2014

Feminist identification in heterosexual encounters : exploring the relationship betweeen women's personal values and their experiences of verbal sexual coercion

Shawna M. Hershberger
Smith College

Shawna Hershberger
Feminist Identification in
Heterosexual Encounters: Exploring
the Relationship between Women's
Personal Values and their
Experiences of Verbal Sexual
Coercion

ABSTRACT

Verbal Sexual Coercion by men is a common experience for young women that can lead to both physical and psychological harm (Byers & Glenn, 2012; Faulkner, Kolts & Hicks, 2008; Katz & Myhr, 2008). Clinicians who treat these young women may benefit from a deeper understanding of the role that personal values and beliefs about gender plays in the experiences of this common type of sexual coercion. The present study surveyed n=217 women between the ages of 21 to 30 about their gender role ideology, feminist identification and experiences of verbal sexual coercion to determine if there is a relationship between personal values and experiences of verbal sexual coercion. The participants were separated into two groups ('feminist' and 'non-feminist') for the purposes of comparison. One unexpected finding demonstrated that verbal sexual coercion is a common occurrence within the 21 to 30 age group. Quantitative findings indicate that there is no significant difference between women who identify with the term 'feminist' and those who do not in relation to their experience of verbal sexual coercion in the past two years. Qualitative findings may indicate a difference in the specific aspects of the coercive experience viewed as 'upsetting' based on identification with the term 'feminist.' Limitations to the study and possible explanations of findings are discussed.

FEMINIST IDENTIFICATION IN HETEROSEXUAL ENCOUNTERS:

EXPLORING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WOMEN'S PERSONAL VALUES

AND THEIR EXPERIENCES OF VERBAL SEXUAL COERCION

A project based on an independent investigation,
submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Social Work.

Shawna Hershberger

Smith College School for Social Work
Northampton, Massachusetts 01063

2014

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Unwanted sexual activity is a fairly common experience among young people in the United States. In 2003, Struckman-Johnson, Struckman-Johnson, and Anderson found that 78% of female participants in their study had experienced sexual coercion tactics after reaching the age of 16. Unwanted sexual activity can have a negative impact on both psychological and physical health including depression, sexually transmitted illnesses, negative self-esteem, decreased sense of sexual agency, and many other negative ramifications (Byers & Glenn, 2012; Faulkner, Kolts & Hicks, 2008; Schick, Zucker, & Bay-Cheng, 2008). Often, the negative consequences of sexual coercion lead young women to seek therapy. Clinicians may benefit from better understanding how a woman's personal values regarding her gender and sexuality impact these situations.

With the dawn of sexual liberation, largely ushered in by the feminist movement in the 1960's, both sexual coercion and consent have received more and more attention by researchers (Struckman-Johnson, Sturckman-Jonhnson & Anderson, 2003). The issues of sexual coercion and consent have been widely debated and discussed in the mainstream media over the past 5 years. The results of such debates have had and will continue to have major implications for the legal system, pop culture, and education. Though much focus is placed on physically aggressive sexual encounters or encounters while under the influence of consciousness altering substances, an increasingly prevalent type of coercion that is largely overlooked is that of verbal coercion.

Verbal coercion occurs when sexual partners utilize feelings such as guilt, shame, or obligation to pressure their partner to consent to further sexual activity. Verbal or emotional coercion is an extremely common experience for young women in heterosexual encounters (Katz & Myhr, 2008). Emotional coercion in many cases goes unrecognized as a category of coercion. It is all the more staggering that this type of coercion can have similar negative impacts on women's sexual well-being as its more aggressive counterparts. This problem has been noted by Byers and Glenn (2011) when they identify that often victims of emotional sexual coercion engage in self-blame and Jennifer Katz and Lauren Myhr (2008) when they report findings that women's sexual functioning and relationships suffer as a result of emotional sexual coercion. The prevalence of these experiences and possible causes are only beginning to be studied. Due to its less aggressive nature, emotional sexual coercion by men is often considered socially acceptable and is much more difficult to determine culpability, admonish, and prevent this more subtle type of sexual coercion (Katz & Myhr, 2008).

