à la fin de la collecte de données, soit décembre 2005. Les gagnant(e)s seront contactés par courrier électronique ou par téléphone.

Risques potentiels pouvant découler de votre participation
Certains items des questionnaires peuvent paraître très intimes. Quelques questions portent sur les antécédents d'abus ou d'agression sexuelle vécus ainsi que la violence dans le couple. Ces questions pourraient entraîner une détresse chez certains sujets ayant vécu ou vivant ces expériences, ou en ayant été témoins. Afin de prévenir tout risque d'inconfort, vous pouvez choisir de ne pas répondre à certaines questions. Si l'inconfort persiste, vous pouvez vous référer à la liste de contacts pour les services d'aide (ci-jointe) ou contacter Mélanie Brousseau au (514) 793-7396, à qui vous pourrez parler de votre détresse et qui pourra vous référer à un professionnel de la santé approprié
Vous pouvez poser des questions à propos de cette étude à n'importe quel moment et votre participation est strictement volontaire. Vous pouvez en tout temps vous retirer de l'étude et refuser de répondre à certaines questions sans que vous et votre partenaire ayez des répercussions négatives. Toutes questions sur votre participation, critiques ou plaintes peuvent être adressées à Sophie Bergeron (987-3000 poste 3031) ou Martine Hébert (987-3000 poste 5697). Si une plainte ne peut être réglée, vous pouvez faire valoir vos droits auprès du comité institutionnel d'éthique de la recherche avec des êtres humains de l'Université du Québec à Montréal au numéro 987-3000 poste 7753.

Confidentialité
Toutes les informations recueillies dans le cadre de cette étude seront gardées confidentielles. Votre lettre de consentement sera conservée dans un dossier séparé de votre questionnaire complété. Votre nom n'apparaîtra pas sur le questionnaire. De plus, toutes les informations recueillies lors de ce projet seront conservées et entreposées de façon sécuritaire et confidentielle. Par la suite, ces informations seront détruites. Les questionnaires ainsi que les résultats de l'étude demeureront à la disposition de l'équipe de recherche seulement et seront identifiés uniquement par un numéro.
Vos résultats ne seront pas discutés avec votre partenaire.

Université du Québec à Montréal

Case postale 8888, succursale Centre-Ville
Montréal (Québec) Canada H3C 3P8

Signature du (de la) participant(e)
De façon générale, les procédures de l'étude ont été expliquées à ma satisfaction et on a répondu à toutes mes questions. Je suis d'accord pour prendre part à cette étude.

Signature (participant/e) _____

Nom _____

Date _____

Signature (chercheur) _____

Nom Sophie Bergeron, Ph.D.

Date 3 mai 2005

Signature (chercheur) _____

Nom Mélanie Brousseau, M.A.

Date 3 mai 2005

APPENDIX G

LIST OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES FOR PARTICIPANTS

Université du Québec à Montréal

Case postale 8888, succursale Centre-Ville
Montréal (Québec) Canada H3C 3P8

Ressources disponibles

Parfois, lorsque les gens réfléchissent au sujet de leurs vies et de leurs expériences, ils ressentent un besoin d'aide. Voici une liste de ressources et leurs numéros de téléphones au cas où vous avez besoin de discuter de vos inquiétudes ou de celles d'un(e) ami(e). Si ces questionnaires vous ont fait réalisé que vous vivez des difficultés, nous vous encourageons de contacter un de ces centres d'aide.

Vous pouvez aussi téléphoner à Mélanie Brousseau M.A., sexologue clinicienne, au (514) 793-7396, si vous avez des inquiétudes ou vous vivez de la détresse reliée à cette étude.

Ressources disponibles à l'UQAM:

Soutien psychologique

- Centre de services psychologiques de l'UQAM, Département de psychologie 987-0253

SUPPORT MORAL TÉLÉPHONIQUE

- Tel-aide (écoute 24h/jour) 935-1101
- Halte-ami (écoute et référence) 987-8509
- Déprimés anonymes 278-2130
- Centre de victimes d'agressions sexuelles (écoute 24h/jour) 934-4504
- S.O.S Violence conjugale (écoute 24h/jour) 873-9010

PSYCHOLOGIE ET SANTÉ

- Répertoire téléphonique de l'Ordre des psychologues du Québec 738-1223
- Association des Sexologues du Québec 270-9289
- Clinique de thérapie de couple de l'hôpital Royal-Victoria 398-6094
- Service de psychologie de l'Université de Montréal 343-7725
- Fédération des CLSC (où est le CLSC le plus près ?) 327-0400
- Association des médecins-psychiatres 350-5128
- CLSC des Faubourgs 527-2361
- Société canadienne du stress 641-4721

VIOLENCE, INCESTE, AGRESSION SEXUELLE

- Centre de victimes agressions sexuelles 934-4504 / 934-0354
- Hôpital Hôtel-Dieu (agression sexuelle) 843-2645
- PRO-GAM (hommes abusifs et aide femmes) 270-8462
- Victimes agressions criminelles 277-5780
- Centre de santé des femmes 270-6110
- Centre des femmes de Montréal 842-4780
- CRIPHASE (pour hommes victimes) 529-5567
- Centre de la prévention d'agression de Montréal 284-1212
- CALACS de l'Ouest de l'île/West Island CALACS 620-4333
- Regroupement québecois des CALACS (514) 529-5252
- Trêve pour Elles 251-0323

UQÀM

APPENDIX H
QUESTIONNAIRES

La négociation sexuelle chez le couple

Partie 1 : Informations socio-démographiques

Veuillez lire attentivement chacune des questions suivantes et répondre le plus honnêtement possible.

