Manipulation and Force as Sexual Coercion Tactics: Conceptual and Empirical Differences

By: Amy E. Lyndon, Jacquelyn W. White, and Kelly M. Kadlec

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.

Abstract:

This study examines the relationship between perpetrator characteristics, situational characteristics, and type of sexual coercion tactics used to obtain sexual contact (including sexual intercourse) with an unwilling partner. Men who used manipulation or force were compared to each other and to men who engaged in only consensual sex. Participants were college men drawn from the first wave of a 5-year longitudinal study. Stepwise discriminant function analyses, univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA), and *v*2 analyses tested group differences. As predicted, men who used force reported more childhood sexual abuse, witnessed more domestic violence, were more accepting of male violence, and were less likely to endorse love as a motive for sex than men in both the manipulation and consent groups. Men in the force group were also more likely to have had a casual relationship with the woman, and to be drinking and also intoxicated during the coercive incident than men in the manipulation group. Hypothesized differences between men who used force and manipulation regarding parental physical punishment, traditional gender role attitudes, delinquency, hedonistic and dominance motives for sex, prior sexual contact, and the length of the relationship were not supported. The results suggest that types of tactic used in sexual assaults can be distinguished on the basis of person and situational variables and that knowledge of these differences can facilitate future research, as well as rape deterrent and intervention programs.

Article:

INTRODUCTION

Extensive research over the past three decades has documented associations between sexual coercion and various person and situational factors [see White et al., 2006 for a recent review]. Given that there is now consensus about these characteristics, attention is turning toward a better understanding of differences among sexually coercive men. For example, Groth and Hobson's [1997] typology of sexually aggressive men, Hall and Hirschman's [1991] quadripartite model of sexual aggression, and Shotland's [1992] theory of courtship rape all suggest variability within groups of sexually coercive men that would result in some being more physically aggressive than others. Surprisingly, however, until recently little empirical work has followed up on their suggestions. A literature examining the relationship between tactics used to achieve sexual contact with an unwilling partner and person and situational variables is beginning to emerge [Abbey et al., 2004; Byers and Eno, 1991; Christopher et al., 1998; Cleveland et al., 1999; Emmers-Sommer and Allen, 1999; Kosson et al., 1997; Tyler et al., 1998]. Using a broad scope of sexually coercive incidents and tactics, this study builds on this research using men's reports.

One impetus for this interest in sexually coercive tactics revolves around issues of the definition of *sexual coercion*, *sexual aggression*, and *victimization* [see Lamb, 1999]. Gavey [1999] has asked whether all cases of sexual coercion are victimizing and cause harm; other scholars have suggested that some coerced sex "appears to be sex-as-usual," in that it involves normative heterosexuality [Atmore, 1999], and may even be a conventional aspect of dating [Byers and Eno, 1991]. Muehlenhard and Peterson [2004] have suggested that some verbally coerced sex may not even constitute sexual victimization. Given that numerous studies have found that women are more likely to be verbally pressured, or in some way manipulated, rather than physically forced into unwanted sexual activity [Abbey et al., 2004; Humphrey and White, 2000; Koss et al., 1987], it seems imperative to determine the nature of the differences between men who use verbal pressure and other manipulative tactics, men who engage in only non-coerced sex, and men who use force to obtain sex. Identification of such differences may inform sexual assault prevention programs.

A definition of terms used in this study is in order given the numerous terms used in the research literature. According to White et al. [2006] "the terms sexual coercion, sexual aggression, sexual assault, sexual offense, and sexual perpetration are often used interchangeably to refer to a continuum of sexual behaviors in which one person, *the perpetrator*, engages in behavior against another's will, *the victim*" (p 128–219). They also state that the outcome for the victim can range from unwanted sexual contact to rape, which can include penetrating the victim orally, anally, or vaginally with the penis or other objects. They further note that perpetrators may rely on various tactics, including psychological pressure (i.e., threatening to end the relationship; saying things one does not mean, such as falsely professing love), verbal pressure (i.e., overwhelming a person with continual arguments), using a position of authority, giving drugs or alcohol, taking advantage of an intoxicated person, threatening or using physical force (e.g., holding down, pushing, slapping, beating, choking), or displaying a weapon. Thus, the term *sexual coercion* has been used to encompass a range of unwanted outcomes via a number of tactics [Cleveland et al., 1999; Emmers-Sommer and Allen, 1999]. It has also been used in a delimited manner. For example, Koss et al. [1987; p 166] defined sexual coercion as including "sexual intercourse subsequent to the use of menacing verbal pressure or the misuse of authority." Similarly, Testa and Dermen [1999; p 550] stated that sexual coercion "involves verbal or emotional pressure whereas rape and attempted rape typically involve force." In these latter two definitions, it appears that outcome and tactic are intertwined. Hence, in this paper we will follow the common practice of using the term *sexual coercion* or *sexually coercive incidents* to refer to the broad spectrum of tactics to achieve various sexual outcomes. We use the terms *tactics* to refer to the strategies that perpetrators use to obtain various outcomes that may range from unwanted sexual contact to completed sexual intercourse. *Manipulative tactics* include verbal pressure, continual arguing, use of authority, and use of alcohol or drugs to reduce a woman's ability to resist, whereas *force tactics* include the threat and use of physical force. Our primary research question is: What factors discriminate the use of force from manipulation in sexually coerced incidents? We draw upon two bodies of research, women's reports of men's strategies and men's self-reported characteristics and behaviors in sexually coercive incidents, to derive hypotheses about variables that discriminate the use of force from manipulation. Person variables are defined as those that a person brings to a particular situation and include past history with childhood victimization, attitudes, motives, and past behavior. In contrast, situational variables are aspects

of the situation at the time of a sexually coercive incident; these include the use of alcohol and the nature of the relationship between the perpetrator and victim.