Gender roles may play a role in women's response, both during and after emotionally coercive experiences. Traditional gender roles and sexual scripts may perpetuate emotional coercion by creating expectations that a woman will play a subservient role while the male dominates. Schick et al. (2008) found that women who identify with traditional gender roles are less assertive in relationships and are more likely to defer to the sexual preferences of their partners. In contrast, feminist platforms often include the critique of these normative gendered sexual scripts that emphasize male privilege and female subordination. In addition, feminist platforms engage in anti-sexist and individual empowerment perspectives. Schick et al. (2008) concluded that a feminist critique of gender norms may help promote women's sexual well-being and their ability to negotiate condom use. Though these studies indicate that feminist ideology

may be helpful in attaining autonomy in one's sexuality, identifying as a feminist may or may not have an impact on verbal coercion within heterosexual relationships. It is entirely possible that identifying as a 'feminist' may lead to more males expecting more sexual activity from partners who identify as 'feminist' or outwardly support nontraditional gender roles.

Of the many studies examining sexual coercion, none explore the impact of feminist vs. traditional gender roles on women's experiences of emotional coercion. The purpose of this study is to fill that gap, and proposes to explore women's experiences of emotional coercion in heterosexual encounters in relation to their beliefs on traditional vs. nontraditional gender roles and feminist self-identification. Our culture has only recently begun to grapple with means to prevent or ameliorate the prevalence and effects of emotional sexual coercion. Because of the need for further study of the causes and impacts of emotional sexual coercion, this study is intended to advance our understanding of the impact women's gender ideologies have on their experience of verbal sexual coercion.

This is an exploratory, descriptive study. Data collection for this study was based on an anonymous survey that was be administered online to women ages 21 to 30 who have experienced heterosexual encounters in the two years before taking the survey. Findings of this study are primarily intended to advance knowledge about sexual coercion for practicing clinicians. Clinicians who work with this population will benefit from further understanding the impacts of various ideologies on sexual experiences of young people.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

In this review of literature, I discuss research on the reasons woman and men engage in sexual activity to lay the ground work for the heterosexual encounters that are explored in this study. Due to the ever changing impacts of the greater culture on sexual interaction, I next explore the change that has occurred in normative heterosexual couplings in recent years. In this review, definitions and limitations of the concept of "consent" are explored to serve as a contrast to the concept of coercion. I also explore the question of the parameters of consent in a heterosexual encounter. I examine the various ways that consent has been defined across previous study. Through the exploration of women and men's responses to their own experiences of verbal coercion, both as the victim and perpetrator, the review begins to formulate an understanding of how one's gender impacts their experience. The social acceptance of verbally coercive tactics is explored through reviewing several studies in which participants offer feedback on their perceptions of the severity of coercive interactions. This literature review also examines how researchers define and delineate gender roles in current American culture with a focus on the ways in which woman may be socialized to adhere to traditional gender roles. This part of the review establishes how, through their studies, researchers are led to understand traditional versus non-traditional gender role ideology and orientation, and how it plays out in the interplay during pre-sexual engagement between men and women.

This review also includes what is popularly referred to in the literature as 'sexual script theory'. In addition to defining this theory, it was important to explore how gender role ideology

relates to sexual script theory. This focus of the review contributes to better understand how gender role ideology shifts the experience and expectations between the parties in sexual encounters. I then explore how heterosexual sexual scripts have been shown by some authors to lay the ground work for the use of tactics of verbal coercion. Also included is a focus on how some authors have identified ways in which sexual scripts have established use of verbal coercion as a normative experience in heterosexual relationships in American culture. Next, explore the modern cultural implications of feminist ideology and how possessing feminist ideology has been found by some authors to impact the presence or absence of the experience of sexual coercion. Finally, I include a review of studies that describe the impact of one's gender role ideology and feminist identification on women's heterosexual experiences of intimacy.

Exploration of Couples and Sexual Relationships

In order to better understand women's experiences of coercion it is helpful to reflect on various perspectives on why and how human beings engage in sexual partner ships. From a biological and evolutionary standpoint, sexual partnering is beneficial for the purposes of procreation and endurance of our species. Therapists and clinicians may argue that sexual relationships are a reenactment or reflections of relationships with early caregivers. From the perspective of American culture, one may surmise from various messages that we have sexual partnerships, from marriage to "hookups," to meet personal and social needs, and to find completion. In fact, sexual partnering is the subject of much of our films, music, art, and various other cultural mediums. Women seem to be encouraged to focus large amounts of energy on acquiring a single, long-lasting, intimate relationship. Like women, men are encouraged to spend time and energy on the pursuit of sexual intimacy; however there is often less focus on relationship and more on quantity and quality of partners (Walker, 1997). Obviously these

differences have the potential to inspire conflict. Though surely conflict occurred in the past, women in most cases held less power than their male partners and therefore their arguments were easily dismissed. As the societal power differential between men and women shrinks, such conflicts are gaining more attention and normative sexual experiences are shifting. One such conflict is differentials in desired level of intimacy.