1. Quel est votre sexe ? 1 Femme 2 Homme

2. Quelle est votre orientation sexuelle ? 1 Hétérosexuelle 2 Homosexuelle 3 Bisexuelle

3. En quelle année de votre programme d'étude êtes-vous ?
   1 1ère baccalauréat 2 2e baccalauréat 3 3e baccalauréat 4 4e baccalauréat
   5 Maîtrise 6 Je ne suis pas aux études 7 Autre :_____

4. Quel âge avez-vous ? _____

5. Quelle est la culture à laquelle vous vous sentez le plus étroitement liée ?
   1 Québécoise 5 Européenne de l'Est 9 Moyen-Orient
   2 Canadienne 6 Africaine 10 Latine/Sud-américaine
   3 Américaine 7 Asiatique 11 Caraïbes
   4 Européenne de l'Ouest 8 Autochtone 12 Autre : _____

6. Cochez lequel des énoncés suivants s'applique à vous :
   1 J'ai présentement un(e) partenaire amoureux(se) (« chum » ou « blonde ») et ce depuis au moins trois mois.
   2 J'ai déjà eu un(e) partenaire amoureux(se) pendant au moins trois mois, mais ce n'est pas le cas actuellement. (Répondez aux questions suivantes en fonction de votre relation la plus récente qui a duré trois mois ou plus).
   3 Je n'ai jamais eu de relation ayant duré au moins trois mois.

Veuillez noter : Les mots « partenaire » et « votre partenaire » réfèrent à la personne avec qui vous avez été impliqué(e) dans la relation que vous allez décrire dans les questions suivantes. Répondez à chacune des questions en fonction de votre partenaire actuel ou de votre partenaire le plus récent (et répondez toujours en fonction de la même personne, à moins qu'il en soit indiqué autrement).

7. Quelle est la nature de votre relation avec votre partenaire (ou quelle était-elle lorsque vous étiez ensemble ?)
   1 Nous nous fréquentons, relation non-exclusive 4 Mariés
   2 Chum/blonde, relation exclusive 5 Je n'ai jamais eu de relation de couple
   3 Chum/blonde en cohabitation

8. Cette relation dure depuis combien de temps (ou combien de temps votre dernière relation a-t-elle duré) ?
   1 Moins d'un mois 4 6 à 11 mois 7 2 ans ou plus
   2 Moins de 3 mois 5 Environ un an (indiquez :_____)
   3 3 à 5 mois 6 Plus d'un an, mais moins de 2 ans

9. Depuis combien de temps cette relation est-elle terminée ?
   1 Elle n'est pas terminée 4 Il y a 3 à 5 mois 6 Il y a environ un an
   2 Il y a moins d'un mois 5 Il y a 6 à 11 mois 7 Il y a plus d'un an
   3 Il y a moins de 3 mois

10. Quel est (ou était) le sexe de votre partenaire ? 1 Femme 2 Homme

11. En moyenne, vous avez (aviez) des relations sexuelles avec votre partenaire à quelle fréquence ?
   1 Au moins 1 fois par jour 3 Au moins 1 fois par mois 4 Moins que 1fois par mois
   2 Au moins 1 fois par semaine 5 On a jamais eu de relations sexuelles ensemble

12. En général, vous aimeriez avoir des relations sexuelles avec votre partenaire à quelle fréquence ?
   1 Beaucoup plus 3 Pareil 5 Beaucoup moins
   2 Un peu plus 4 Un peu moins 6 Jamais

14. À quel âge avez-vous eu votre première relation sexuelle complète (coït) ? _____

15. Jusqu'à présent, combien de différent(e)s partenaires sexuel(le)s avez-vous eu ?

1 aucun(e)	3 2 à 3	5 11-20
2 1	4 4 à 10	6 Plus que 20

---

16. **Avant** l'âge de 14 ans, une personne m'a fait voir ou m'a fait toucher ses parties intimes (seins, fesses, et/ou organes sexuels) ou a regardé ou a touché les miennes lorsque je ne le voulais pas :

1 Oui 2 Non

Si oui, je considère cette expérience comme de l'abus sexuel : 1 Oui 2 Non
Quel était le sexe de l'abuseur ou cette personne ? 1 Homme 2 Femme
Type de relation avec l'abuseur : 1 Membre de la famille immédiate 4 Ami(e)/connaissance
2 Membre de la famille élargie 5 Inconnu(e)
3 Partenaire amoureux(se)

---

17. **Avant** l'âge de 14 ans, une personne a eu une relation sexuelle avec moi (vaginale, orale ou anale) lorsque je ne le voulais pas :

1 Oui 2 Non

Si oui, je considère cette expérience comme de l'abus sexuel : 1 Oui 2 Non
Quel était le sexe de l'abuseur ou cette personne ? 1 Homme 2 Femme
Type de relation avec l'abuseur : 1 Membre de la famille immédiate 4 Ami(e)/connaissance
2 Membre de la famille élargie 5 Inconnu(e)
3 Partenaire amoureux(se)

---

18. **Depuis** l'âge de 14 ans, une personne a eu une relation sexuelle avec moi (vaginale, orale ou anale) lorsque je ne le voulais pas :

1 Oui 2 Non

Si oui, je considère cette expérience comme une agression sexuelle : 1 Oui 2 Non
Quel était le sexe de l'abuseur ou cette personne ? 1 Homme 2 Femme
Type de relation avec l'abuseur : 1 Membre de la famille immédiate 4 Ami(e)/connaissance
2 Membre de la famille élargie 5 Inconnu(e)
3 Partenaire amoureux(se)

---

19. **Depuis** l'âge de 14 ans, une personne m'a fait voir ou m'a fait toucher ses parties intimes (seins, fesses, et/ou organes sexuels) ou a regardé ou a touché les miennes lorsque je ne le voulais pas :

1 Oui 2 Non

Si oui, je considère cette expérience comme une agression sexuelle : 1 Oui 2 Non
Quel était le sexe de l'abuseur ou cette personne ? 1 Homme 2 Femme
Type de relation avec l'abuseur : 1 Membre de la famille immédiate 4 Ami(e)/connaissance
2 Membre de la famille élargie 5 Inconnu(e)
3 Partenaire amoureux(se)

Partie 2 : Votre Sexualité

Il existe plusieurs raisons pour qu'une personne vive un sentiment ou un désir sexuel. Lorsque vous vivez ces émotions ou intérêts, vous n'agissez pas nécessairement chaque fois. La sexualité ou une relation sexuelle peut inclure un comportement sexuel avec une autre personne (p. ex : votre partenaire) ainsi qu'un comportement sexuel lorsque vous êtes seul(e) (p. ex : la masturbation, visionner du matériel érotique).

