

GENDER ROLES, SEXUAL ASSERTIVENESS, AND SEXUAL COERCION IN SAME-SEX  
COUPLES

A Thesis prospectus  
presented in partial fulfillment of requirements  
for the degree of Master of Arts  
in the department of Psychology  
The University of Mississippi

by

LAVINA YING HO

September 2017

## Gender Roles, Sexual Assertiveness, and Sexual Coercion in Same-Sex Couples

Sexual assault is a prominent health and community issue, as approximately 1 in 5 women and 1 in 16 men report being sexually assaulted (Cantor et al., 2015; Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2007). In particular, sexual coercion refers to submission to “unwanted sexual behavior as a result of direct pressure, manipulation, or force” (Waldner-Haugrud, 1999). Sexual assault can result in negative health outcomes such as depression, anxiety, and posttraumatic stress disorder (Campbell, Dworkin, & Cabral, 2009).

Gender may be a factor in sexual coercion as women report more sexually submissive behavior and lower sexual satisfaction than men (Kiefer & Sanchez, 2007; Sanchez, Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Good, 2012). Moreover, women are more likely to engage in submissive sexual behaviors such as deferring to their partner’s desires and waiting for their partner to initiate the sexual interaction (O’Sullivan & Byers, 1992; Sanchez et al., 2012). Women also implicitly associate sex with submission, which leads them to engage in a submissive sexual role (Sanchez, Kiefer, & Ybarra, 2006). Kelly and Erickson (2007) found that men utilized more aggressive sexual behaviors than women. Both men and women viewed women as more submissive, giving, and emotional (Werner & LaRussa, 1985).

Gender role is typically defined as “the degree to which one associates closely with being either male or female” (Kelly & Erickson, 2007). Furthermore, it may play a role in sexual coercion as women are stereotyped as submissive while men are stereotyped as aggressive within sexual encounters. Sexually compliant heterosexual women were more likely to endorse traditional gender norms (Kennett, Humphreys, & Bramley, 2013). When men and women were sex-primed, they were more likely to endorse gender stereotypical beliefs (Hundhammer & Mussweiler, 2012). Seal, O’Sullivan, and Ehrhardt (2007) discussed how past literature on

sexual scripts, socially constructed beliefs regarding sexuality and sexual behavior (Simon & Gagnon, 1969) have examined “traditional” sexual scripts in which women are gatekeepers while men are initiators. In their qualitative study, they found that some men saw sexual compliance as the “man’s right” within the relationship context.

In a meta-analysis examining masculinity in relation to sexual aggression, Murnen, Wright, and Kaluzny (2002) found that hypermasculinity strongly predicted sexual aggression. Moreover, endorsing certain types of masculine attitudes such as the need to display toughness and independence predicted a history of sexual aggression in men (Truman, Tokar, & Fischer, 1996). Conformity to gender roles predicted lower sexual agency for women and higher levels of sexual agency for men (Kiefer & Sanchez, 2007). For women in particular, adhering to gender roles predicted sexual passivity. However, there have been mixed results as Kelly and Erickson (2007) found a weak, non-statistically significant correlation between masculinity and sexually aggressive behavior. These differences in findings may be due to psychometric issues associated with Bem’s Sex Role Inventory (Good, Borst, & Wallace, 1994).

Sexual assertiveness refers to the ability to initiate wanted sexual experiences, as well as the ability to refuse unwanted sexual experiences (Morokoff et al., 1997). For college women, initial sexual victimization has been found to correlate with lower sexual refusal assertiveness (Katz, May, Sorenson, & DelTosta, 2010). Additionally, women who have been re-victimized had lower levels of sexual assertiveness and sexual self-efficacy in comparison to women who had not been victimized (Kearns & Calhoun, 2010). The reverse of sexual assertiveness would be considered sexual passivity. Kiefer and Sanchez (2007) found that sexual passivity predicted less sexual satisfaction.

Relationships among masculinity, sexual coercion, and sexual assertiveness have been largely based on heterosexual samples. Recent reports suggest elevated prevalence rates of sexual assault among gay, lesbian, bisexual, and other non-heterosexual individuals (Edwards et al., 2015; Johnson, Matthews, & Napper, 2016; Martin, Fisher, Warner, Krebs, & Lindquist, 2011). There have been fewer studies examining gender roles and sexual assertiveness within lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer (LGBQ) individuals. The purpose of this study is to examine relationships among these variables in non-heterosexual couples. Following a review of sexual coercion and victimization among heterosexual men and women, sexual coercion and victimization among gay and lesbian individuals will be examined. The impact of gender role on sexual coercion will also be reviewed. Finally, the role of sexual assertiveness in sexual victimization/perpetration will be examined.

### **Sexual Coercion**

Sexual coercion encompasses a wide spectrum of force including physical force and psychological intimidation (World Health Organization [WHO], 2002). . It is defined as the “act of using pressure, alcohol or drugs, or force to have sexual contact with someone against his or her will” (Struckman-Johnson, Struckman-Johnson, & Anderson, 2003). Essentially, it can be conceptualized as “making another person engage in sexual activity despite his or her unwillingness to do so” (Brousseau, Bergeron, Hebert, & McDuff, 2011).

Initially, sexual coercion was understood as a form of sexual victimization perpetrated by men against women. As noted above, recent research has expanded the conceptualization of sexual coercion to include female perpetrators and male victims. When examining sexual coercion in a broader context with other forms of sexual violence such as unwanted sexual contact, noncontact unwanted sexual experiences, being forced to penetrate a perpetrator (0.6%

of women and 6.7% of men), prevalence rates increased to 43.9% for women and 23.4% for men (Breiding et al., 2011).

Sexual coercion rates for women have varied from 12.5% to 69%, while rates for men vary from 5.8% to 50%. Brousseau, Bergeron, Hebert, and McDuff (2011) surveyed Canadian undergraduate and graduate student couples and assessed sexual coercion victimization and perpetration. They found that 54.5% of couples reported an incident of sexual coercion, and 20% reported reciprocal sexual coercion where both partners experienced and perpetrated sexual coercion. Rapoza and Drake (2009) found that 35.5% of college men reported perpetrating sexual aggression, which encompassed acts of sexual coercion and threatened/forced sex, while 31.1% of college women reported experiencing sexual victimization. Similarly, in a sample of 2,149 German college students, 35.9% of women and 19.4% of men reported having experienced sexual aggression, including sexually coercive strategies and sexual acts (Krahe & Berger, 2013).

In a study of gender, sexual harassment, and sexual coercion among college men and women, Menard and colleagues (2003) administered measures of sexual coercion, child sexual abuse, adult sexual victimization, personality, nonsexual aggression, and sexual harassment. It was reported that men were three times more likely to engage in sexually coercive behaviors in comparison to women. While female victims reported mostly male perpetrators, perpetrators for male victims varied according to type of sexual violence (Breiding et al., 2011). Male victims of sexual coercion reported predominantly female perpetrators. Male rape victims reported predominantly male perpetrators.