In the past, sexual contact outside of marriage was permissible only for men. Once married, women were expected to please their husbands on their husbands' terms. As this somewhat rigid set of expectations becomes obsolete, the lines between what is acceptable behavior and what is not become more and more confused. Both modern men and women are having to negotiate their relationships in light of changing power dynamics and expectations.

Norms of heterosexual couples. Research has demonstrated that the average college student is 17 years old at the age of first intercourse (Lottes, 1993). As society becomes more sexually open this number has the potential to continue to decrease. It is not uncommon for this first experience in intercourse to be experienced more negatively for young women than it is for their male peers. However, women have been found to experience more feelings of guilt following their first intercourse than men (Lottes, 1993). This may be related to other research that has found that many young women engage in their first sexual experiences with men for reasons other than their own sexual arousal and desire. Research has demonstrated that this a rather normative experience for young women (Elmerstig, Wijma, Sandell, & Berterö, 2012; Walker, 1997).

It is now normalized for many young people in the United States to engage in sexual activity outside of marriage and committed romantic relationships. Sexual intimacy may occur in varying degrees of commitment, from one night "hook-ups" to friendship to marriage. Numerous

studies have shown that cultural stereotypes and sexual scripts accurately predict that men desire a higher level of sexual intimacy than their female partners in various types of relationships. Wright, Norton and Matusek found support for this expectation in their study of intimacy in "hookup" situations. They found that 46% of man and only 14% of women reported having the experience of desiring more sexual activity that a partner in a casual sex or hookup situation (Wright et al., 2010).

In the dating realm of relationships it remains more common and consistent with the traditional expectations of sexual relationships that men will request a date, pay for a drink or date, and initiate sexual encounters more often than a female. Studies have demonstrated that these norms are shifting (e.g. Aronson and Buchholz, 2001; Lottes, 1993; Wright et al., 2010).

Changing partnering patterns. Partnering, though often viewed as desirable, is challenging due to the need for happiness for each partner. Communication between partners has been shown to be an essential part of successful partnerships no matter the length of time (Cvancara & Kinney, 2009). In heterosexual encounters, gender roles can inform the way in which the sexual encounter takes place. As gender roles become more egalitarian, this communication becomes more necessary to maintain the well-being of both parties engaged in the heterosexual encounter.

"As for the past 30 years, Western society continues to grapple with a major sex-role revolution (Aronson and Buchholz, 2001, pg.109)." Over the past several decades, the societal roles of men and women have changed in terms of vocation, mobility, education, finances and sexuality as well as others. How has this societal shift in men and women's role changed or not changed how they interact as sexual partners? In review of the literature several authors describe a "shift" in the way women have begun to behave in sexual situations when compared to past

normative behaviors (Aronson and Buchholz, 2001; Lottes, 1993). These changes include women initiating sexual acts, paying for meals, and actively pursuing potential male partners. These are, and for many years have been, largely viewed as traditionally male behaviors (Lottes, 1993; Lucke, 1998).

So too has there been evidence that the expectations for how a woman might act has changed. Lottes (1993) reports:

> Although less than men's frequencies, sizable proportions of women acknowledged they had multiple sex partners and sex without emotional involvement. Support for an increased proportion of females engaging in the traditional male roles of initiating sexual involvement and dates and paying date expenses was also found" (p. 645).

Traditional male and female roles, expectations and stereotypes have been questioned over the past few decades in which the United States has seen dual career households and shared financial responsibilities in family life (Lucke, 1998).

There has also been a change in the social perception of appropriateness of heterosexual intimacy outside of marriage. Heterosexual intimacy is now common in marriage, engagements, committed and "open" relationships, casual dating, friendships, acquaintance relationships, and in "hook ups" or "one night stands" (Livingston, Buddie, Testa, & Vanzile-Tamsen, 2004).