Les raisons qui vous poussent à avoir de l'intérêt ou à avoir des comportements sexuels ne sont pas toutes énumérées dans la liste ci-dessous. Certaines raisons vont sembler bien vous décrire, tandis que d'autres ne le feront pas. Si une raison semble bien vous décrire, vous pouvez choisir vrai ou très vrai, selon le cas. Si une raison ne vous décrit pas bien, vous pouvez cocher pas vrai ou pas du tout vrai, selon le cas. Si la raison semble le moindrement descriptive pour vous, vous pouvez cocher Parfois vrai.

Les questions peuvent vous paraître répétitives. Veuillez bien réfléchir et répondre honnêtement à chaque énoncé. Il n'y a pas de bonne ou mauvaise réponse.

Veuillez utiliser l'échelle ci-dessous pour indiquer jusqu'à quel point chaque énoncé est vrai ou descriptif pour vous. Encerclez le numéro qui vous semble le plus pertinent :

		Pas du tout vrai	Pas vrai	Parfois vrai	Vrai	Tout à fait vrai
1.	Je ressens souvent un sentiment de supériorité et de pouvoir lorsque je m'exprime sexuellement.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Un des aspects les plus excitants de la sexualité est le sentiment de pouvoir que je ressens en contrôlant le plaisir sexuel et la stimulation que mon (ma) partenaire éprouve.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Je trouve les comportements sexuels et les fantasmes sexuels plus excitants lorsque je peux me sentir puissant(e) et dominant(e) avec mon (ma) partenaire.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	La sexualité et les fantasmes sexuels sont plus excitants lorsque je ressens que mon (ma) partenaire est plus puissant(e) que moi et me contrôle totalement.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Lorsque je vis des moments difficiles, je peux commencer à me sentir mieux simplement en m'engageant dans certains types de fantasmes ou de comportements sexuels.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Souvent, il est extrêmement excitant lorsque mon (ma) partenaire prend totalement le contrôle et commence à me dire quoi faire durant les relations sexuelles.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Souvent, j'ai un besoin réel de me sentir dominé(e) et possédé(e) par mon (ma) partenaire pendant que nous sommes engagés dans une relation sexuelle ou des fantasmes sexuels.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Je constate que penser ou m'engager dans une activité sexuelle peut fréquemment m'aider à traverser des périodes désagréables dans ma vie.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Souvent, lorsque je me sens malheureux(se) ou déprimé(e), penser à la sexualité ou m'engager dans une activité sexuelle m'aide à me sentir mieux.	1	2	3	4	5

	Pas du tout vrai	Pas vrai	Parfois vrai	Vrai	Tout à fait vrai
10. Quand les choses ne vont pas bien, penser à la sexualité ou faire quelque chose de sexuel est souvent très motivant pour moi et cela m'aide à oublier mes problèmes pendant un moment.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Avoir une activité sexuelle est un moyen très important pour moi de me sentir puissant(e) et charismatique.	1	2	3	4	5
12. J'ai souvent un grand besoin de fantasmer à propos de la sexualité ou de faire quelque chose de sexuel lorsque je me sens bouleversé(e) ou malheureux(se).	1	2	3	4	5
13. Je constate souvent que c'est vraiment excitant lorsque mon (ma) partenaire prend le contrôle et devient autoritaire durant les activités sexuelles ou les fantasmes.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Je suis particulièrement excité(e) par le sentiment de domination et l'idée d'être contrôlé(e) par mon (ma) partenaire durant les relations sexuelles et les fantasmes sexuels.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Souvent le sentiment de pouvoir que j'ai sur mon (ma) partenaire sexuel(le) peut être extrêmement exaltant.	1	2	3	4	5

Pour chaque énoncé, veuillez encercler la réponse qui décrit le mieux la fréquence des raisons pour lesquelles vous avez une relation sexuelle complète ou une activité sexuelle. Il n'y a pas de bonne ou de mauvaise réponse.

	Presque jamais ou jamais	Parfois	La moitié du temps	Souvent	Presque toujours ou toujours
1. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles parce que vous vous sentez excité(e) sexuellement ?	1	2	3	4	5
2. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles pour vous prouver que votre partenaire vous trouve attirant(e) ?	1	2	3	4	5
3. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles pour devenir plus intime avec votre partenaire ?	1	2	3	4	5
4. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles par peur que votre partenaire ne vous aime plus si vous ne le faites pas ?	1	2	3	4	5
5. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles parce qu'il est difficile de refuser des activités sexuelles avec votre partenaire lorsque vous avez déjà participé à de telles activités auparavant ?	1	2	3	4	5
6. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles parce que c'est agréable ?	1	2	3	4	5
7. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles parce que cela vous fait sentir comme une personne plus intéressante ?	1	2	3	4	5