Survivors' Descriptions of Men's Tactics

Although no studies have provided a direct comparison of manipulation and force tactics as operationally defined in this paper, several studies of survivors' descriptions of their sexual coercion experiences suggest a pattern of differences. It appears that verbal pressure (one type of manipulative strategy) is more likely to occur than physical force in established relationships [Abbey et al., 1996; Testa and Livingston, 1999], as well as when there has been prior consensual sexual activity [Abbey et al., 2004]. Cleveland et al. [1999] found that acquaintances and dates used alcohol/drug-related tactics (i.e., another form of manipulation) significantly more often than husbands, whereas strangers tended to use force (i.e., weapons) and isolation and/or demand for silence more than any other group of men (except ex-husbands). Less established relationships are thus linked to force and also to situational alcohol use [Harrington and Leitenberg, 1994]. Specifically, alcohol use in sexually coercive incidents is associated with casual relationships and in settings that involve alcohol consumption (bars, parties) [Abbey et al., 2002, 2003]. Thus, situations involving force may be the same ones in which alcohol is used [Emmers-Sommer and Allen, 1999], especially when the perpetrator is intoxicated rather than simply drinking [Abbey et al., 2002; Testa et al., 2004]. Although male and female alcohol use frequently co-occur [Abbey et al., 1998; Harrington and Leitenberg], female intoxication lowers a woman's ability to defend herself, perhaps making the use of force unnecessary to overcome her resistance [Abbey et al., 2004; Harrington and Leitenberg].

Sexual Coercion and Men's Self-Reports

Malamuth et al.'s [1991] confluence model provides the most comprehensive integration of variables predicting sexual coercion in men. Although the model does not distinguish between manipulation and force tactics, it offers a useful guide for variables to consider. These include childhood experiences with family violence, delinquency (including alcohol use), sexual motives, and attitudes. An extensive body of research has documented the relationship between childhood experiences with physical abuse and sexual coercion in intimate relationships [Wolfe and Wekerle, 1997]. Experiencing or witnessing violence in childhood has been associated with an increased risk of physical violence in intimate relationships in adulthood [Gwartney-Gibbs et al., 1987; Davis and Petretic-Jackson, 2000; White and Widom, 2003]. Overall, prior experiences with and attitudes supportive of violence and dominance should be greater in men who use force than those who use manipulation. For example, Kosson et al. [1997] found that the threat of or use of force was associated with a callous, remorseless exploitation of others, whereas abuse of one's authority was associated with narcissistic attributes. Men with an impulsive, unstable, antisocial lifestyle tended to use manipulative and exploitative behaviors and verbal pressure, but not force or threat of force. Byers and Eno [1991] found that men who used physical force were more accepting of interpersonal violence and reported more sexual arousal than did men who used verbal pressure. Men who used verbal pressure, however, reported more frequent and longer lasting dating relationships. Christopher et al. [1998] found that men who used force had peers who were similarly aggressive, more so than men who used verbal pressure or lies. Men who used force also endorsed rape myths more so than men who used verbal pressure, with both groups being different from men who engaged in only consensual sex. Shotland [1992] theorized that men who use physical violence during a sexually coercive incident have a stronger need for

control and are more motivated by dominance than men who sexually coerce without using violence; thus these men may be less motivated by love. Men who use force may also have a history of alcohol use, as frequent drinking and intoxication predicts the use of alcohol/drugs during a sexual assault incident [White and Humphrey, 1994] and men who frequently become intoxicated use more aggression during sexually coercive incidents [Ullman et al., 1999a].

The Present Study

The goal of this study was to examine the differences in the tactics used to obtain sex. We compared men who had engaged in only consensual sex with men who reported using manipulation and men who reported using force in a sexually coercive incident on a number of person and situational variables. Our overarching hypothesis was that men who use force, men who use manipulation, and men who engage in only consensual sex constitute discriminable groups. Men who use manipulative tactics will fall between men who use force and men who engage in only consensual sex. Owing to the suggested "normative" nature of manipulative tactics [Byers and Eno, 1991; Muehlenhard and Peterson, 2004], we hypothesize that men who used these tactics should be more similar to men who use consent than men who use force. Furthermore, incidents involving force will involve

1. a less well-established relationship between the male and female,
2. with less prior sexual contact, and
3. more alcohol use by both the male and female.

In addition to situational factors, we hypothesize that several person variables will be associated with tactic use. On the basis of the literature reviewed above, men who use force, in contrast to manipulation, will have

4. experienced more childhood physical violence, sexual abuse, and witnessed more domestic violence;
5. attitudes more supportive of violence toward women and traditional gender roles;
6. a stronger history of frequent drinking and intoxication;
7. greater hedonistic or dominance motives for sex, but will be *less* motivated by love; and
8. engaged in more delinquent behaviors in adolescence.

METHOD

Participants

This study is drawn from the first wave of data from a larger longitudinal study regarding sexual assault perpetration and victimization [White and Humphrey, 1997]. Three incoming freshmen classes of men at a medium-sized state-supported university in the southeastern region of the US were invited to participate in a 5-year longitudinal study of social experiences; 65% of these men responded (N=835). Approximately 87.4% of these men were white, 9.3% were black, and 3.3% belonged to other ethnic groups. Participants were representative of the institution, which itself is representative of national state-supported universities [Carnegie Foundation, 1987]. Only men in the 18–20 years age range at the beginning of the study participated.

Procedure

Before the survey was administered its purpose and methods were explained and each participant signed a consent form. The survey was designed to assess various predictors, correlates, and consequences of interpersonal violence. Trained undergraduates administered the initial survey to students in mixed sex groups during the first session of fall orientation. Approximately 50% of new students attended. Students who did not attend an orientation session were contacted by telephone and invited to participate. They were given the option to attend a session being held on campus or to receive the survey via mail.

Adolescent sexual perpetration. Respondents were asked to indicate how many times since the age of 14 years they had committed each of the several sexual behaviors directed toward a woman, using the Sexual Experiences Survey [SES; Koss et al., 1987]. The SES is a well-established measure of sexual aggression, consisting of ten questions asking about a variety of sexual experiences, ranging from no experiences, only consensual experiences, to coercive ones. A sample item is, "Have you ever engaged in sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.?)" Men who had no sexual experiences were excluded from all analyses (n=230), leaving a total sample of N=621. For all analyses, men who reported only consensual experiences were labeled the consent group (n=432). To be assigned to the manipulation group, men had to report that they had some form of sexual contact with an unwilling woman by overwhelming her with continual arguments and pressure, using their authority, or deliberately giving her alcohol or drugs, yet not have endorsed any force items; this resulted in 150 cases. Men who reported that they had threatened to use or actually used some degree of force were assigned to the *force* group (n=39). Owing to the large number of men in the force group who also reported using manipulation (n=33), men were assigned to the force group regardless of whether they also reported manipulation, which may or may not have occurred in the same incident. These groups were defined according to the tactic used to obtain sex and not the outcome of the event.