Zinzow and Thompson (2015) examined sexual aggression in a sample of male college students. Participants were administered measures assessing experiences of sexual coercion,

characteristics of their first sexually coercive perpetration offense, peer norms, and rape supportive attitudes. Analyses revealed that 68% of participants who reported perpetrating sexual coercion and assault engaged in these behaviors on more than one occasion. The authors also found that rape supportive beliefs accounted for variance in the prediction of sexual coercion. Moreover, sexually aggressive beliefs also predicted sexually coercive repeat transgressors. Similarly, Struckman-Johnson et al. (2003) showed that men were more likely to report using sexually coercive tactics (e.g., persistent kissing and touching, removing clothes) than women (40.4% vs. 25.5%). Additionally, more women reported experiencing post-refusal sexual persistence tactics in comparison to men (78.2% vs. 57.8%).

Similar rates of sexual coercion have been found in community samples. Black and colleagues (2011) found that 12.5% of women and 5.8% of men reported experiencing sexual coercion in their lifetime. In the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey conducted by Black and colleagues (2010), sexual coercion included activities such as making false promises, threatening to end the relationship, or spreading rumors if the individual refused sex. Coercion included being pressured without the use of physical force into unwanted sexual anal, oral, or vaginal penetration. A review by Spitzberg (1999) of 120 studies revealed that 25% of women and 23% of men reported experiencing sexual coercion. The review demonstrated that women were also likely to engage in sexual coercion, as 29% of women and 24% of men perpetrated sexual coercion. Lottes and Weinberg (1997) reported 69% of U.S. women and 50% of U.S. men reported experiencing some form of nonphysical sexual coercion. They also noted that 45% of U.S. women reported experiencing some form of physical sexual coercion. Seventy-five percent of women and 69.7% of men who experienced sexual coercion stated that the perpetrator was an intimate partner (Black et al., 2010). Data from Campbell and Soeken's

(1999) survey revealed that 45.9% of battered women reported experienced forced sex by their intimate partner.

Being sexually coerced may have undesirable outcomes. Negative consequences associated with unwanted sexual experiences include disordered eating and depressive symptoms (Capitaine, Rodgers, & Chabrol, 2011). Other consequences of sexual coercion include elevated levels of anger, social isolation, depressed mood, and lower self-esteem (Zweig, 1997). Larimer, Lydum, Anderson, and Turner (1999) found that while men and women reported experiencing sexual coercion, men reported greater depressive symptoms following coercive sex. In order to determine whether emotional responses to sexual coercion differed in men and women, Kernsmith and Kernsmith (2009) administered measures of sexual coercion victimization, emotional responses to coercive behavior, and previous abuse experiences to undergraduate college students. Analyses revealed that relative to men, women reported higher victimization rates of coercion frequency. Furthermore, compared to women, male participants reported more positive emotional reactions to experiences of sexual coercion.

Sexual coercion is also associated with other sexual health risks. Turchik and Hassija (2014) observed that in comparison to women who reported no sexual victimization, women reporting sexual victimization were more likely to engage in greater drug use, problematic alcohol use, sexual risk taking, and sexual dysfunction. Similarly, in a qualitative study of women who had verbally sexually coerced their partner, sexually coercing their partner negatively influenced their relationship, and approximately one-fourth of the women engaged in self-blame for the sexual coercion (Livingston, Buddie, Testa, & VanZile-Tamsen, 2004).

The above review suggests that being sexually coerced is a frequently occurring phenomenon experienced by men and women. While common to both male and female

experience, type of sexually coercive act may vary by gender, and is associated with several undesirable consequences and significant health risks.

### **Sexual Coercion and Gender Roles**

Gender role refers to “behaviors, expectations, and role sets defined by society as masculine or feminine which are embodied in the behavior of the individual man or woman and culturally regarded as appropriate to males or females” (O’Neill, 1981). These beliefs are taught to children and modeled through processes of socialization, which may lead to restrictive attitudes and behaviors. When men or women engage in behaviors that are incongruent with their perceived gender, they may be punished or devalued for their deviations from their traditional roles. These processes often lead to a restriction in behaviors that become more aligned with their gender role. While the feminine gender role is characterized by expressiveness, empathy, and passivity (Bem, 1975; Harris, 1994), the masculine gender role is characterized by restricted emotionality, socialized control, homophobia, restrictive sexual and affectionate behavior, independence, and assertiveness (Bem, 1975; O’Neill, 1981). Although gender roles have been conceptualized in a myriad of ways, contemporary views conceptualize gender roles as the behavioral characteristics associated with being male or female. Early research often used the terminology sex roles to describe gender roles.

Sexual coercion has also been understood within a framework of gender roles and traditional sexual scripts that suggest what is expected of men and women in romantic contexts. Heteronormative beliefs refer to the cultural beliefs that men and women hold contrasting roles in sexual interactions, such as men being sexually dominant over women or women being passive. Heteronormative beliefs have been studied as an aspect of masculinity.

In a study of verbal sexual coercion and heteronormative beliefs among heterosexual college students, Eaton and Matamala (2014) predicted that heteronormative beliefs would be correlated with approval of verbal sexual coercion. They also predicted that endorsing heteronormative beliefs would be related to men's reports of perpetrating verbal sexual coercion, as well as women's victimization experiences with verbal sexual coercion. Measures of heteronormative beliefs (e.g., male dominance, male sexuality, and sexual double standards) were administered to a sample of 555 heterosexual undergraduate students. Regression analyses revealed that heteronormative attitudes, which included beliefs that men should dominate women, men are always ready for sex, and that men's sexual activity is more acceptable compared to women's, predicted a greater likelihood of accepting verbal sexual coercion in both men and women. Analyses also revealed that men and women who endorsed heteronormative attitudes reported having been a victim and/or perpetrator of verbal sexual coercion.

In a study of sex roles and sexual coercion among college men and women, Poppen and Segal (1988) hypothesized that men were expected to be perpetrators while females were expected to be victims. They also hypothesized that individuals with masculine traits would report using sexually coercive tactics more than individuals with feminine traits. Measures of sexual behaviors, reasons for engaging in unwanted sex, and sex roles were administered. Analyses demonstrated that participants who identified with a masculine sex role orientation were more likely to use sexually coercive strategies in comparison to participants who identified with other sex roles. It was suggested that people who identified with masculine roles were least likely to report having been sexually coerced using continual arguments, while people who identified with androgynous or feminine roles were most likely to have been sexually coerced through continual arguments.

In a study of gender role identity and coercive behaviors within male and female undergraduate students, Mahoney, Shively, and Traw (1986) examined factors associated with men and women experiencing and perpetrating sexual coercion. Measures of sexual experience, male macho personality, attitude towards female gender roles, and experience with coercive sexual behaviors were administered. Results showed that men who reported greater levels of hypermasculine traits were more likely to engage in sexual coercion in comparison to men who reported fewer hypermasculine traits.