	Presque jamais ou jamais	Parfois	La moitié du temps	Souvent	Presque toujours ou toujours
8. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles parce que vous ne voulez pas que votre partenaire se fâche contre vous ?	1	2	3	4	5
9. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles pour empêcher que votre partenaire vous trompe avec un(e) autre ?	1	2	3	4	5
10. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles pour exprimer votre amour pour votre partenaire ?	1	2	3	4	5
11. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles parce que cela vous donne plus de confiance en vous ?	1	2	3	4	5
12. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles pour établir un lien émotionnel avec votre partenaire ?	1	2	3	4	5
13. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles parce que vous croyez que c'est votre devoir en tant que partenaire dans un couple ?	1	2	3	4	5
14. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles parce que vous êtes inquiet(e)s que votre partenaire ne veule plus être avec vous autrement ?	1	2	3	4	5
15. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles pour l'excitation que cela suscite ?	1	2	3	4	5
16. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles pour vous rassurer que vous êtes sexuellement désirable ?	1	2	3	4	5
17. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles pour le plaisir ?	1	2	3	4	5
18. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles pour vous rapprocher de votre partenaire ?	1	2	3	4	5
19. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles parce que vous croyez que vous devez être disponible si votre partenaire le désire ?	1	2	3	4	5
20. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles pour vous rapprocher émotionnellement de votre partenaire ?	1	2	3	4	5
21. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles pour vous aider à vous sentir mieux à votre égard ?	1	2	3	4	5
22. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles parce que vous avez peur que votre partenaire vous quitte si vous ne le faites pas ?	1	2	3	4	5
23. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles pour satisfaire vos besoins sexuels ?	1	2	3	4	5
24. À quelle fréquence avez-vous des relations sexuelles parce que vous vous sentez coupable si vous refusez les avances de votre partenaire ?	1	2	3	4	5

Partie 3 : La négociation dans la relation de couple

Dans un couple, il est possible que les deux partenaires soient en désaccord quant au niveau d'intimité sexuelle qu'ils veulent; c'est-à-dire qu'il arrive qu'un des deux partenaires désire s'engager dans une forme d'activité sexuelle, alors que l'autre ne veut pas. Par exemple, il est possible que l'un soit d'accord seulement pour embrasser et faire des caresses tandis que l'autre désire plutôt avoir une relation sexuelle complète. Chacun des énoncés ci-dessous représente une situation qui a pu vous arriver dans vos relations de couple ou vos relations d'un soir. Nous vous demandons de lire chacune de ces situations et d'indiquer si oui ou non votre partenaire actuel et/ou un(e) autre partenaire s'est comporté comme cela avec vous. Vous trouverez peut-être que certains de ces énoncés se ressemblent, mais ils sont tous différents. Prenez soin de bien les lire. Si une ou plusieurs situations ont été bouleversantes pour vous veuillez cocher la ou les case(s) appropriée(s).

	Avec votre partenaire actuel (ou le/la plus récent(e)?	**Si oui,** cochez la case si cette expérience a été bouleversante pour vous	Avec un(e) autre partenaire depuis que vous avez 14 ans ?	**Si oui,** cochez la case si cette expérience a été bouleversante pour vous
1. Avez-vous déjà eu une activité sexuelle (embrasser, caresser ou faire des attouchements, sans relation sexuelle complète) alors que votre partenaire et vous le vouliez ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
2. Avez-vous déjà eu une relation sexuelle complète (avec pénétration) alors que votre partenaire et vous le vouliez ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
3. Avez-vous déjà cédé à des avances sexuelles (embrasser, caresser, ou faire des attouchements, sans relation sexuelle complète) alors que vous ne vouliez pas, parce que vous vous sentiez accablé par les arguments et les pressions de l'autre ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
4. Avez-vous déjà cédé à des avances sexuelles (embrasser, caresser, ou faire des attouchements, sans relation sexuelle complète) alors que vous ne vouliez pas, parce que l'autre vous a menacé de vous quitter si vous ne l'acceptiez pas ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
5. Vous êtes-vous déjà aperçu que l'autre a réussi à avoir des contacts sexuels avec vous (embrasser, caresser, ou faire des attouchements, sans relation sexuelle complète), après vous avoir dit des choses qu'il ou elle ne pensait pas ou ne ressentait pas vraiment ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
6. Avez-vous déjà cédé à des avances sexuelles (embrasser, caresser, ou faire des attouchements, sans relation sexuelle complète) alors que vous ne vouliez pas, parce que l'autre a utilisé sa situation d'autorité (ex : patron, enseignant(e), votre dépendance) pour vous y obliger ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	

	Avec votre partenaire actuel (ou le/la plus récent(e)?	**Si oui,** cochez la case si cette expérience a été bouleversante pour vous	Avec un(e) autre partenaire depuis que vous avez 14 ans ?	**Si oui**, cochez la case si cette expérience a été bouleversante pour vous
7. Avez-vous déjà cédé à des avances sexuelles (embrasser, caresser, ou faire des attouchements, sans relation sexuelle complète) alors que vous ne vouliez pas, parce que l'autre vous a menacé ou a utilisé un certain degré de force physique (tordre votre bras, vous maintenir, etc.) pour vous y obliger?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
8. Est-ce qu'il vous est déjà arrivé que l'autre ait essayé d'avoir une relation sexuelle (se coucher par-dessus vous, essayer d'obtenir une pénétration) alors que vous ne vouliez pas, en vous menaçant ou en utilisant un certain degré de force physique (tordre votre bras, vous maintenir, etc.), mais où il n'y a pas eu de relation sexuelle complète ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
9. Est-ce qu'il vous est déjà arrivé que l'autre ait essayé d'avoir une relation sexuelle (se coucher par-dessus vous, essayer d'obtenir une pénétration) alors que vous ne vouliez pas, lorsque vous étiez sous l'effet (ou en vous donnant) de la drogue ou de l'alcool, mais où il n'y a pas eu de relation sexuelle complète ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
10. Avez-vous déjà eu une relation sexuelle complète où l'autre était à ce point excité(e) sexuellement que vous avez eu l'impression qu'il était inutile de lui demander d'arrêter et ce, même si vous ne vouliez pas avoir cette relation ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
11. Avez-vous déjà eu une relation sexuelle complète, alors que vous ne vouliez pas, parce que l'autre vous a menacé de vous quitter si vous ne l'acceptiez pas ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
12. Vous êtes-vous déjà aperçu que l'autre a réussi à avoir une relation sexuelle complète avec vous, après vous avoir dit des choses qu'il (elle) ne pensait pas ou ne ressentait pas vraiment ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
13. Avez-vous déjà eu une relation sexuelle complète, alors que vous ne vouliez pas, parce que vous vous sentiez accablé par les arguments et les pressions de l'autre ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
14. Avez-vous déjà eu une relation sexuelle complète, alors que vous ne vouliez pas, parce que l'autre a utilisé sa situation d'autorité (ex : patron, enseignant(e), votre dépendance) pour vous y obliger?	Oui Non		Oui Non	