Measures

Situational variables. Time constraints restricted men to describing the circumstances surrounding only their most coercive sexual experience, which was the last item on they endorsed on the SES. Men whose most coercive strategy was manipulation described that experience, whereas men who had used force reported on the context surrounding that event. The men described their relationship with the woman (*family member, stranger, casual acquaintance, friend, or girlfriend*) and why they were together (*casual, unplanned meeting; first date; a date, the second to fifth; a date, beyond the fifth; or another reason*), and the amount of sexual contact with the woman on a previous occasion (*none, only kissing and petting, sexual intercourse*). The men also indicated whether they were drinking and whether the woman was drinking, using a four-point scale, with 1=*no*; 2=*yes, but not intoxicated*; 3=*yes, somewhat intoxicated*; 4=*yes, very intoxicated*; 5=*don't know*.[1]

Person variables: childhood victimization. Three forms of childhood victimization were assessed (items taken from Koss et al., 1987). *Childhood sexual abuse* was defined as a sexual act perpetrated by an adult or any coercive sexual act perpetrated by a similarly aged peer, on the respondent before the age of 14 years, whether or not actual contact occurred [Wyatt, 1985]. Respondents reported on the frequency of four acts: Exposure to someone's sex organs or

exposing theirs; fondling of sexual organs or being asked to fondle someone else; attempted intercourse; or completed intercourse. A 1–5 coding system was used: 1= *never*; 2=*one time*; 3=*two times*; 4= *three to five times*; 5=*more than five times*. Cronbach's α for the present sample was .70. Respondents then indicated who the other person was (*stranger, older person, same aged person, older family member, or similar-aged family member*). A respondent was categorized as a childhood sexual abuse victim if he experienced any kind of sexual act (contact or non-contact) perpetrated by an adult, regardless of the inducement strategy used, or if a similarly aged peer used a coercive tactic, defined as threatening to hurt or punish or actual use of physical force. As reported in White and Smith [2004], 9.5% of the men were classified as childhood sexual abuse victims: 1.1% reported that the most severe form of coercive sexual experience involved a similar-aged peer or relative (.5% involved exposure and/or fondling; .6% involved attempted and/or completed sexual intercourse) and 8.4% experienced some sexual contact with an adult (5.4% experienced only exposure and/or fondling by an adult and 3% experienced attempted and/or completed sexual intercourse by an adult). *Parental physical punishment* was measured by asking respondents how often, in an average month, their parents or guardians used "physical blows" like hitting, kicking, and throwing someone down, against them. *Witnessing domestic violence* was assessed by asking respondents how often, during an average month, their parents/guardians delivered physical blows to one another. The measures of witnessing domestic violence and experiencing parental physical punishment were designed to capture children's recurrent experiences with violence in the home, rather than with a single occurrence, or with even a few, throughout childhood. It is the cumulative effects that produce the most negative outcomes [Repetti et al., 2002; Turner and Finkelhor, 1996]. For both measures of experiencing parental physical punishment and witnessing domestic violence, a five-point rating scale was used: 1=*never*, 2=*one to five times*, 3=*six to ten times*, 4=*11– 20 times*, 5=*over 20 times*.

Delinquency. Engaging in delinquent activities was assessed using the Elliott and Ageton [1980] measure in which respondents indicated how frequently they engaged in each of 11 delinquent behaviors in the past year (α=.83), using a five-point scale: 1=*none*, 2=*one*, 3=*two to five*, 4=*six to 10*, 5=*over 10*. Sample items included "purposely damage or destroyed property that did not belong to you"; "carried a hidden weapon other than a plain pocket knife"; "been loud, rowdy, or unruly in a public place."

Attitudes. Two subscales from Ashmore et al. [1995] 26-item Gender Attitude Inventory Attitudes were used to measure acceptance of male violence (five items; α=.65) and traditional gender attitudes (10 items; α=.67). Typical items included "In most cases, when a woman gets raped, she was asking for it" and "Women are generally more sensitive to the needs of others than men are." In all cases a five-point "*agree strongly*" to "*disagree strongly*" scale was used. Some items were reverse coded.

Motives for sex. A subset of items from Nelson [1979] Reasons for Sexual Behavior 28-item scale was used to measure hedonism (six items; α=.90), dominance (four items; α =.77), and love (eight items; α =.90) as motives for sex. Respondents indicated the extent to which each item described their reasons for engaging in sexual activity, using a five-point "*agree strongly*" to "*disagree strongly*" scale. Typical items included "Because I enjoy indulging my appetites";

"Because I like the feeling that I really have someone in my grasp"; "Because it's the way I show that I really care about someone."

History of intoxication. Men's typical alcohol use was measured by combining how often they drank alcohol in the past year, how many times they became drunk or pretty high in an average month, and how often in an average month they had five or more drinks in a row; each was measured using a five-point Likert scale. For the question "How often do you drink alcohol?" response options were 1=*I never drink or have not drunk in the past year*; 2=*I drink less than once a month but at least once in the past year*; 3=*I drink one to three times a month*; 4=*I drink one to two times a week*; 5=*I drink more than two times a week*. For the questions "In an average month, how many times do you have five or more drinks in a row?" and "How many times do you become drunk or pretty high in an average month?" response options were 1=*Never*, 2=*One time*, 3=*Two to five times*, 4=*Six to nine times*, 5=*Ten or more times*. Responses were cross-multiplied to create a history of intoxication index (α =82) [see Leonard and Mudar, 2004].

RESULTS

Types and frequency of coercive behaviors

Table I reports the number and percentage of men in each of the traditional SES categories by tactic group, as well as the percentage of men within each tactic group endorsing each item on the SES. Overall, 27.2% of the men reported no sexual experiences (and were dropped from the sample), 51% only consensual experiences, 11% unwanted contact, 4.7% verbal coercion, 1.1% attempted rape, and 5.1% rape. Within the manipulation tactic group the majority of men fell in the unwanted contact category (59.5%), followed by verbal coercion (27%); the remainder fell in the attempted and completed rape categories (13.5%). For the manipulation group, it is clear that verbal pressure for sex play (88.7%) and sexual intercourse (33.3%) were the two items most frequently endorsed. Within the force group, the majority of men fell into the attempted or completed rape categories (86.5%). Almost half this group endorsed each of the force items as well as the manipulation items. Men in the force group reported an average of 2.08 force items (averaged across the four items) and a mean of 2.37 manipulation items (averaged across six items), which was significantly greater than the manipulation average for the manipulation group (M=1.44), t(187)=8.77, P<.001. Additionally, men in the consent group (M=4.26) and manipulation group (M=4.05) reported significantly more consensual sexual experiences than did men in the force group (M=3.26), F(2)=11.97, P<.001.