Literature indicates that gender roles are an important factor in predicting sexual coercion. In particular, masculinity has been related to perpetrating sexual coercion, while femininity has been associated with experiencing sexual coercion. Gender roles may be useful in understanding sexually coercive behavior.

### **Sexual Assertiveness**

Although sexual assertiveness has been conceptualized as an amalgamation of various behaviors, it is defined as “a commitment to employ appropriate contraception, the ability to initiate sex with a partner, the ability to refuse unwanted sex, the capacity to communicate sexual desires and satisfaction, and/or the ability to discuss sexual history with a sexual partner” (Loshek, 2015). Sexual assertiveness is separate from general assertiveness as it focuses on communicating an individual’s sexual desires. Sexual assertiveness is correlated with greater sexual satisfaction and greater subjective sexual desire (Hulbert, 1991; Menard & Offman, 2009).

In a study designed to determine the role of sexual assertiveness on sexual victimization, Livingston, Testa, and VanZile-Tamsen (2007) assessed a large sample of women at three time-points over a two-year period. Measures of childhood sexual abuse, sexual victimization, sexual

assertiveness, depression, and posttraumatic stress disorder were gathered. Results revealed that women who reported low sexual refusal assertiveness at the first assessment point were more likely to experience re-victimization compared to women who did not report low sexual refusal assertiveness. Furthermore, women who experienced sexual victimization reported more difficulties with stopping unwanted sexual advances. The authors suggested that sexual assertiveness may serve as a protective factor against sexual coercion. Similar findings have been reported by Greene and Navarro (1998).

Katz, May, Sorensen, and DeTosta (2010) examined sexual re-victimization, self-blame, and sexual refusal assertiveness in a sample of 87 female college women at two time points over an academic year. Measures of sexual victimization, self-blame, and sexual assertiveness were administered. Analyses indicated that women who reported re-victimization at Time 2 were more likely to have reported self-blame and lower sexual refusal assertiveness at Time 1 in comparison to women who did not report re-victimization at Time 2. Path analyses revealed that initial victimization was associated with self-blame and subsequently, self-blame indirectly predicted re-victimization at Time 2 through lower sexual refusal assertiveness. The authors suggested that sexual victimization occurring within high school or at the beginning of women's college education may lead to self-blame of unwanted sexual experiences, which then may inhibit sexual assertiveness.

While considerable evidence suggests that sexual assertiveness may be a protective factor against sexual victimization, inconsistent results have been reported. Walker, Messman-Moore, and Ward (2011) administered measures of sexual victimization, number of sexual partners, refusal sexual assertiveness, and relational sexual assertiveness to 335 female college students. Correlational analyses revealed that greater sexual assertiveness was associated with lower rates

of verbal sexual coercion and rape. Moreover, analyses also suggested that women with low sexual assertiveness who had a higher number of sexual partners reported more experiences of sexual victimization. Surprisingly, sexual assertiveness did not moderate the relationship between number of sexual partners and verbal sexual coercion.

Research suggests that sexual assertiveness may influence an individual's response to sexual coercion. Data also indicate that sexual assertiveness level may mediate the relationship between an initial sexual coercion victimization and subsequent re-victimization (Kelley, Orchowski, & Gidycz, 2016). In sum, these studies suggest that higher sexual assertiveness is associated with fewer sexually coercive experiences, as well as future coercive experiences.

### **Sexual Coercion among Gay and Lesbian Individuals**

Research indicates that sexual violence is also problematic among gay, bisexual, lesbian, and queer individuals. Rothman, Exner, and Baughman's (2011) review noted that lifetime sexual assault ranged from 15.6% to 85% for lesbian or bisexual women, and 11.8% to 54% for gay or bisexual men. These rates are similar, if not greater, than those found among heterosexual couples. The authors highlighted differences between GLB and heterosexual prevalence rates of sexual assault as prevalence rates within the general population typically range from 11-17% for women and 2-3% for men. They also reported that lesbian and bisexual women were more likely to report adult sexual assault, lifetime sexual assault, and intimate partner sexual assault in comparison to gay and bisexual men. Similarly, in a sample of LGBTQ individuals, 41% reported that at least one of their sexual violence experiences occurred in a relationship with an intimate partner (Virginia Education Fund & Virginia Anti-Violence project, 2008). In a sample of LGBT adults seeking services for intimate partner violence, 41% of LGBT adults reported

that a partner had forced them to have sex, and 10% were forced to have sex with another individual (Heintz & Melendez, 2006).

Examination of sexual coercion experiences among GLBT individuals has also received attention and revealed little difference in victimization rates between gay men and lesbian women. Waldner-Haugrud and Gratch (1997) examined sexual orientation and sexual coercion with a lesbian or gay partner in a sample of 273 gay men and lesbian women. Measures of sexual orientation through Kinsey's Heterosexual-Homosexual Rating Scale and unwanted sexual behavior with a lesbian/gay partner were administered. Results revealed that 52% of the sample reported having experienced at least one sexually coercive incident. Chi-square analyses revealed that while gay men were not more likely to be victims of sexual coercion, gay men in this sample reported a higher average number of sexually coercive experiences than lesbian women. Authors suggested that although the gay men in their sample were not more likely to be classified as sexual coercion victims, the finding approached significance and a larger sample of gay men was needed to detect significant findings.

Waterman, Dawson, and Bologna (1989) examined sexually aggressive coercion, conflict tactics, and relational power in a sample of 34 gay and 36 lesbian adults. Results revealed that 12% of men and 31% of women reported having experienced sexual coercion, defined as being forced to engage in sex, by a current or recent partner. It was suggested that the higher reported rate of sexual coercion among lesbian women in comparison to gay men may be due to the longer reported relationship duration for lesbian women, and/or greater awareness of sexual coercion among lesbian women.

In a study of sexual health differences in lesbian, gay, bisexual and heterosexual individuals, Kuyper and Vanwesenbeeck (2011) conducted a study on 4,333 Dutch adults.

Several measures of sexual health, sexual behavior, minority stress, and sexual coercion were administered. Analyses revealed that bisexual women reported having experienced more sexual coercion than heterosexual women. Results also revealed that both bisexual and homosexual men reported more sexually coercive experiences in comparison to heterosexual men. Similarly, in a sample of Australian men and women de Visser, Smith, Rissel, Richters, and Grulich (2007) found that bisexual or lesbian women reported more sexually coercive experiences than heterosexual women. Similarly, analyses revealed that bisexual or gay men reported more sexually coercive experiences than heterosexual men.

Krahe and Berger (2013) examined sexual aggression, sexual victimization, engagement of sexual activity with opposite or same-sex partners, and alcohol consumption in a sample of 2,149 German college students. Chi-square analyses revealed that women who reported having sexual relationships with both opposite and same-sex partners reported the highest victimization and perpetration rates of sexual aggression compared to heterosexual women. Moreover, men who reported having sexual relationships with both opposite and same-sex partners reported greater sexual victimization by a female perpetrator compared to heterosexual men.