Though not all sexual encounters occur in the context of a date, dating norms clearly illustrate the shift in gender performance. In the past it was more common that men were expected to pursue female partners, initiate relationships and be responsible for planning and paying for dates. Recent research has demonstrated how these norms have changed. In a study conducted in the early 1990's, many female college students reported engaging in these very

8

same behaviors such as initiating sexual activity and paying for dates (Lottes, 1993). The sexual "double standard," which makes certain behaviors taboo for women that are viewed as perfectly acceptable for men, though still present, is decreasing. Despite the presence of this "double standard," research supports that women are changing their attitudes about their own sex lives and taking ownership of their experiences to a greater degree than they did in past generations. Traditional gender roles are increasingly questioned by society and have led to differing opinions on an individual level (Lucke, 1998). For example, it is now more common for women to express sexual desire and initiate sexual encounters (Lottes, 1993).

Though these changes have occurred, it seems that the expectations present in past heterosexual patterns continue to have an impact. For example, research shows that women continue to feel higher levels of guilt, anxiety and low self-respect following sexual encounters than their male partners (Lottes, 1993). Poppen and Segal report that their hypothesis, "That males were expected to be aggressors and females to be the victims, was clearly supported, suggesting that there is a continuation of traditional sex role behavior in dating and sexual interaction, specifically sexual coercion (pg. 698, 1988)." This may be evidence that the sexual double standard may still be in place when it comes to a woman's perceptions about her ability to demonstrate sexual self-efficacy (Lottes, 1993).

Studies of Phenomenon of Coercion: What is Consent?

A longstanding issue between men and women is that of forced sexual interaction often defined as rape and/or coercion. In the history of the United States, women have traditionally held far less power than men. As this changes, so too does the legality of unwanted sexual encounters. In modern American culture, consent is required in order to achieve a legal sexual

interaction. Consent also increases the likelihood that a sexual interaction is viewed positively by all taking part in the encounter.

Some of the most troublesome aspects of heterosexual partnering in the US at this time include consent and coercion. Sexual consent includes a mutual understanding in which all individuals engaged in a sexual encounter fully understand and agree to engage in an act willingly. In contrast, rape and coercion are commonly defined as nonconsensual encounters (Walker, 1997.) According to research, between 22% and 85% of women have reported experiencing an unwanted sexual encounter at some point in their lives (Byers, 1996; Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988). Though both men and women can be victims of coercion, Struckman-Johnson et al. (2003) report, "Greater percentages of women than men had been subjected to the full range of tactics of sexual coercion from verbal pressure to physical force (pg. 78)." This wide range in prevalence may begin to be understood by exploring how one demonstrates his or her consent.

According to several researchers, there seems to be difficulty in reaching consensus on what constitutes consent and how this impacts sexual encounters (Walker, 1997). For example, a woman may use her hand to physically push away her partner or she may vocalize her unwillingness to engage in a sexual act (Livingston et al., 2004). Women have also reported passively consenting out of fear of the negative consequences they might experience because of their unwillingness. Even when a woman does communicate her refusal, pressure from her partner may only intensify. Whether the pressure for sexual intimacy is verbal or physical, this pressure from a partner falls into the category of coercion. Sexual coercion can be broadly defined as physical or verbal pressure to engage in a sexual act that with an unwilling partner.

Unfortunately, coercive sexual encounters occur frequently (Byers, 1996; Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988; Walker, 1997). This begs the question, "If a person refuses but later agrees to engage in a sexual act as a result of pleading or further pressure, can this be considered consent?"

Frequency of sexual coercion. How often are people pressured of forced into engaging in sexual acts? Coercion in heterosexual, sexual situations has been studied for decades (Byers, 1996; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003; Walker, 1997). This focus may be due to the negative impact unwanted sexual activity may have on individuals physiologically and psychologically. Though there are many definitions of sexual coercion, for the purposes of this study sexual coercion is defined as one or more tactics used to obtain sexual acts from an unwilling partner (Oswald & Russel, 2006). Several studies have demonstrated that unwanted sexual activity, along with its negative impact, is experienced by both men and women (Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003) though research has also shown that women are far more likely to be victimized and men are more likely to initiate coercive behaviors (Byers, 1996; Byers & Glenn, 2012; Poppen & Segal, 1988; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003).