The combination of person and situational variables that best discriminates the tactic groups

The overarching hypothesis is that men who use coercive strategies differ from men who use consent. Thus, a stepwise discriminant function analysis (DFA) was conducted to identify the best set of person and situational variables that discriminated between tactic groups, and to predict group classification based on these variables on the basis of a priori probabilities.[2] A stepwise DFA takes into account the intercorrelated nature of the variables (see Table II) and identifies the best subset of variables for discriminating between the groups when there are no a priori hypotheses concerning the ordering of variables; furthermore, it allows for the pairwise comparison of groups (i.e., an F to test the significance of the Mahalanobis' distance between groups) [Tabachnick and Fidell, 1989]. A solution was reached in six steps, Wilks' λ=.74, P<.001, with two significant functions, the first accounting for 72.5% of the variance and the second accounting for 27.5%. The variables, in order of magnitude contributing to the DFA,

were witnessing domestic violence, dominance as a motive for sex, acceptance of male violence toward women, parental physical punishment, whether the victim was a girlfriend, and prior sexual contact. Additionally, the DFA pairwise comparisons indicated that all three groups were significantly different from each other at $P<.001$ on all but frequency of intoxication, beyond the fifth date, and prior sexual contact (See Table III). According to the canonical discriminant function coefficients, witnessing domestic violence, acceptance of male violence, whether the victim was a girlfriend, and prior sexual contact contributed the most to the first function, whereas witnessing domestic violence (negatively valenced), parental physical punishment, and domination as a motive for sex contributed to the second. The squared canonical correlation coefficients to determine the effect size of each function [Merther and Vannatta, 2005] revealed that tactic group accounts for 28% of variance explained, mostly because of the first function. Examination of the centroids and territorial map indicate that the first function most clearly discriminated between the force (1.76) and both manipulation (.20) and consensual (—.25) groups, which although significantly different, were closer together.

Cross-validated classification results indicated that 70.9% of the total sample was correctly classified. When separated by tactic group, 91.6% of the consensual, 16.9% of the manipulation, and 46.2% of the force group were correctly classified. These percentages significantly improved classification beyond chance when prior group probabilities were compared with observed classification, $\chi^2(4)=217.51$, $P<.001$. This result was primarily because of the successful classification of men into the consent and force groups beyond chance. Misclassification was due primarily associated with assigning men who belonged in the manipulation group to the consent group.

Person variables

According to the univariate *F* tests provided by the DFA, the groups differ on all variables except history of intoxication. Follow-up means comparisons were conducted using Dunnett's post hoc tests, which tested the directional hypotheses that the manipulation and force groups would be significantly different from the consensual group. Although the cells in each tactic group are discrepant, an ANOVA is generally robust to violations of the normality of variance assumption [Harris, 1998]. With the exception of traditional gender role attitudes and history of intoxication, all variables distinguished men who used consent and men who used either manipulation or force in the hypothesized directions; men who used consent scored the lowest on these variables, with the means for manipulation in the middle and the means for force at the extreme end. For love as a motive for sex, the manipulation and consent groups were not different, yet both had means higher than the force group. For traditional gender role attitudes, men who used consent endorsed these attitudes more than men who used manipulation but not more than force. Further comparisons revealed that men who used force were significantly different in the hypothesized direction from men who used manipulation with regard to witnessing domestic violence, child sexual abuse, acceptance of male violence, and love as a motive for sex. Contrary to hypotheses, however, men who used manipulation and men who used force did not significantly differ on the frequency of parental physical punishment, delinquency, traditional gender role attitudes, and dominance and hedonism as motives for sex. Although groups did not differ on the frequency of parental physical punishment, a χ^2 analysis revealed that men in the force group (43.2%) were significantly more likely than men in the manipulation group (5.7%) or consent group (3.1%) to report at least one instance of both

parental physical punishment and witnessing domestic violence in a typical month while growing up, $\chi^2(6)=107.14$, $P<.001$ (this analysis compared no childhood experiences, only parental physical punishment, only witnessing domestic violence, and both parental physical punishment and witnessing domestic violence). Similarly, more men in the force group (33.3%) reported at least one instance of childhood sexual abuse than men in the manipulation group (10.1%) or consent group (7.2%), $\chi^2(2)=16.6$, $P<.001$.

Situational variables. Table IV shows the percentage of men reporting the presence of each situational variable by tactic group. χ^2 were computed to further explore the nature of the group differences. Examination of standardized residuals permitted identification of cells contributing significantly to the overall χ^2; standardized residuals greater than or equal to 1.96 are indicative of a cell's contribution to the significance of the χ^2 at $P=.05$ [Sheskin, 2003]. As hypothesized, force was more likely to be associated with a casual relationship than was manipulation or consent. That is, girlfriends were least likely to be identified as the target by men in the force group (37.0%), whereas men in the manipulation group were more likely than expected to report that the target was not a girlfriend (39.8%), but were still more likely to report that she was a girlfriend (60.2%) than men in the force group. Men in the consent group were, as expected, likely to identify the target as a girlfriend (77%), (60.2%), $\chi^2(4)=12.03$, $P<.001$. Because of a strong association between being a girlfriend and the event occurring beyond the fifth date, a similar pattern was found; force was less likely to be associated with being together beyond the fifth date (27%) than was consent (54.2%) or manipulation (42.6%), $\chi^2(4)=4.42$, $P<.01$. Unexpectedly, the amount of prior sexual contact did not differ according to tactic group, $\chi^2(2)=3.74$, $P>.05$. In fact, most men in each tactic group had some prior sexual contact with the woman (consent, 80.0%; manipulation, 71.7%; force, 80%). However, as predicted, perpetrator alcohol use, and intoxication in particular, was associated with tactic group. The percentage of men who were not drinking significantly declined from 80.8% for the consent group to 65.6% for the manipulation group to 44.4% for the force group, $\chi^2(4)=36.74$, $P<.001$. Furthermore, the percentage of men who were drinking *and also* intoxicated increased (8.9%, 24.2%, 38.9%), respectively as a function of group: consent, manipulation, or force. Because of the high correlation between his drinking and her drinking ($r=.83$), a similar pattern of results were found for her drinking, (9.0, 18.1, and 31.4%, respectively), $\chi^2(4)=31.08$, $P<.001$.[3]

DISCUSSION

This study indicates that sexually coercive men who use manipulative tactics and those who use force or threat of force constitute meaningfully different groups. The results show a unique subset of person and situational factors that discriminate between these two groups. Consistent with expectations, men who used force differed from men who used manipulation in their experiences with and attitudes about violence. Specifically, men who used force were more likely to have witnessed domestic violence, experienced child sexual abuse, were more accepting of male violence, and reported lower levels of love as a motive for sex than men who used manipulation or consent. In addition, men in the force group were more likely to be with a woman who was not a girlfriend, before the fifth date, and to be drinking and intoxicated than men in the manipulation group or consent group.