Menning and Holtzman (2014) examined unwanted sexual contact, sexual orientation, and characteristics of unwanted sexual contact in a sample of 195 male and female college students. Measures of unwanted sexual experiences, characteristics of unwanted sexual experiences, sexual orientation, gender identity, and sex were administered. Odds ratios, constructed by binary regression models, indicated that bisexual or homosexual orientations in men predicted unwanted sexual contact 3.5 times more than heterosexual men. In contrast, bisexual and homosexual orientations in women did not predict unwanted sexual contact for women.

Johnson, Matthews, and Napper (2016) examined sexual assault victimization, sexual orientation status, alcohol use, and gender in a sample of American college students. They hypothesized that gay men would report greater rates of sexual victimization than heterosexual men, and that bisexual men and women were more likely to report victimization than heterosexual men and women. They also predicted that men and women who questioned their sexual orientation were more likely to be sexually victimized than heterosexual individuals. Binomial logistic regression analyses revealed that gay men and bisexual students of both sexes were more likely than heterosexual students to report victimization including unwanted touching, attempted penetration, completed penetration, and sexually abusive relationships. Relative to heterosexual students, students who were unsure of their sexual orientation were more likely to report all types of victimization experiences measured except for sexually abusive relationships. Lesbian women did not report greater rates of sexual victimization than heterosexual individuals. Base rates indicated that transgendered students were 4.5 times more likely to report unwanted touching, completed penetration, and sexually abusive relationships relative to female college students.

In sum, prior research has demonstrated that gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals are often more likely to report prior experiences of unwanted sexual experiences such as sexual coercion, sexual aggression, and sexual assault. In particular, bisexual men and women have reported elevated victimization rates of unwanted sexual experiences. For some studies examined above, these acts occurred within the context of an intimate relationship with their partner.

**Gender Roles.** Several studies indicate that gender roles may play a key role in sexual victimization among non-heterosexual couples. VanderLaan and Vasey (2009) examined gender roles, sexual orientation, and sexual coercion in a sample of Canadian university and community

individuals. Measures of masculinity/femininity, aggressive tendencies, sexual coercion victimization, and sexual coercion perpetration were administered. Regression analyses demonstrated that non-heterosexual men perpetrated fewer non-physical sexually coercive acts than heterosexual men, but more than non-heterosexual women. Findings also indicated that relative to heterosexual men, non-heterosexual men scored lower on the Masculinity scale, but both heterosexual and non-heterosexual men reported greater verbal aggression in comparison to non-heterosexual women.

McConaghy and Zamir (1995) administered measures of sexual experiences, sex-linked behaviors, and sex roles to a sample of 182 Australian medical students. Results showed that 4% of men and women reported experiencing sexual coercion by someone of the same sex. Results also revealed that when lesbian women or gay men endorsed more masculine sex roles, they were more likely to engage in sexually coercive behaviors.

The above review suggests that sexual coercion is a common problem in heterosexual and non-heterosexual relationships. Moreover, regardless of sexual orientation data support the notion that masculine gender role identity is related to perpetration of sexual coercion, while feminine gender role identity is related to sexual coercion victimization. Data from studies of heterosexual relationships indicate that sexual assertiveness can be a protective factor for sexual coercion. The purpose of the present study is to examine relationships among sexual coercion, gender roles, and sexual assertiveness in a lesbian and gay sample. Measures of gender roles, sexual assertiveness, sexual coercion, and sexual orientation will be administered to a sample of lesbian women and gay men. It is expected that gender role and sexual assertiveness will predict sexual coercion perpetration and victimization. It is also anticipated that sexual assertiveness will moderate the relationship between gender role and sexual coercion victimization.

## Methods

### Participants

Participants will consist of men and women within the United States who are greater than 18 years of age and identify as gay or lesbian. In order to obtain adequate power and negate attrition a sample of approximately  $N = 375$  will be recruited.

### Measures

Participants will be asked to report information based on their personal characteristics such as age, sex, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and education. They will also be asked about their relationship status and if applicable, length of current relationship, prior sexual intimacy with partner, and quality of their current relationship.

**Sexual Victimization.** The revised Sexual Experiences Survey (SES-SFV; Koss et al., 2007) is a self-report measure consisting of 10 items to examine victimization of unwanted sexual experiences. The first 7 items regarding unwanted sexual acts are comprised of 5 additional questions that ask about the specific tactics used such as verbal coercion, disapproval or criticism, intoxication, threats of physical harm, and physical force. For the first 7 items, participants indicate how many of each unwanted sexual experience they have experienced within the past 12 months as well as since the age of 14 (e.g., 0, 1, 2, 3+). Due to this study's use of a non-heterosexual sample, gender-neutral pronouns will be utilized when referring to the perpetrator of the unwanted sexual experience. Although psychometric data were not provided in the original study by Koss and colleagues (2007), Johnson, Murphy, Gidycz (2017) administered the SES-SFV to a sample of 433 college women. They found the internal consistency for items for unwanted sexual experiences in the past 12 months to be .92, and test-retest reliability for

unwanted sexual experiences in the past 12 months between the first and third assessment to be 73%.

**Sexual Perpetration.** The Sexual Perpetration Survey (SES-SFP; Koss et al., 2006) is a similar self-report measure consisting of 10 items to examine perpetration of unwanted sexual experiences. The first seven items refer to various sexual behaviors that the participant may have engaged in (e.g., fondling, forced oral sex, penetration) through five coercive tactics within the past 12 months, as well as since the age of 14. Some items will be reworded as the current SES-SFP is based in some heteronormative language. Similarly, psychometric data were not provided in the original study by Koss and colleagues (2006), but a subsequent psychometric study by Johnson, Murphy, Gidycz (2017) whom administered the SES-SFP on a sample of 136 college men revealed that the internal consistency for perpetration of unwanted sexual experiences in the past 12 months to be .99 and the test-retest reliability between the first and third assessment for perpetration of unwanted sexual experiences in the past 12 months to be 91%. However, they also stated that endorsement of perpetrating unwanted sexual acts was generally low within their sample of male college students.