	Avec votre partenaire actuel (ou le/la plus récent(e)?	**Si oui,** cochez la case si cette expérience a été bouleversante pour vous	Avec un(e) autre partenaire depuis que vous avez 14 ans ?	**Si oui,** cochez la case si cette expérience a été bouleversante pour vous
15. Avez-vous déjà eu une relation sexuelle complète, alors que vous ne vouliez pas, parce que vous étiez sous l'effet de la drogue ou de l'alcool et que l'autre a pris avantage de votre état (ou vous a donné de la drogue ou de l'alcool) pour vous y obliger ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
16. Avez-vous déjà eu une relation sexuelle complète, alors que vous ne vouliez pas, parce que l'autre vous a menacé ou a utilisé un certain degré de force physique (tordre votre bras, vous maintenir, etc.) pour vous y obliger ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
17. Avez-vous déjà reçu ou fait une pénétration anale alors que vous ne vouliez pas, parce que l'autre vous a menacé ou a utilisé un certain degré de force physique (tordre votre bras, vous maintenir, etc.) pour vous y obliger ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
18. Avez-vous déjà reçu ou fait une relation orale-génitale alors que vous ne vouliez pas, parce que l'autre vous a menacé(e) ou a utilisé un certain degré de force physique (tordre votre bras, vous maintenir, etc.) pour vous y obliger ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	

Chacun des énoncés ci-dessous représente une situation qui a pu vous arriver dans vos relations de couple ou vos relations d'un soir. Nous vous demandons maintenant d'indiquer si oui ou non vous vous êtes comportés comme cela avec votre partenaire actuel et/ou tout(e) autre partenaire. Si une ou plusieurs situations ont été bouleversantes pour votre partenaire actuel, veuillez cocher la ou les case(s) appropriée(s).

	Avec votre partenaire actuel (ou le/la plus récent(e)?	**Si oui**, cochez la case si cette expérience a été bouleversante pour **lui/elle**	Avec un(e) autre partenaire depuis que vous avez 14 ans ?	**Si oui**, cochez la case si cette expérience a été bouleversante pour **l'autre**
1. Avez-vous déjà fait des avances sexuelles (embrasser, caresser, ou faire des attouchements, sans relation sexuelle complète) alors que l'autre ne voulait pas, en utilisant des arguments et des pressions ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
2. Avez-vous déjà fait des avances sexuelles (embrasser, caresser, ou faire des attouchements, sans relation sexuelle complète) alors que l'autre ne voulait pas, en menaçant de le (la) quitter s'il (elle) n'acceptait pas ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
3. Avez-vous déjà réussi à avoir des contacts sexuels avec l'autre (embrasser, caresser, ou faire des attouchements, sans relation sexuelle complète), après lui avoir dit des choses que vous ne pensiez pas ou ne ressentiez pas vraiment ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
4. Avez-vous déjà fait des avances sexuelles (embrasser, caresser, ou faire des attouchements, sans relation sexuelle complète) alors que l'autre ne voulait pas, en utilisant votre situation d'autorité (patron, enseignant(e), la dépendance de l'autre) pour l'obliger?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
5. Avez-vous déjà fait des avances sexuelles (embrasser, caresser, ou faire des attouchements, sans relation sexuelle complète) alors que l'autre ne voulait pas, en menaçant ou en utilisant un certain degré de force physique (tordre son bras, le ou la maintenir, etc.) pour l'obliger ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
6. Est-ce que vous avez déjà essayé d'avoir une relation sexuelle (vous coucher par-dessus l'autre, essayer d'obtenir une pénétration) alors que l'autre ne voulait pas, en menaçant ou en utilisant un certain degré de force physique (tordre son bras, le ou la maintenir, etc.), mais où il n'y a pas eu de relation sexuelle complète ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	

	Avec votre partenaire actuel (ou le/la plus récent(e)?	**Si oui,** cochez la case si cette expérience a été bouleversante pour **lui/elle**	Avec un(e) autre partenaire depuis que vous avez 14 ans ?	**Si oui,** cochez la case si cette expérience a été bouleversante pour **l'autre**
7. Est-ce que vous avez déjà essayé d'avoir une relation sexuelle (vous coucher par-dessus l'autre, essayer d'obtenir une pénétration) alors que l'autre ne voulait pas, en profitant du fait que l'autre était sous l'effet de la drogue ou de l'alcool (ou en lui donnant de la drogue ou de l'alcool), mais où il n'y a pas eu de relation sexuelle complète ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
8. Avez-vous déjà eu une relation sexuelle complète où vous étiez à ce point excité(e) sexuellement que vous avez eu l'impression que vous ne pouviez pas vous arrêter et ce, même si l'autre ne voulait pas avoir cette relation ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
9. Avez-vous déjà eu une relation sexuelle complète, alors que l'autre ne voulait pas, en menaçant de le (la) quitter s'il (elle) n'acceptait pas ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
10. Avez-vous déjà réussi à avoir une relation sexuelle complète avec l'autre, après lui avoir dit des choses que vous ne pensiez pas ou ne ressentiez pas vraiment ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
11. Avez-vous déjà eu une relation sexuelle complète, alors que l'autre ne voulait pas, en utilisant des arguments et des pressions ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
12. Avez-vous déjà eu une relation sexuelle complète, alors que l'autre ne voulait pas, en utilisant votre situation d'autorité (patron, enseignant(e), la dépendance de l'autre) pour l'y obliger ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
13. Avez-vous déjà eu une relation sexuelle complète, alors que l'autre ne voulait pas, en profitant du fait que l'autre était sous l'effet de la drogue ou de l'alcool (ou en lui donnant de la drogue ou de l'alcool) pour l'y obliger ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
14. Avez-vous déjà eu une relation sexuelle complète, alors que l'autre ne voulait pas, en menaçant ou en utilisant un certain degré de force physique (tordre son bras, le ou la maintenir, etc.) pour l'y obliger ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	
15. Avez-vous déjà reçu ou fait une pénétration anale alors que l'autre ne voulait pas, en menaçant ou en utilisant un certain degré de force physique (tordre son bras, le ou la maintenir, etc.) pour l'y obliger ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	