The manipulation group was intermediate regarding the girlfriend status of the target. These men were more likely to be involved with a girlfriend than were those in the force group, but less than

those in the consent group. The manipulation group was also less likely to use alcohol during the assault than the consent group. Perhaps manipulation is selectively used by men in more "romantic" situations to talk a girlfriend into sex. Research suggests that men may feel greater entitlement to sex in a long-term relationship [Abbey et al., 2001; Emmers-Sommer and Allen, 1999]; these men may prefer manipulation as a strategy to obtain sex. In contrast, if a couple has just begun dating, they are less likely to know each other's limits or to have discussed acceptable sexual behavior. In casual dating, both partners have less information about each other [Shotland, 1992] and may be in social situations involving alcohol use [Ullman, 2003]; this study suggests that force is more likely to occur in this situation. The fact that more men in the force group reported alcohol use by both parties is noteworthy because one could argue that the potential confounding of group assignment with reports of situational drinking might skew the pattern in the opposite direction. It is also important to remember that the participants in this study reported on adolescent experiences. The fact that these are cases of underage drinking underscores the importance of examining alcohol and tactic use at different ages in future research. A different pattern is likely to emerge with older males.

The strength of the DFA in this study is that it takes into account the intercorrelated nature of the variables, which revealed the best combination of person and situational variables associated with tactic use. Although the DFA revealed the importance of witnessing domestic violence, acceptance of male violence toward women and status of the victim as a girlfriend, other variables should not be discounted. Situational contexts tend to co-occur; having a date with a less familiar woman with little to no prior sexual contact may happen in an environment promoting the use of alcohol—or the presence of alcohol may encourage behaving sexually toward a woman not well known to the man [Abbey et al., 1996; Ullman et al., 1999b]. In addition, the univariate ANOVAs indicated that sexual coersion tactics were significant for all variables except history of intoxication, suggesting that a composite of numerous intercorrelated variables differentiated the groups. As discussed further below, the lack of a relationship between tactic use and history of intoxication is likely due to men's reporting on only adolescent experiences.

Although the current data do not allow for causal inferences, we can speculate that it is probable that sexually coercive men choose situations that facilitate coercive sexual interactions based on their personality. It is less likely (although not impossible) that the situation creates the coercion. It is more likely that person factors drive the intention to either create or take advantage of the context. If observed across time, would some men in the manipulation group use force in some future situation or would they persist in never going beyond using manipulative tactics? Given that on almost all variables studied men in the manipulation group fell between men in the force and consensual group, it is possible that at least some of these men may eventually become men who use force. A man's willingness to go forward with force if manipulation fails may distinguish the use of force from manipulation. If men are able to obtain sex via manipulation they do; that is, they may only try as hard as necessary. Men who did not go further probably did not either because they were successful or because they did not have those personality characteristics that might propel them to cross the line. Those personality characteristics appear to be a past history of witnessing domestic violence and childhood sexual abuse, combined with attitudes accepting of violence. Men who use force may be opportunistic aggressors by using whichever tactic best fits the situation. A developmental perspective would suggest that

childhood experiences set the stage for a male to learn not only coercive strategies for resolving conflicts or getting his way but may also distort his perceptions of normal relationship dynamics [White et al., 2001]. These early experiences may contribute to an increased likelihood of endorsing violence against women and may make negotiating heterosexual relationships more difficult, both reducing the likelihood of consensual sexual relationships and increasing the likelihood of force, particularly if manipulative strategies do not work. What might contribute to some men drawing the line at manipulation? First, they have fewer childhood victimization experiences so may have a less dysfunctional view of relationships; they may, for whatever reason, be more capable of developing a sense of love and commitment which helps them develop and maintain a more long-term relationship and protect them from force or threat of force.

Further research should more carefully investigate specific episodes of sexual coercion to discover whether or when men who use force may also use manipulative tactics. The question is whether under different situational circumstances the same men would use different tactics. A comparison of circumstances involving consensual sex with those involving some form of coercion among sexually aggressive men is also warranted. A longitudinal perspective into tactic choice would also provide needed answers regarding consistency in the use of manipulation or force across situations for men with different histories and personalities.

Although others have found that sexual precedence distinguishes verbal sexual coercion from forceful tactics [Abbey et al., 2004; Testa et al., 2003], in this study we found no differences between the groups. This may be because of the amount of missing data for this question. It could also be related to a lack of success with obtaining consensual sexual intercourse, especially for men in the force group, who reported significantly fewer consensual experiences than the other men. Another possible reason for these inconsistencies may be this study's use of perpetrators' self-reports to obtain this information in contrast to victims' self-report obtained in other studies. It would not be surprising to find different perspectives from perpetrators and victims. A more consistent picture of the differences among sexually aggressive men will arise as more researchers make distinctions between men based on the tactics used to obtain unwanted sex.

Although this study extends our knowledge of sexually coercive men and is one of the few to provide information about tactic use, the reliance on retrospective self-report is a limitation. Given the nature of the behaviors they are reporting and the timespan covered (ages 14–18 years), it is possible that these men either did not remember or did not wish to reveal the events as they actually occurred. Furthermore, in this study men were reporting on only adolescent experiences. It is likely that their sexual behaviors, motives, and attitudes will change as they grow into adulthood [Seiffge-Krenke, 2003]. The age range may be one reason why no differences were found on delinquency and hedonistic and dominance motives for sex. Another limitation is that although participants were separated into three different groups based on tactics, it is possible that men who admitted to using both force and manipulation may be reporting about the same event in which both tactics were used. Nevertheless, several situational factors discriminated between the groups; thus to some extent, men were describing different occasions.