**Sexual Assertiveness.** The Sexual Assertiveness Questionnaire (SAQ; Loshek & Terrell, 2015) is an 18-item questionnaire that examines sexual assertiveness through three subscales that assess for communication about sexual initiation and satisfaction, refusal of unwanted sex, and sexual history communication. Each item is rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The communication about sexual initiation and satisfaction subscale encompasses items 1 through 8, the refusal of unwanted sex subscale comprises items 9 through 13, and the sexual history communication subscale encompasses items 14 to 18. Items 1, 2, 5, 10, 11, and 12 are reverse-coded. Each subscale is scored by taking

the mean of the responses for each subscale. Loshek & Terrell (2015) conducted an exploratory factor analysis and found three dimensions of communication consisting of sexual initiation and satisfaction, the ability to refuse unwanted sexual acts, and the ability to communicate sexual risk and prior sexual history. A confirmatory factor analysis was also conducted to ensure the fit of the factor structure for the SAQ utilizing the three dimensions. The Cronbach alpha coefficients for the three subscales were .79 (sexual initiation and satisfaction subscale), .78 (refusal subscale), and .81 (risk/prior history subscale). In addition, the overall Cronbach alpha coefficient for the Sexual Assertiveness Questionnaire was .878. Lastly, all three factors were found to be moderately correlated ( $.44 < r < .55, p < .001$ ).

**Gender Roles.** The Traditional Masculinity and Femininity (TMF) scale is a 6-item measure with each item rated on a Likert-type scale from 1 (*totally masculine*) to 7 (*totally feminine*) that assesses for gender role in the areas of gender role adoption, gender-role preference, and gender-role identity (Kachel, Steffens, & Niedlich, 2016). A sample item includes the statement “traditionally, my behavior would be considered as...” and then ranked from 1 to 7 for masculinity or femininity. Researchers conceptualized that femininity and masculinity lie on one bipolar dimension. Although the study was originally conducted in German, it has been translated to English. An exploratory principal axis factoring revealed a one-factor solution, and each item’s factor loadings ranging from 0.75 to 0.94. Cronbach alpha coefficients were found to be good for the overall scale ( $\alpha_{\text{TMF}} = 0.94$ ), as well as for the masculinity and femininity scales ( $\alpha_{\text{TMF-M}} = 0.89, \alpha_{\text{TMF-F}} = 0.90$ ). The TMF was found to be moderately correlated with other gender role measures such as the German Extended Personal Attributes Questionnaire and Bem’s Sex Role Inventory. Lastly, the TMF was also administered

to a sample of heterosexual men and women as well as lesbian women and gay men, as it was found to predict sexual orientation for men and women.

~~**Resilience.** The Brief Resilience Scale (BRS; Smith et al., 2008) is a 6-item measure that assesses the ability to bounce back or recover from stress. Each statement is rated a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). A sample item of this scale includes the statement, “It does not take me long to recover from a stressful event.” This measure is scored by reversing items 2, 4, and 6, and calculating the mean of all 6 items for a participant’s score. Regarding interpretation of the BRS, Smith et al. (2008) considered scores below 3.00 to be indicative of low resilience while scores above 4.30 to be indicative of high resilience. Cronbach alphas ranged from .80-.91 while test-retest reliability scores ranged from .62-.69 in two samples ranging from one to three months (Smith et al., 2008).~~

**Life Satisfaction.** The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) examines judgments of one’s overall life satisfaction through 5 self-rated statements which are rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) and 7 (*strongly agree*). A sample item of the SWLS asks participants to rate the statement, “If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.” Scores are summed for the 5 items and range in categories of extremely satisfied (31-35), satisfied (26-30), slightly satisfied (21-25), neutral (20), slightly dissatisfied (15-19), dissatisfied (10-14), and extremely dissatisfied (5-9). Cronbach alphas ranged from .85-.87 while test-retest reliability coefficients ranged from .82-.84 (Diener et al., 1985, Pavot, Diener, Colvin, & Sandvik, 1991).

## Procedures

Participants will be recruited online through social networking platforms such as Facebook.com, Twitter.com, and websites such as Reddit.com. Participants will additionally be

recruited from various organizations that serve the lesbian and gay community. Individuals will be asked to forward the survey to other adults who identify as lesbian and gay via the snowball sampling method. The survey will be administered on Qualtrics and personally identifying information will not be collected to ensure anonymity. Inclusion criteria will mandate that participants must be 18 or older, identify as a gay male or a lesbian female, and are currently in or have been in a romantic relationship with a same-sex partner. Participants will be introduced to the study through a standard email and undergo an informed consent process advising of confidentiality, what the survey entails, the right to withdraw from the survey at any time, and the potential risk related to reflecting upon unwanted sexual experiences before proceeding to the study.

After the informed consent process all measures will be administered. The order of measure administration will consist of counterbalanced presentation of sexual assertiveness and gender roles measures, followed by sexual victimization and perpetration measures. [Life satisfaction?](#) Questions regarding sexual victimization and perpetration may alter people's responses and affect their later answers regarding sexual assertiveness and gender roles.

~~Therefore, i~~In order to minimize desirable responding, ~~the~~ measures of sexual victimization and perpetration will be administered after the measures of sexual assertiveness or gender roles.

Comparison to the average time to complete the survey will be examined utilizing z-scores (to determine low outliers) and common-sense cutoffs (if z-scores do not allow for lower N cutoffs, for instance an arbitrary cutoff of one minute) in order to ensure that participants read and responded to questions based on overall participant averages. To ensure that participants are responding carefully and attentively to survey items, a question will be placed within the survey that asks participants to select a certain response (e.g., select C). Failure to provide the correct

response to this item will lead the participant to be excluded from the statistical analyses. All participants will be provided with a list of national services such as Rainn.org in the event that discussing unwanted sexual experiences leads to personal distress or symptomology.

## Results

### Statistical Analyses

Descriptive statistics will be computed for all measures. Data will be examined for missing values, duplicate participants (based on computer's IP address), and missingness will be completed to exclude these subjects utilizing MCAR. Multivariate outliers will be calculated using Mahalanobis distance. Scores + or -3 SD will be excluded. Distributions will be examined for evidence of non-normality including skew and kurtosis. Transformations will be considered if warranted. A table of means and standard deviations for each variable will be created to examine overall variability. A correlation matrix of sexual assertiveness, gender roles, ~~and~~ sexual coercion, and life sat will be presented.

A hierarchical ~~moderated~~ multiple regression analyses will be conducted to examine whether sexual assertiveness moderates the relationship between gender roles and sexual coercion. ~~Thus, g~~Gender roles and sexual assertiveness will serve as predictor variables. In the regression analysis demographic variables and life satisfaction ~~gender roles~~ will be entered in step one, gender roles ~~sexual assertiveness~~ will be entered in step two, sexual assertiveness will be entered in step three, and the interaction term (gender role X sexual assertiveness) will be entered in the final equation ~~as step three~~. Sexual coercion will serve as the dependent variable. Gender roles and sexual assertiveness will be mean centered utilizing z scores prior to the analysis to allow for greater ease of data interpretation. Statistical outliers will be removed prior to the mean centering process.



## Appendix A

### The Sexual Experiences Survey (SES-SFV)

The following questions concern sexual experiences that you may have had that were unwanted. We know that these are personal questions, so we do not ask your name or other identifying information. Your information is completely confidential. We hope that this helps you to feel comfortable answering each question honestly. Place a check mark in the box showing the number of times each experience has happened to you. If several experiences occurred on the same occasion--for example, if one night someone told you some lies and had sex with you when you were drunk, you would check both boxes a and c. The past 12 months refers to the past year going back from today. Since age 14 refers to your life starting on your 14th birthday and stopping one year ago from today.