	Avec votre partenaire actuel (ou le/la plus récent(e)?	**Si oui,** cochez la case si cette expérience a été bouleversante pour **lui/elle**	Avec un(e) autre partenaire depuis que vous avez 14 ans ?	**Si oui,** cochez la case si cette expérience a été bouleversante pour **l'autre**
16. Avez-vous déjà reçu ou fait une relation orale-génitale alors que l'autre ne voulait pas, en menaçant ou en utilisant un certain degré de force physique (tordre son bras, le ou la maintenir, etc.) pour l'y obliger ?	Oui Non		Oui Non	

Merci beaucoup pour votre participation !
N'oubliez pas de remplir le bulletin de participation pour le tirage.

REFERENCES

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*, 784-807.

Abbey, A., Parkhill, M. R., & Koss, M. P. (2005). The effects of frame of reference on responses to questions about sexual assault victimization and perpetration. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*(4), 364-373.

Adams-Curtis, L. E., & Forbes, G. B. (2004). College women's experiences of sexual coercion: A review of cultural, perpetrator, victim and situational variables. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 5*(2), 91-122.

Anderson, P. B., & Savage, J. S. (2005). Social, legal, and institutional context of heterosexual aggression by college women. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 6*(2), 130-140.

Anderson, P. B., & Sorensen, W. (1999). Male and female differences in reports of women's heterosexual initiation and aggression. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 28*(3), 243-253.

Ansara, D. L., & Hindin, M. J. (2009). Perpetration of intimate partner aggression by men and women in the Philippines: Prevalence and associated factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*, 1579-1590.

Apt, C., & Hurlbert, D. F. (1993). The sexuality of women in physically abusive marriages: A comparative study. *Journal of Family Violence, 8*(1), 57-69.

Arata, C. M. (2000). From child victim to adult victim: A model for predicting sexual revictimization. *Child Maltreatment, 5*(1), 28-38.

Banyard, V. L., Arnold, S., & Smith, J. (2000). Childhood sexual abuse and dating experiences of undergraduate women. *Child Maltreatment, 5*(1), 39-48.

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.

Baumeister, R. F., Catanese, K. R., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Is there a gender difference in strength of sex drive? Theoretical views, conceptual distinctions, and a review of relevant evidence. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5*, 242-273.

Bell, K. M., & Naugle, A. E. (2007). Effects of social desirability on students' self-reporting of partner abuse perpetration and victimization. *Violence and Victims, 22*, 243-256.

Boul, L., Hallam-Jones, R., & Wylie, K. R. (2009). Sexual pleasure and motivation. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 35*, 25-39.

Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1*(3), 185-216.

Byers, E. S. (1996). How well does the traditional sexual script explain sexual coercion? Review of a program of research. In E. S. Byers & L. F. O'Sullivan (Eds.), *Sexual coercion in dating relationships* (pp.7-25). New York: Haworth Press.

Caetano, R., Field, C., Ramisety-Mikler, S., & Lipsky, S. (2009). Agreement on reporting of physical, psychological, and sexual violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*, 1318-1337.

Caetano, R., Schafer, J., Field, C., & Nelson, S. M. (2002). Agreement on reports of intimate partner violence among white, black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 1308-1322.

Camilleri, J. A., & Quinsey, V. L. (2009). Individual differences in the propensity for partner sexual coercion. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 21*, 111-129.

Carr, J. L., & VanDeusen, K. M. (2004). Risk factors for male sexual aggression on college campuses. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*(5), 279-289.

Christopher, F. S., Madura, M., & Weaver, L. (1998). Premarital sexual aggressors: A Multivariate analysis of social, relational, and individual variables. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60*, 56-69.

Classen, C. C., Palesh, O. G., & Aggarwal, R. (2005). Sexual revictimization: A review of the empirical literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 6*(2), 103-129.

Cooper, M. L., Shapiro, C. M., & Powers, A. M. (1998). Motivations for sex and risky sexual behavior among adolescents and young adults: A functional perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 1528-1558.

Craig, M. E. (1990). Coercive sexuality in dating relationships: A situational model. *Clinical Psychology Review, 10*, 395-423.

Daigneault, I., Hébert, M. & McDuff, P. (2009). Men's and women's childhood sexual abuse and victimization in adult partner relationships: A study of risk factors. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 33*, 638-647.

Davis, D., Shaver, P. R., & Vernon, M. L. (2004). Attachment style and subjective motivations for sex. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 1076-1090.

Dworkin, S. L., & O'Sullivan, L. (2005). Actual versus desired initiation patterns among a sample of college men: Tapping disjunctures within traditional male sexual scripts. *The Journal of Sex Research, 42*, 150-158.

Emmers-Sommer, T. M. (2002). Sexual coercion and resistance. In M. Allen, R. W. Preiss, B. M. Gayle, & N. A. Burrell, (Eds.), *Interpersonal communication research: Advances through meta-analysis* (pp. 315-343). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Emmers-Sommer, T. M. & Allen, M. (1999). Variables related to sexual coercion: A path model. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 16*(5), 659-678.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Geisinger, K. F. (1994). Cross-cultural normative assessment: Translation and

adaptation issues influencing the normative interpretation of assessment instruments. *Psychological Assessment, 6*(4), 304-312.