The implications for sexual assault prevention education are several. It appears that the context for manipulation is the one in which young women may have begun to develop trust and thus be less vigilant for danger cues [Norris et al., 1996]. The use of manipulative tactics by a boyfriend found in this study may be the type of experience that women are less likely to view as sexual assault or rape [Kahn, 2003], and may even view as acceptable [McAuslan et al., 1998] or a conventional part of the dating experience [Byers and Eno, 1991; Muehlenhard and Peterson, 2004]. This view is in part supported by our finding that a large number of men who used manipulation were misclassified into the consent group in the DFA. Although manipulators are not as physically dangerous as men who use force, their strategies could be insidious in the long term. Women who experience verbally coerced intercourse feel heightened levels of depression, anxiety, and anger [Zweig et al., 1999]. It is likely that coercive interpersonal strategies, possibly learned in a coercive family environment, would extend into adolescent and adult dating relationships, suggesting the need for early intervention. The men who use manipulative tactics may be the most open to intervention efforts. If targeted early enough, these men may be less likely to offend or reoffend, whereas men who use force may pose more of a challenge for sexual assault prevention education. Their greater experiences with childhood sexual abuse and witnessing domestic violence may weaken the effects of typical psycho-educational programs used on college campuses [Lonsway, 1996]. The numerous psychological consequences of these early negative experiences likely mediate the relationship between childhood experiences and later sexually coercive behavior in ways that necessitate more extensive intervention [Loh and Gidycz, 2006]. Therefore, rape deterrent programs for women should also focus on defining sexual coercion involving boyfriends. Effective rape prevention programs for men should explicitly distinguish between men who use only manipulation and men who use threat or force. Such specificity in depicting different types of sexual assault may increase the chances that potential victims may learn to recognize risky situations, while adjusting perpetrators' attitudes and expectancies regarding their dates. At the very least, rape deterrent and prevention programs should address the issue of manipulation and power in ongoing relationships as well as the more traditional topics of attitudes and substance use.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Funding for this study was provided by National Institutes of Mental Health (R01MH45083), National Institute of Justice, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 98WTVX0010, to the second author. Along with approval from the university's Institutional Review Board, a federal Certificate of Confidentiality from the National Institute of Mental Health was obtained.

REFERENCES

Abbey A, Ross LT, McDuffie D. 1996. Alcohol and dating risk factors for sexual assault among college women. Psychol Women Q 20:147–169.

Abbey A, McAuslan P, Ross LT. 1998. Sexual assault perpetration by college men: The role of alcohol, misperception of sexual intent, and sexual beliefs and experiences. J Soc Clin Psychol 17: 167–195.

Abbey A, McAuslan P, Zawacki T, Clinton AM, Buck PO. 2001. Attitudinal, experiential, and situational predictors of sexual assault perpetration. J Interpers Violence 16:784–807.

Abbey A, Clinton AM, McAuslan P, Zawacki T, Buck PO. 2002. Alcohol-involved rapes: Are they more violent? Psychol Women Q 26:99–109.

Abbey A, Clinton-Sherrod AM, McAuslan P, Zawacki T, Buck PO. 2003. The relationship between the quantity of alcohol consumed and the severity of sexual assaults committed by college men. J Interpers Violence 18:813–833.

Abbey A, BeShears R, Clinton-Sherrod M, McAuslan P. 2004. Similarities and differences in women's sexual assault experiences based on tactics used by the perpetrator. Psychol Women Q 28: 323–332.

Atmore C. 1999. Victims, backlash, and radical feminist theory (or, The morning after they stole feminism's fire). In: Lamb S, (ed). "New Visions of Victims: Feminist Struggle with the Concept," New York: New York University Press.

Ashmore RD, Del Boca FK, Bilder SM. 1995. Construction and validation of the Gender Attitude Inventory, a structured inventory to assess multiple dimensions of gender attitudes. Sex Roles 32:753–785.

Byers ES, Eno RJ. 1991. Predicting men's sexual coercion and aggression from attitudes, dating history, and sexual response. J Psychol Hum Sex 4:55–70.

Carnegie Foundation. 1987. "A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education." Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Christopher FS, Madura M, Weaver L. 1998. Premarital sexual aggressors: A multivariate analysis of social, relational, and individual variables. J Marriage Fam 60:56–69.

Cleveland HH, Koss MP, Lyons J. 1999. Rape tactics form the survivors' perspective: Situational dependence and within-event independence. J Interpers Violence 14:532–547.

Davis JL, Petretic-Jackson PA. 2000. The impact of child sexual abuse on adult interpersonal functioning: A review and synthesis of the empirical literature. Aggression Violent Behav 5:291–328.

Elliott DS, Ageton SS. 1980. Reconciling race and class differences in self-reported differences in self-reported and official estimates of delinquency. Am Sociological Rev 45:95–110.

Emmers-Sommer TM, Allen M. 1999. Variables related to sexual coercion: A path model. J Soc Pers Relationships 16: 659–678.

Gavey N. 1999. 'I wasn't raped, but/p./p./p./p.': Revisiting definitional problems in sexual victimization. In: Lamb S, (ed). "New Visions of Victims: Feminist Struggle with the Concept," New York: New York University Press.

Groth AN, Hobson WF. 1997. The dynamics of sexual assault. In: Schlesinger LB, Revitch E, (eds). “Sexual Dynamics of Anti-Social Behavior,” Springfield, IL: Thomas, pp 158–170.

Gwartney-Gibbs PA, Stockard J, Bohmer S. 1987. Learning courtship aggression: The influence of parents, peers, personal experiences. Fam Relations: J Appl Fam, Child Studies 36: 276–282.

Hall GC, Nayayama, Hirschman R. 1991. Toward a theory of sexual aggression: A quadripartite model. J Consult Clin Psychol 59: 662–669.

Harrington NT, Leitenberg H. 1994. Relationship between alcohol consumption and victim behaviors immediately preceding sexual aggression by an acquaintance. Violence Vict 9:315–324.

Harris MB. 1998. “Basic Statistics for Behavioral Science Research, 2nd edition.” Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Humphrey JA, White JW. 2000. Women’s vulnerability to sexual assault from adolescence to young adulthood. J Adolesc Health 27:419–424.

Kahn AS. 2003. Carolyn Sherif award address: What college women do and do not experience as rape. Psychol Women Q 28:9–15.

Koss MP, Gidycz CA, Wisniewski N. 1987. The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. J Consult Clin Psychol 55:162–170.

Kosson DS, Kelly JC, White JW. 1997. Psychopathy-related traits predict self-reported sexual aggression among college men. J Interpers Violence 12:241–254.

Lamb S. 1999. “New Visions of Victims: Feminists Struggle with the Concept,” New York: New York University Press.

Leonard LE, Mudar P. 2004. Husbands’ influence on wives’ drinking: Testing a relationship motivation model in the early years of marriage. Psychol Addict Behav 18:340–349.