<b>Sexual Experiences</b>	<b>How many times in the past 12 months?</b>	<b>How many times since age 14?</b>
<b>Someone fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of</b>		
<b>1. my body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt) or removed some of my clothes without my consent (<i>but did not attempt sexual penetration</i>) by:</b>	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.		
b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.		
c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.		
d. Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.		
e. Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.		
<b>2. Someone had oral sex with me or made me have oral sex with them without my consent by:</b>		0 1 2 0 1 2 3+ 3+
a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.		
b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.		
c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.		
d. Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.		
e. Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.		
	<b>How many times in the past 12 months?</b>	<b>How many times since age 14?</b>
<b>If you are a male, check box and skip to item 4</b>		
<b>3. A man put his penis into my vagina, or someone inserted fingers or objects without my consent by:</b>	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+

- Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.
- Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.
- Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.
- Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.
- Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

4. **A man put his penis into my butt, or someone inserted fingers or objects without my consent by:** 0 1 2 0 1 2  
3+ 3+

- Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.
- Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.
- Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.
- Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.
- Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

5. **Even though it didn't happen, someone TRIED to have oral sex with me, or make me have oral sex with them without my consent by:** 0 1 2 0 1 2  
3+ 3+

- Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.
- Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.
- Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.
- Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.
- Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

**If you are male, check this box and skip to item 7.**

6. **Even though it didn't happen, a man TRIED to put his penis into my vagina, or someone tried to stick in fingers or objects without my consent by:** How many times in the past 12 months? How many times since age 14?  
0 1 2 3+ 0 1 2 3+

- Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.
- Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.
- Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.
- Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.
- Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

my arms, or having a weapon.

7. **Even though it didn't happen, a man TRIED to put his penis into my butt, or someone tried to stick in objects or fingers without my consent by:** 0 1 2 0 1 2  
3+ 3+

- a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.
- b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.
- c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.
- d. Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.
- e. Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

8. I am: Female Male My age is \_\_\_\_\_ years and \_\_\_\_\_ months.

9. Did any of the experiences described in this survey happen to you 1 or more times? Yes No  
What was the sex of the person or persons who did them to you?

- Female only
- Male only
- Both females and males
- I reported no experiences

10. Have you ever been raped? Yes No

## Sexual Perpetration Survey (SES-SFP)

The following questions concern sexual experiences. We know these are personal questions, so we do not ask your name or other identifying information. Your information is completely confidential. We hope this helps you to feel comfortable answering each question honestly. Place a check mark in the box showing the number of times each experience has happened. If several experiences occurred on the same occasion--for example, if one night you told some lies and had sex with someone who was drunk, you would check both boxes a and c. The past 12 months refers to the past year going back from today. Since age 14 refers to your life starting on your 14th birthday and stopping one year ago from today.

<b>Sexual Experiences</b>	<b>How many times in the past 12 months?</b>	<b>How many times since age 14?</b>
<p><b>1. I fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of someone's body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt) or removed some of their clothes without their consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration) by:</b></p> <p>a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn't want to.</p> <p>b. Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn't want to.</p> <p>c. Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.</p> <p>d. Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.</p> <p>e. Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.</p>	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
<p><b>2. I had oral sex with someone or had someone perform oral sex on me without their consent by:</b></p> <p>a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn't want to.</p> <p>b. Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn't want to.</p> <p>c. Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.</p> <p>d. Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.</p> <p>e. Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.</p>	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+
<p><b>3. I put my penis (men only) or I put my fingers or objects (all respondents) into a woman's vagina without her consent by:</b></p> <p>a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn't want to.</p>	0 1 2 3+	0 1 2 3+

- b. Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn't want to.
- c. Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.
- d. Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.
- e. Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.
- 4. I put in my penis (men only) or I put my fingers or objects (all respondents) into someone's butt without their consent by:** 0 1 0 1  
2 3+2 3+
- a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn't want to.
- b. Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn't want to.
- c. Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.
- d. Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.
- e. Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.
- 5. Even though it did not happen, I TRIED to have oral sex with someone or make them have oral sex with me without their consent by:** 0 1 0 1  
2 3+2 3+
- a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn't want to.
- b. Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn't want to.
- c. Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.
- d. Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.
- e. Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.
- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | How many times<br>in the past 12<br>months? | How many<br>times since<br>age 14? |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Even though it did not happen, I TRIED put in my penis (men only) or I tried to put my fingers or objects (all respondents) into a woman's vagina without their consent by:</b>                                               | 0 1 2 3+                                    | 0 1 2 3+                           |
| a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn't want to. |                                             |                                    |
| b. Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn't want to.                                                                           |                                             |                                    |
| c. Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.                                                                                                                                            |                                             |                                    |
| d. Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.                                                                                                                                                                 |                                             |                                    |
| e. Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.                                                                                                                       |                                             |                                    |
| <b>7.</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                             | 0 1 0 1                            |

**Even though it did not happen, I TRIED to put in my penis (men only) or I tried to put my fingers or objects (all respondents) into someone's butt without their consent by:** 2 3+2 3+

Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making  
 a. promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn't want to.

b. Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn't want to.

c. Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.

d. Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.

e. Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.

8. I am: Female Male My age is \_\_\_\_\_ years and \_\_\_\_\_ months.

9. Did you do any of the acts described in this survey 1 or more times? Yes No

If yes, what was the sex of the person or persons to whom you did them?

Female only

Male only

Both females and males

I reported no experiences

10. Do you think you may have you ever raped someone? Yes No







### Traditional Masculinity-Femininity (TMF) Scale

1. I consider myself as...

1            2            3            4            5            6            7

*Totally masculine*

*totally feminine*

2. Ideally, I would like to be...

1            2            3            4            5            6            7

*Totally masculine*

*totally feminine*

3. Traditionally, my interests would be considered as...

1            2            3            4            5            6            7

*Totally masculine*

*totally feminine*

4. Traditionally, my attitudes and beliefs would be considered as...

1            2            3            4            5            6            7

*Totally masculine*

*totally feminine*

5. Traditionally, my behavior would be considered as...

1            2            3            4            5            6            7

*Totally masculine*

*totally feminine*

6. Traditionally, my outer appearance would be considered as...

1            2            3            4            5            6            7

*Totally masculine*

*totally feminine*

### Brief Resilience Scale (BRS)

---

**Instructions:** Use the following scale and **circle** one number for each statement to indicate how much you disagree or agree with each of the statements.