Gidycz, C. A., Coble, C. N., Latham, L., & Layman, M. J. (1993). Sexual assault experience in adulthood and prior victimization experiences: A prospective analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 17*(2), 151-168.

Gidycz, C. A., Hanson, K., & Layman, M. J. (1995). A prospective analysis of the relationships among sexual assault experiences: An extension of previous findings. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19*, 5-29.

Graves, K. N., Sechrist, S. M., White, J. W., & Paradise, M. J. (2005). Intimate partner violence perpetrated by college women within the context of a history of victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*, 278-289.

Hamby, S. L., (2005). Measuring gender differences in partner violence: Implications from research on other forms of violent and socially undesirable behavior. *Sex Roles, 52*, 725-742.

Hamby, S. L., & Koss, M. P. (2003). Shades of gray: A qualitative study of terms used in the measurement of sexual victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 27*, 243-255.

Harney, P. A., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (1991). Rape. In E. Grauerholz & M. A. Koralewski (Eds.), *Sexual coercion: A sourcebook on its nature, causes, and prevention* (pp. 3-15). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Hill, C. A. (November, 2003). Sexual coercion as a function of gender, gender-related aggression beliefs, and sexual motives. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality, San Antonio, TX.

Hill, C. A., & Preston, L. K. (1996). Individual differences in the experience of sexual motivation: Theory and measurement of dispositional sexual motives. *The Journal of Sex Research, 33*(1), 27-45.

Himelein, M. J. (1995). Risk factors for sexual victimization in dating: A longitudinal study of college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19*, 31-48.

Hines, D. (2007). Predictors of sexual coercion against women and men: A

multilevel, multinational study of university students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 36*, 403-422.

Impett, E. A., & Peplau, L. A. (2002). Why some women consent to unwanted sex with a dating partner: Insights from attachment theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26,* 360-370.

Impett, E. A., & Peplau, L. A. (2003). Sexual compliance: Gender, motivational, and relationship perspectives. *The Journal of Sex Research, 40*(1), 87-100.

Impett, E. A., Peplau, L. A., & Gable, S. L. (2005). Approach and avoidance sexual motives: Implications for personal and interpersonal well-being. *Personal Relationships, 12*, 465-482.

Johnson, I. M., & Sigler, R. T. (2000). Forced sexual intercourse among intimates. *Journal of Family Violence, 15*, 95-108.

King, M., Coxell, A., & Mezey, G. (2000). The prevalence and characteristics of male sexual assault. In G. C. Mezey & M. B. King (Eds.), *Male victims of sexual assault* (2nd Ed.) (pp. 1-15). New York: Oxford University Press.

King, M., & Woollett, E. (1997). Sexually assaulted males: 115 men consulting a counseling service. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 26*(6), 579-588.

Kolivas, E. D., & Gross, A. M. (2007). Assessing sexual aggression: Addressing the gap between rape victimization and perpetration prevalence rates. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12*, 315-328.

Koss, M. P., & Dinero, T. E. (1989). Discriminant analysis of risk factors for sexual victimization among a national sample of college women. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57*, 242-250

Koss, M. P., Dinero, T. E., Siebel, C. A., & Cox, S. L. (1988). Stranger and acquaintance rape: Are there differences in victim's experience? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12*, 1-24.

Koss, M. P., & Gidycz, C. A. (1985). Sexual Experiences Survey: Reliability and validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53*, 422-423.

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence

and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55*, 162-170.

Krahé, B., Scheinberger-Olwig, R., & Bieneck, S. (2003). Men's report of nonconsensual sexual interactions with women: Prevalence and impact. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 32*, 165-175.

Krahé, B., Scheinberger-Olwig, R., & Kolpin, S. (2000). Ambiguous communication of sexual intentions as a risk marker of sexual aggression. *Sex Roles, 42*, 313-337.

Larimer, M. E., Lydum, A. R., Anderson, B. K., & Turner, A. P. (1999). Male and female recipients of unwanted sexual contact in a college student sample: Prevalence rates, alcohol use, and depression symptoms. *Sex Roles, 40*, 295-308.

Lawrance, K.-A., & Byers, E. S. (1995). Sexual satisfaction in long-term heterosexual relationships: The interpersonal exchange model of sexual satisfaction. *Personal Relationships, 2*, 267-285.

Lemieux, S. R., & Byers, E. S. (2008). The sexual well-being of women who have experienced child sexual abuse. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*, 126-144.

Lim, G. Y., & Roloff, M. E. (1999). Attributing sexual consent. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 27*, 1-23.

Littleton, H. L., & Axsom, D. (2003). Rape and seduction scripts of university students: Implications for rape attributions and unacknowledged rape. *Sex Roles, 49*, 465-475.

Livingston, J. A., Buddie, A. M., Testa, M., & VanZile-Tamsen, C. (2004). The role of sexual precedence in verbal sexual coercion. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28*(4), 287-297.

Lyndon, A. E., White, J. W., & Kadlec, K. M. (2007). Manipulation and force as

sexual coercion tactics: Conceptual and empirical differences. *Aggressive Behavior, 33*, 291-303.

MacNeil, S., & Byers, E. S. (2005). Dyadic assessment of sexual self-disclosure and sexual satisfaction. *Journal of Personal and Social Relationships, 22*, 169-181.

Margolin, L., Moran, P. B., & Miller, M. (1989). Social approval for violations of sexual consent in marriage and dating. *Violence and Victims, 4*, 45-55.