Loh C, Gidycz CA. 2006. A prospective analysis of the relationship between childhood sexual victimization and perpetration of dating violence and sexual assault in adulthood. J Interpers Violence 21:732–749.

Lonsway KA. 1996. Preventing acquaintance rape through education: What do we know? Psychol Women Q 20:229–265.

Malamuth NM, Sockloskie RJ, Koss MP, Tanaka JS. 1991. Characteristics of aggressors against women: Testing a model using a national sample of college students. J Consult Clin Psychol 59:670–681.

McAuslan P, Abbey A, Zawacki T. 1998. Acceptance of pressure and threats to obtain sex and sexual assault. Paper presented at the SPSSI Convention, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Muehlenhard CL, Peterson ZD. 2004. Conceptualizing sexual violence: Socially acceptable coercion and other controversies. In: Miller AG, (ed). "The Social Psychology of Good and Evil," New York, NY, US: Guilford Press, pp 240–268.

Merther CA, Vannatta RA. 2005. "Advanced and Multivariate Statistical Methods: Practical Application and Interpretation, 3rd edition." USA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Nelson PA. 1979. Personality, sexual functions, and sexual behavior: An experiment in methodology. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida.

Norris J, Nurius PS, Dimeff LA. 1996. Through her eyes: Factors affecting women's perception of and resistance to acquaintance sexual aggression threat. Psychol Women Q 20:123–145.

Repetti RL, Taylor SE, Seeman TE. 2002. Risky families: Family social environments and the mental and physical health of offspring. Psychol Bull 128:330–366.

Seiffge-Krenke I. 2003. Testing theories of romantic development from adolescence to young adulthood: Evidence of a developmental sequence. Int J Behav Dev 27:519–531.

Sheskin D. 2003. "Handbook of Parametric and Nonparametric Procedures, 3rd edition." Chapman & Hall/CRC, 526p.

Shotland RL. 1992. A theory of the causes of courtship rape: Part 2. J Soc Issues 48:127–143.

Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS. 1989. "Using Multivariate Statistics, 2nd edition." New York: Harper Collins.

Testa M, Dermen KH. 1999. The differential correlates of sexual coercion and rape. J Interpers Violence 14:548–561.

Testa M, Livingston JA. 1999. Qualitative analysis of women's experiences of sexual aggression: Focus on the role of alcohol. Psychol Women Q 23:573–589.

Testa M, Livingston JA, VanZile-Tamsen C, Frone MR. 2003. The role of women's substance use in vulnerability to forcible and incapacitated rape. J Studies Alcohol 64:756–764.

Testa M, Vanzile-Tamsen C, Livingston JA. 2004. The role of victim and perpetrator intoxication on sexual assault outcomes. J Stud Alcohol 65:320–329.

Tyler KA, Hoyt DR, Whitbeck LB. 1998. Coercive sexual strategies. Violence Vict 13:47–61.

Turner HA, Finkelhor D. 1996. Corporal punishment as a stressor among youth. J Marriage Fam 58:155–166.

Ullman SE. 2003. A critical review of field studies on the link of alcohol and adult sexual assault in women. Aggr Violent Behav 8:471–486.

Ullman SE, Karabatsos G, Koss MP. 1999a. Alcohol and sexual aggression in a national sample of college men. Psychol Women Q 23:673–689.

Ullman SE, Karabatsos G, Koss MP. 1999b. Alcohol and sexual assault in a national sample of college women. J Interpers Violence 23:673–689.

White JW, Humphrey JA, 1994. Alcohol/Drug Use and Sexual Aggression: Distal and Proximal Influences. Paper presented at XI World Meeting: International Society for Research on Aggression, Delray Beach, Florida.

White JW, Humphrey JA. 1997. A longitudinal approach to the study of sexual assault. In: Schwartz M, (ed). "Researching Sexual Violence Against Women. Thousand Oaks," CA: Sage Publications, Inc., pp 22–42.

White JW, Donat PLN, Bondurant B. 2001. A developmental examination of violence against girls and women. In: Unger R, (ed). "Handbook of the Psychology of Women and Gender," New York: Wiley, pp 343–357.

White HR, Widom CS. 2003. Intimate partner violence among abused and neglected children in young adulthood: The mediating effects of early aggression, antisocial personality, hostility and alcohol problems. Aggr Behav 29:332–345.

White JW, Smith PH. 2004. Sexual assault perpetration and reperpetration: From adolescence to young adulthood. J Crim Justice Behav 31:182–202.

White JW, Kadlec KM, Sechrist S. 2006. Adolescent sexual aggression within heterosexual relationships. In: Barbaree HE, Marshall WL, (eds). "The Juvenile Sex Offender," New York: Guilford Press.

Wolfe DA, Wekerle C. 1997. Pathways to violence in teen dating relationships. In: Cicchetti D, Toth S, (eds). "Developmental Perspectives on Trauma: Theory, Research, and Intervention," Rochester, NY, US: University of Rochester Press, pp 315–341.

Wyatt G. 1985. The sexual abuse of Afro-American and White-American women in childhood. Child Abuse Negl 9: 507–519.

Zweig JM, Crockett LJ, Sayer A, Vicary JR. 1999. A longitudinal examination of the consequences of sexual victimization for rural young women. J Sex Res 36:396–409.

NOTES

[1]Examination of the initial contingency tables for tactic groups by response options for the relationship variables (who was the female, why they were together, and prior sexual contact) revealed a number of cells had very small ns, indicating the need to collapse across several response options. For who was the female, options were dichotomized to girlfriend or not girlfriend. Why they were together was dichotomized as beyond the fifth date or not beyond the fifth date (labeled casual). For prior sexual contact, the responses were some contact versus no contact.

[2]DFA requires complete data on each case, thus the complete sample could not be used. However, an examination of the pattern of missing data did not indicate any systematic biases. For the person variables, with the exception of history of intoxication (6% missing), less than 5% of the data were missing for any given variable. However, for the contextual variables, 25% of the sample was missing data on at least one variable. These men were most likely to have been in the consensual group. A series of t-tests, with a Bonferroni adjustment, revealed no significant differences between those who did or did not provide data for the contextual variables on any of the person variables. Additionally, the DFA was also run with option to replace missing data with the mean. The results did not change.

[3]The SES questions regarding deliberately giving a woman alcohol or drugs that were used to classify men as using manipulation could possibly be confounded with alcohol use during the incident. To test this possibility, men who reported using alcohol or drugs as a tactic were dropped from the sample and all analyses were re-run without these men. The number of men in the manipulation group became 108 and the men in the force group dropped to 15. The pattern of results for men's alcohol use during incident did not change when these men were dropped from the sample. The women's alcohol use, however, did change, as it was no longer significantly different between the three tactic groups.