1 = Strongly Disagree   2 = Disagree   3 = Neutral   4 = Agree   5 = Strongly Agree

---

- |                                                                         |   |   |   |   |   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I tend to bounce back quickly after hard times..                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I have a hard time making it through stressful events (R).....       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. It does not take me long to recover from a stressful event.....      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. It is hard for me to snap back when something bad happens (R).....   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I usually come through difficult times with little trouble.....      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I tend to take a long time to get over set-backs in my life (R)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
- 

Note. R = Item was reverse-coded

## References

- Bem, S. L. (1975). Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 634–643.
- Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Basile, K.C., Walters, M.L., Chen, J., & Merrick, M.T. (2011). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence victimization – National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, United States, 2011. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 63(8), e11-e12. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.2015.302634
- Brousseau, M.M., Bergeron, S., Hebert, 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
- Brown, A.L., Testa, M., & Messman-Moore, T.L. (2009). Psychological consequences of sexual victimization resulting from force, incapacitation, or verbal coercion. *Violence Against Women*, 15, 898-919. DOI: 10.1177/1077801209335491
- Campbell, J.C. & Soeken, K.L. (1999). Forced sex and intimate partner violence: Effects on women's risk and women's health. *Violence against Women*, 5, 1017-1035. DOI: 10.1177/1077801299005009003

- Campbell, R., Dworkin, E., & Cabral, G. (2009). An ecological model of the impact of sexual assault on women's mental health. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 10*, 225-246. DOI: 10.1177/1524838009334456
- Campbell, T., Gillaspay, J. A., Jr., & Thompson, B. (1997). The factor structure of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI): Confirmatory analysis of long and short forms. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 57*, 118-124.
- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Townsend, R., Lee, H., Bruce, C., & Thomas, G. (2015). *Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct*. Rockville, Maryland: Westat.
- Capitaine, M., Rodgers, R.F., & Chabrol, H. (2011). Unwanted sexual experiences, depressive symptoms and disordered eating among college students. *Eating Behaviors, 12*, 86-89. DOI: 10.1016/j.eatbeh.2010.11.003
- Choi, N., Fuqua, D.R., & Newman, J.L. (2009). Exploratory and confirmatory studies of the Bem Sex Role Inventory Short Form with two divergent samples. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 69*, 696-705. DOI: 10.1177/0013164409332218
- DeGue, S. & DiLillo, D. (2004). Understanding perpetrators of nonphysical sexual coercion: Characteristics of those who cross the line. *Violence and Victims, 19*, 673-688. DOI: 10.1891/088667004780927701
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*, 71-75.
- Eaton, A.A. & Matamala, A. (2014). The relationship between heteronormative beliefs and verbal sexual coercion in college students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 43*, 1443-1457. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-014-0284-4

- Edwards, K.M., Sylaska, K.M., Barry, J.E., Moynihan, M.M., Banyard, V.L., Cohn, E.S., Walsh, W.A., & Ward, S.K. (2015). Physical dating violence, sexual violence, and unwanted pursuit victimization: A comparison of incidence rates among sexual-minority and heterosexual college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*, 580-600. DOI: 10.1177/0886260514535260
- Fair, C.D. & Vanyur, J. (2011). Sexual coercion, verbal aggression, and condom use consistency among college students. *Journal of American College Health, 59*, 273-280. DOI: 10.1080/07448481.2010.508085
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G\*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods, 41*, 1149-1160.
- Good, G. L., Borst, T. S., & Wallace, D. L. (1994). Masculinity research: A review and critique. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 3*, 3–14. DOI: 10.1016/S0962-1849(05)80104-0
- Hall, G.C.N., DeGarmo, D.S., Eap, S., Teten, A.L., & Sue, S. (2006). Initiation, desistance, and persistence of men's sexual coercion. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 74*, 732-742. DOI: 10.1037/0022-006X.74.4.732
- Harris, A. C. (1994). Ethnicity as a determinant of sex role identity: A replication study of item selection for the Bem sex role inventory. *Sex Roles, 31*, 241–273. DOI:
- Heintz, A.J. & Melendez, R.M. (2006). Intimate partner violence and HIV/STD risk among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*, 193-208. DOI: 10.1177/0886260505282104

- 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. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-006-9141-4
- Hundhammer, T. & Mussweiler, T. (2012). How sex puts you in gendered shoes: Sexuality-priming leads to gender-based self-perception and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103*, 176-193. DOI: 10.1037/a0028121
- Hurlbert, D. F. (1991). The role of assertiveness in female sexuality: A comparative study between sexually assertive and sexually nonassertive women. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 17*, 183–190. DOI:10.1080/00926239108404342
- Johnson, L.M., Matthews, T.L., & Napper, S.L. (2016). Sexual orientation and sexual assault victimization among US college students. *The Social Science Journal, 53*, 174-183. DOI: 10.1016/j.soscij.2016.02.007
- Judson, S.S., Johnson, D.M., & Perez, A.L.U. (2013). Perceptions of adult sexual coercion as a function of victim gender. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 14*, 335-344. DOI: 10.1037/a0030448
- Kalichman, S.C. & Rompa, D. (1995). Sexually coerced and noncoerced gay and bisexual men: Factors relevant to risk for Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) infection. *The Journal of Sex Research, 32*, 454-50.
- Katz, J., May, P., Sörensen, S., & DelTosta, J. (2010). Sexual revictimization during women's first year of college: Self-blame and sexual refusal assertiveness as possible mechanisms. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*, 2113-2126. DOI: 10.1177/0886260509354515
- Kearns, M.C. & Calhoun, K.S. (2010). Sexual revictimization and interpersonal effectiveness. *Violence and Victims, 25*, 504-517. DOI: 10.1891/0886-6708.25.4.504

- Kelley, E.L., Orchowski, L.M., & Gidycz, C.A. (2016). Sexual victimization among college women: Role of sexual assertiveness and resistance variables. *Psychology of Violence, 6*, 243-252.
- Kelly, T.C. & Erickson, C.D. (2007). An examination of gender role identity, sexual self-esteem, sexual coercion and sexual victimization in a university sample. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 13*, 235-245. DOI: 10.1080/13552600701794366
- Kennett, D.J., Humphreys, T.P., & Bramley, J.E. (2013). Sexual resourcefulness and gender roles as moderators of relationship satisfaction and consenting to unwanted sex in undergraduate women. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 22*, 51-61. DOI: 10.3138/cjhs.933
- Kernsmith, P.D. & Kernsmith, R.M. (2009). Gender differences in responses to sexual coercion. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 19*, 902-914. doi: 10.1080/10911350903008098
- Kiefer, A.K. & Sanchez, D.T. (2007). Scripting sexual passivity: A gender role perspective. *Personal Relationships, 14*, 269-290. DOI: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.2007.00154.x
- Kim, Y.H., Moon, S.T., & Kang, H.S. (2013). Factors influencing on sexual assertiveness of college students. *Korean J Women Health Nurs, 19*, 166-175. DOI: 10.4069/kjwhn.2013.19.3.166
- Krahe, B. & Berger, A. (2013). Men and women as perpetrators and victims of sexual aggression in heterosexual and same-sex encounters: A study of first-year college students in Germany. *Aggressive Behavior, 39*, 391-404. DOI: 10.1002/ab.21482
- Krebs, C.P., Lindquist, C.H., Warner, T.D., Fisher, B.S., & Martin, S.L. (2007). *Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study* (Report No. 221153). Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice.