In recent years, there have been high levels of media focus on verbal coercion for teens and college students. Sexual coercion on college campus is becoming a major concern for parents and school administrators (Oswald & Russel, 2006). There seemingly has been no research on the experiences of women once they have left college or who have never attended higher education. In consideration of the high frequency of sexual coercion in both teen and college aged young people it is alarming that there are few programs that discuss the importance of consensual sexual experiences for physical and psychological health and well-being.

Types of sexual coercion. Men and women alike have reported that their partners have utilized multiple tactics to persuade them to participate in sexual acts after they demonstrated

11

that they were unwilling. Physical force is the most harshly punished and widely recognized type of coercion tactic in the United States followed by intoxication with a substance and threat of harm (Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003). Sexual violence is widely studied and has gained recognition in recent years through the media and awareness of a high rate of occurrence on college campuses. Other types of tactics recognized in the latest research include sexual arousal (in which a partner removes his or her clothing or touches their partner in a sexual way to encourage arousal) and verbal sexual coercion.

Without the benefit of education on consent and coercion one may not be able to recognize the tactics being used. The most frequently used type of coercion is verbal in which one partner pressures the other in order to achieve his or her desired degree of intimacy (Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003). These tactics of coercion have been shown to have similar negative impacts to physically forced sexual encounters but have remarkably different social implications. While forced intercourse or threats of harm are viewed as abhorrent and illegal, coercion through sexual arousal and verbal/emotional tactics are largely viewed as insignificant or normal (Oswald & Russel, 2010). The impacts of such coercion often lead the victims to struggle psychologically and therefore require a closer look for professionals seeking to improve the well-being of individuals impacted by this phenomenon.

Verbal Sexual Coercion

Research has shown that verbal coercion is the most common tactic used to obtain sexual intimacy from an unwilling partner (Byers & Glenn, 2012; Livingston et al. 2004; Struckman-Johnson et al., 1998). Though much of the research focuses on long term relationships verbal coercion can occur with any level of familiarity. Verbal coercion is most often used by acquaintances, friends or romantic partners of the victim (Struckman-Johnson, 2003).

In this area of sexual violence, an individual may, in actuality, give his or her consent to engage in sexual activity, though she truly does not want to, due to outside pressures (Katz and Myhr, 2008; Walker, 1997). Studies have shown that many women have consented to sexual encounters due to verbal or emotional pressure from their romantic partners (Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003). Livingston et al. (2004) conducted a qualitative study in which they interviewed 114 young women about their experiences of verbal coercion. They report, "In a majority of transcripts, the man's persistence played a key role in convincing the woman to comply with his sexual advances (Pg. 291)."

Struckman-Johnson, Struckman-Johnson, and Anderson (2003) identified several verbally or emotionally coercive tactics such as: repeatedly asking, telling lies, questioning the partner's sexuality, threatening a break up, and threatening self-harm. Some research has shown that men's use of verbal coercion is influenced by sexual precedence, meaning whether or not the woman has had sex prior to the altercation. Livingston et al. report, "Critical to understanding this method of sexual aggression (verbal sexual coercion) is the recognition that men's verbal coercion tactics are largely determined by sexual precedence status, since precedence invokes cultural norms regarding sexual obligation (pg. 294)."

Legally, sexual actions such as this cannot be considered rape without the presence of force or direct threat of force and yet, the negative impacts (physical, psychological, and relational) of sexual violence can be present following an experience of unwanted sexual activity due to verbal coercion (Mulenhard & Schrag, 1991). Verbal coercion is difficult to punish and prevent due to its widely accepted and difficult to recognize manner (Katz and Myhr, 2008). Both men and women may fail to view verbal tactics as coercion because they have begun to be viewed as normative especially among college students and possibly young adults.

13

Contexts in which verbal sexual coercion occurs. Verbal sexual coercion in heterosexual encounters may be found in any situation in which two or more individuals may engage in sexual activity. These situations may include a verbal encounter between strangers in a public location or between a married couple in the privacy of their home. Current research largely focuses on the experiences of unmarried couples in dating relationships. This research has demonstrated that verbal sexual coercion is negatively related to relationship satisfaction and sexual functioning and positively related to the coerced woman's perceptions of psychological abuse and "destructive verbal conflict patterns (Katz and Myhr, 2008)." Further, some studies indicate that verbal sexual coercion is less likely to occur in the context of the participant's report of satisfying relationships and positive sexual experiences (Katz & Myhr, 2008).