Metts, S., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1996). Sexual communication in interpersonal contexts: A script-based approach. In B. R. Burleson & A. W. Kunkel (Eds.), *Communication Yearbook 19.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Meyer, S.-L., Vivian, D., & O'Leary, K. D. (1998). Men's sexual aggression in marriage: Couples' reports. *Violence Against Women, 4*, 415-465.

Monson, C. M., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Binderup, T. (2000). Does "No" really mean "No" after you say "Yes"? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*, 1156-1174.

Muñoz-Rivas, M. J., Graña, J. L., O'Leary, K. D., & González, M. P. (2009). Prevalence and predictors of sexual aggression in dating relationships of adolescents and young adults. *Psicothema, 21*, 234-240.

O'Leary, K. D., Slep, A. M. S., Avery-Leaf, S., & Cascardi, M. (2008). Gender differences in dating aggression among multhiethnic high school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 42*, 473-479.

O'Sullivan, L. F., & Byers, E. S. (1992). College students' incorporation of initiator and restrictor roles in sexual dating interactions. *The Journal of Sex Research, 29*, 435-446.

O'Sullivan, L. F., & Byers, E. S. (1993). Eroding stereotypes: College women's attempts to influence reluctant male partners. *The Journal of Sex Research, 30*, 270-282.

O'Sullivan, L. F., Byers, E. S., & Finkelman, L. (1998). A comparison of male and

female college students' experiences of sexual coercion. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*, 177-195.

Parrot, A. (1988, 1993, 1995, 1999). *Coping with date and acquaintance rape* (Revised Edition). New York: The Rosen Publishing Group.

Perry, A. R., & Fromuth, M. E. (2005). Courtship violence using couple data: Characteristics and perceptions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*, 1078-1095.

Platt, J. J., & Busby, D. M. (2009). Male victims: The Nature and meaning of sexual coercion. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 37*, 217-226.

Poitras, M. & Lavoie, F. (1995). A study of the prevalence of sexual coercion in adolescent heterosexual dating relationships in a Quebec sample. *Violence and Victims, 10*, 299- 313.

Próspero, M. (2008). The effect of coercion on aggression and mental health among reciprocally violent couples. *Journal of Family Violence, 23*, 195-202.

Rich, C. L., Gidycz, C. A., Warkentin, J. B., Loh, C. & Weiland, P. (2005). Child and adolescent abuse and subsequent victimization: A prospective study. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 29*, 1373-1394.

Rosenthal, D., Moore, S., & Flynn, I. (1991). Adolescent self-efficacy, self-esteem and sexual risk taking. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 1*, 77-88.

Russell, B. L., & Oswald, D. L. (2002). Sexual coercion and victimization of college men: The role of love styles. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 273-285.

Ryan, K. M. (1988). Rape and seduction scripts. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12*, 237-245.

Schachner, D. A., & Shaver, P. R. (2004). Atachment dimensions and sexual motives. *Personal relationships, 11,* 179-195.

Senn, C. Y., Desmarais, S., Verberg, N., & Wood, E. (2000). Predicting coercive sexual behavior across the lifespan in a random sample of Canadian men. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 17*, 95-113.

Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. (1986). Sexual scripts: Permanence and change. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 15*, 97-120.

Spitzberg, B. H., (1998). Sexual coercion in courtship relations. In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.), *The Dark Side of Close Relationships* (pp.179-232). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum associates.

Spitzberg, B. H., (1999). An analysis of empirical estimates of sexual aggression victimization and perpetration. *Violence and Victims, 14*, 241-260.

Stanko, E. A. (1997). "I second that emotion": Reflections on feminism, emotionality, and research on sexual violence. In M. D. Schwartz, (Ed.), *Researching sexual violence against women: Methodological and personal perspectives* (pp. 74-85). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Struckman-Johnson, C. (1988). Forced sex on dates: It happens to men, too. *The Journal of Sex Research, 24*, 234-241.

Struckman-Johnson, C., Struckman-Johnson, D., & Anderson, P. B. (2003). Tactics of sexual coercion: When men and women won't take No for an answer. *The Journal of Sex Research, 40*, 76-86.

Szinovacz, M. E., & Egley, L. C. (1995). Comparing one-partner and couple data on sensitive marital behaviours: The case of marital violence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*, 995-1010.

Testa, M, VanZile-Tamsen, C., Livingston, J., & Koss, M. (2004). Assessing women's experiences of sexual aggression using the sexual experiences survey: Evidence for validity and implications for research. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28, 256-265.*

Teten, A. L., Hall, G. C. N., & Capaldi, D. M. (2009). Use of coercive sexual tactics across 10 years in at-risk young men: Developmental patterns and co-occurring problematic dating behaviours. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 38*, 574-582.

Turchik, J. A., Probst, D. R., Irvin, C. R., Chau, M., & Gidycz, C. A. (2009).

Prediction of sexual assault experiences in college women based on rape scripts: A prospective analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 77*, 361-366.

VanderLaan, D. P., & Vasey, P. L. (2009). Patterns of sexual coercion in heterosexual and non-heterosexual men and women. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 38*, 987-999.

Vannier, S. A., & O'Sullivan, L. F. (2008). The feasibility and acceptability of handheld computers in a prospective diary study of adolescent sexual behaviour. The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 17, 183-192

Vézina, J., & Hébert, M. (2007). Risk factors for victimization in romantic relationships of young women: A review of empirical studies and implications for prevention. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 8*, 33-66.

White, J. W., & Smith, P. H. (2004). Sexual assault perpetration and reperpetration: From adolescence to young adulthood. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 31*, 182-202.

Williams, S. L., & Frieze, I. H. (2005). Patterns of violent relationships, psychological distress, and marital satisfaction in a national sample of men and women. *Sex Roles, 52*, 771-784.

Zweig, J. M., Crockett, L. J., Sayer, A., & Vicary, J. R. (1999). A longitudinal examination of the consequences of sexual victimization for rural young adult women. *The Journal of Sex Research, 36*(4), 396-409.