- 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.
- Koss, M.P. Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., Ullman, S., West, C., & White, J. (2006). The Sexual Experiences Short Form Victimization (SES-SFV). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona.
- Koss, M.P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S; Norris, J., Testa, C., Ullman, S., West, C., & White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 357-370.
- 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. DOI: 10.1023/A:1018807223378
- 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. DOI: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00146.x
- Livingston, J.A., Testa, M., & VanZile-Tamsen, C. (2007). The reciprocal relationship between sexual victimization and sexual assertiveness. *Violence Against Women, 13*, 298-313. DOI: 10.1177/1077801206297339
- Lottes, I.L. (1991). The relationship between nontraditional gender roles and sexual coercion. *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality, 4*(4), 89-109. DOI: 10.1300/J056v04n04\_07

- Lottes, I.L. & Weinberg, M.S. (1997). Sexual coercion among university students: A comparison of the United States and Sweden. *The Journal of Sex Research, 34*(1), 67-76. DOI: 10.1080/00224499709551867
- Mahoney, E.R., Shively, M.D., & Traw, M. (1986). Sexual coercion and assault: Male socialization and female risk. *Sexual Coercion & Assault, 1*, 2-8.
- Martin, S.L., Fisher, B.S., Warner, T.D., Krebs, C.P., & Lindquist, C.H. (2011). Women's sexual orientations and their experiences of sexual assault before and during university. *Women's Health Issues, 21*, 199-205. DOI: 10.1016/j.whi.2010.12.002
- McConaghy, N. & Zamir, R. (1995). Heterosexual and homosexual coercion, sexual orientation, and sexual roles in medical students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 24*, 489-502.
- Menard, K.S., Nagayama Hall, G.C., Phung, A.H., Erian Ghebrial, M.F., & Martin, L. (2003). Gender differences in sexual harassment and coercion in college students: Developmental, individual, and situational determinants. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*, 1222-1239. doi: 10.1177/0886260503256654
- Morokoff, P.J., Quina, K., Harlow, L.L., Whitmire, L., Grimley, D.M., Gibson, P.R., & Burkholder, G.J. (1997). Sexual Assertiveness Scale (SAS) for women: Development and validation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 790-804. DOI: 10.1037//0022-3514.73.4.790
- Morokoff, P.J. (2000). A cultural context for sexual assertiveness for women. In C.B. Travis & J.W. White (Eds.), *Sexuality, society, and feminism* (pp. 299-319). Washington, D.C: APA.

- Munsch, C.L. & Willer, R. (2012). The role of gender identity threat in perceptions of date rape and sexual coercion. *Violence Against Women, 18*, 1125-1146. DOI: 10.1177/1077801212465151
- Murnen, S.K., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If “boys will be boys,” then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles, 46*, 359-375. DOI: 10.1023/A:1020488928736
- O’Neill, J.M. (1981). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men’s lives. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 60*, 203-210. DOI: 10.1002/j.2164-4918.1981.tb00282.x
- 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. DOI: 10.1080/00224499209551658
- Pavot, W., Diener, E., Colvin, C.R., & Sandvik, E. (1991). Further validation of the Satisfaction With Life Scale: Evidence for the cross-method convergence of well-being measures. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 57*, 149-161.
- Rapoza, K.A. & Drake, J.E. (2009). Relationships of hazardous alcohol use, alcohol expectancies, and emotional commitment to male sexual coercion and aggression in dating couples. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 70*, 55-63. DOI: 10.15288/jsad.2009.70.55
- Rothman, E.F., Exner, D., & Baughman, A.L. (2011). The prevalence of sexual assault against people who identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual in the United States: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 12*, 55-66. DOI: 10.1177/1524838010390707

- Sanchez, D.T., Kiefer, A.K., & Ybarra, O. (2006). Sexual submissiveness in women: Costs for sexual autonomy and arousal. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *32*, 512-524. DOI: 10.1177/0146167205282154
- Sanchez, D.T., Phelan, J.E., Moss-Racusin, C.A., & Good, J.J. (2012). The gender role motivation model of women's sexually submissive behavior and satisfaction in heterosexual couples. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*, 528-539. DOI: 10.1177/0146167211430088
- Seal, D.W., O'Sullivan, L.F., & Ehrhardt, A.A. (2007). Miscommunications and misinterpretations: Men's scripts about sexual communication and unwanted sex in interactions with women. In M. Kimmel (Ed.), *The sexual self: The construction of sexual scripts* (pp. 141-161). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. (1969). Psychosexual development. *Society*, *6*(5), 9-17. DOI:10.1007/BF02806366
- Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The Brief Resilience Scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *15*, 194-200.
- Spitzberg, B.H. (1999). An analysis of empirical estimates of sexual aggression victimization and perpetration. *Violence and Victims*, *14*(3), 241-260.
- Struckman-Johnson, C., Stuckman-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. DOI: 10.1080/00224490309552168
- Testa, M. & Dermen, K.H. (1999). The differential correlates of sexual coercion and rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *14*, 548-561.

- Truman, D.M., Tokar, D.M., & Fischer, A.R. (1996). Dimensions of masculinity: Relations to date rape supportive attitudes and sexual aggression in dating situations. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 74*, 555-562. DOI: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.1996.tb02292.x
- Turchik, J.A. & Hassija, C.M. (2014). Female sexual victimization among college students: Assault severity, health risk behaviors, and sexual functioning. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*, 2439-2457. DOI: 10.1177/0886260513520230
- Waldner-Haugrud, L.K. (1999). Sexual coercion in lesbian and gay relationships: A review and critique. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 4*, 139-149. DOI: 10.1016/S1359-1789(97)00054-2
- Waterman, C.K., Dawson, L.J., & Bologna, M.J. (1989). Sexual coercion in gay male and lesbian relationships: Predictors and implications for support services. *The Journal of Sex Research, 26*, 118-124. DOI: 10.1080/00224498909551495
- Werner, P.D. & LaRussa, G.W. (1985). Persistence and change in sex-role stereotypes. *Sex Roles, 12*, 1089-1100. DOI: 10.1007/BF00288107
- World Health Organization. (2002). *Chapter 6 Sexual violence*. Retrieved from: [http://www.who.int/violence\\_injury\\_prevention/violence/global\\_campaign/en/chap6.pdf](http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/global_campaign/en/chap6.pdf)
- Zinzow, H.M. & Thompson, M. (2015). A longitudinal study of risk factors for repeated sexual coercion and assault in U.S. college men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 44*, 213-222. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-013-0243-5
- Zweig, J.N., 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. DOI: 10.1080/00224499909552012