TABLES

Table I: Percentage of Men in Each Tactic Group by SES Category Endorsing Each Item on the Sexual Experiences Survey

	Tactic groups	
	Manipulation (*n*=148)	**Force (*n*=37)**
Unwanted contact	59.5% (*n*=88)	13.5% (*n*=5)
Used authority for sex play	4.1 (*n*=6)	53.8 (*n*=21)
Used verbal pressure for sex play	88.7 (*n*=133)	28.2 (*n*=11)
Used threat/force for sex play	0	56.4 (*n*=22)
Verbal coercion	27 (*n*=40)	0
Used authority for sexual intercourse	1.3 (*n*=2)	43.6 (*n*=17)
Used verbal pressure for sexual intercourse	33.3 (*n*=50)	61.5 (*n*=24)
Attempted rape	4.7 (*n*=7)	5.4 (*n*=2)
Deliberately gave alcohol/drugs for attempted sexual intercourse	10.0 (*n*=15)	48.7 (*n*=19)
Used threat/force for attempted sexual intercourse	0	56.4 (*n*=22)
Rape	8.8 (*n*=13)	81.1 (*n*=30)
Deliberately gave alcohol/drugs for sexual intercourse	8.7 (*n*=13)	48.7 (*n*=19)
Used threat/force for sexual intercourse	0	43.6 (*n*=17)
Used threat/force for other sexual acts	0	59.0 (*n*=23)

SES, Sexual Experiences Survey.

Table II: Point Biserial Intercorrelations Between the Variables Entered into the Discriminate Function Analysis

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Child sexual abuse	1.00														
Parental physical punishment	.2***	1.00													
Witness domestic violence	.25***	.35***	1.00												
Traditional gender role attitudes	.03	.07	.04	1.00											
Acceptance of male violence	.14***	.10***	.21***	.49***	1.00										
Delinquency	.22***	.21***	.16***	.02	.15***	1.00									
Domination	.17***	.07	.14***	.11**	.17***	.31***	1.00								
Hedonism	.20***	.07	.09*	.03	.12**	.36***	.69***	1.00							
Love	.03	.02	-.05	.03	-.01	.04	.41***	.36***	1.00						
Frequent intoxication	.12**	-.05	.04	.02	.11**	.54***	.24***	.28***	.14***	1.00					
A girlfriend	-.21***	-.15***	-.20***	.04	-.09	-.21***	-.13***	.15***	.10*	-.14**	1.00				
After the fifth date	-.21***	-.02	-.11*	-.02	-.03	-.15***	-.15***	.20***	.08	-.09	.53***	1.00			
Prior sexual contact	.04	.15***	.06	.04	.05	-.03	.03	-.01	.06	.02	.29***	.24	1.00		
Male use of alcohol	.12**	.13**	.18***	.06	.20***	-.30***	.15***	.18***	.00	.37***	-.40***	-.33***	-.17***	1.00	
Female use of alcohol	.010*	.16***	.20***	.11**	.21***	-.25***	.12***	.17***	.01	.32***	-.37***	-.30***	-.12***	.82***	1.00

*P<.05; **P<.01; ***P<.001.

Note. N ranges from 410 to 621 because of missing data.

Table III: Discriminant Function Analysis and ANOVA Results by Tactic Group

	Tactic Group							Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients[a]	
	Consent n=365		Manipulation n=128		Force n=35				
Variable	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	DFA 1	DFA 2
Child sexual abuse	2.14_a	3.49	2.90_b	4.00	6.14_c	5.84	18.78***		
Parental physical punishment	1.39_a	3.37	2.50_b	4.93	5.69_b	7.28	19.47***	.13	.44
Witnessing domestic violence	$.20_a$	1.06	$.36_b$	1.62	5.74_c	7.58	93.78***	.60	-.64
Acceptance of male violence	1.95_a	.74	2.18_b	.69	2.94_c	.86	30.71***	.49	.04
Traditional gender role attitudes	2.83_a	.52	2.58_b	.47	$2.74_{a,b}$	.51	2.98*		
History of intoxication	26.33_a	31.53	32.86_a	31.17	31.06_a	37.64	3.41*		
Delinquency	21.64_a	19.30	27.38_b	20.67	35.43_b	26.04	11.77***		
Domination	2.29_a	.93	2.83_b	.88	2.72_b	1.07	23.50***	.15	.76
Hedonism	2.72_a	1.06	3.18_b	.98	2.96_b	1.05	16.09***		
Love	3.47_a	.84	3.53_a	.85	3.02_b	.97	5.85**		
A girlfriend								-.41	-.15
After the fifth date									
Prior sexual contact								.37	-.12
Male use of alcohol									
Female use of alcohol									

Notes. Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ by P<.05. No cure coefficient due to missing data.

[a]Coefficients are given for only the five significant variables in the stepwise DFA.

ANOVA, analysis of variance; DFA, discriminant function analysis.

Table IV: Percentage of Men Reporting Presence of Situational Variables by Tactic Group

	Tactic Group					
	Consensual		Manipulation		Force	
Situational variables	**%**	**Standardized residual**	**%**	**Standardized residual**	**%**	**Standardized residual**
Male use of alcohol						
Not drinking	80.8	1.4	65.6	-1.1	44.4	-2.0
Drinking, not drunk	10.3	-.2	10.2	-.3	16.7	1.0
Drinking and drunk	8.9	-2.9	24.2	2.6	38.9	2.6
Female use of alcohol						
Not drinking	82.4	1.4	66.1	-1.2	45.7	-2.0
Drinking, not drunk	8.7	-1.5	15.7	1.4	22.9	2.0
Drinking and drunk	9.0	-2.2	18.1	1.6	31.4	3.0
Prior sexual contact						
No sexual contact	20.0	-.8	28.3	1.5	20.0	-.3
Some sexual contact	80.0	.5	71.7	-.8	80.0	.1
Relationship						
A girlfriend	77.0	1.6	60.2	-1.3	37.0	-2.3
Not a girlfriend	23.0	-2.1	39.8	2.0	63	2.1
Why together						
Beyond the fifth grade	54.2	1.3	42.6	-1.0	27.0	-1.9
Not beyond the fifth grade	45.8	-.6	57.4	.4	73	2.5

Note: n=432 for the consensual group, n=150 for manipulation, n=39 for force.