The negative impact of verbal coercion. Non-physical tactics used to obtain sexual intimacy from a resistant partner are widely considered normal, expected, and acceptable though some researchers argue that verbal sexual coercion is a form of interpersonal violence similar to rape (Katz and Myhr, 2008). This may, in part, be due to the serious negative impacts such coercion can have on the individual being coerced. Both male and female victims of coercion are negatively impacted by their experience though some researchers have identified gendered differences in these reports (Byers and Glenn, 2012).

Perpetrators of verbal coercion may not understand the impacts of their actions as noted by Struckman-Johnson, Struckman-Johnson and Anderson (2003). They found that perpetrators of verbal coercion saw their activities as playful or improving the relationship rather than a harmful experience for their partner. Without the proper education both the perpetrator and victim of the coercive interaction may fail to understand the potential and likelihood of a verbally coercive heterosexual experience. It is therefore concerning that some research has

14

concluded that women with low self-esteem and low assertiveness are more in danger of having unwanted intimacy through verbal coercion than rape (Livingston et al., 2004).

Researchers have found that women who have experienced unwanted sexual encounters are at a greater risk for sexually transmitted diseases, drug use, physical discomfort, unplanned pregnancy and future sexual violence (Livingston et al., 2004; Walker, 1997). They may also experience a negative impact on their psychological well-being (Byers & Glenn, 2012; Muehlenhard & Schrag, 1991; Livingston et al., 2004). Byers and Glenn (2012) found that both men and women victims of coercion experience self-blame but female victims were more upset in the moment than male victims. Women also experienced more trauma symptoms than male victims. Both male and female victims blamed the coercer but also demonstrated feelings of shame towards the role they, the victim, may have played. Research has also demonstrated a relational impact of the experience of verbal sexual coercion in which both friendships and romantic relationships suffer as a result of verbally coercive sexual behaviors (Katz et al, 2002; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003). This information can be extremely valuable for clinicians whose clients may struggle to identify verbal coercion as a precipitating event to their social and psychological symptoms. For this reason it is important for clinicians to understand how the current culture in the United States perceives verbal sexual coercion and aspects of our culture that may reinforce such perceptions.

Impact of Gender Role Socialization on Young Women

One's gender role orientation has been shown to impact how individuals engage in sexual behaviors that outline acceptable and expected behaviors when engaging in sexual acts. This ideology and orientation may have an impact on many aspects of sexual behavior and may help to better understand the experiences of women in sexual relationships. Gender role orientation

15

and ideology have been shown to impact how and with whom a woman experiences heterosexual activity. Exploring various studies that utilize gender role ideology as a variable will aid in demonstrating how ideology has been found to affect both men and women's experiences of sexual and social interactions.

There are several studies that indicate that women, in many cases, may be taught that their sexual preferences and comfort are secondary to that of men (e.g. Oswald & Russel, 2010; Walker, 1997). This research may help to identify what makes women vulnerable to sexually compliant behavior and thus the negative impacts of unwanted sexual intimacy.

Walker, in her 1997 article, *When "no" becomes "yes": Why girls and women consent to unwanted sex,* explores the relationship between gender role socialization and women giving in to unwanted sex. Though they consent verbally or through omission, women and girls who engage in unwanted sexual encounters can suffer similar negative physical and emotional consequences to women who have been forced (Lucke, 1998; Muehlenhard & Schrag, 1991). It is important then, to better understand what may make a woman more likely to consent to unwanted sex. Walker utilizes a theoretical perspective to explain this phenomenon that focuses on gender-role socialization in US culture. She states, "Central to this theoretical perspective is gender-role socialization in the culture by which many girls internalize stereotyped beliefs about male sexual prerogatives and the importance of a heterosexual relationship to feminine identity (pg. 157)." The present study looks specifically at pressure from male partners, however Walker's (1997) review of studies begs the important question of how gender socialization and gender role adherence/ideology may or may not make a woman vulnerable to unwanted sex and its negative impact.

Various studies have demonstrated that many young women eventually give in to verbal sexual coercion in order to please or maintain a relationship and avoid the negative relational consequences of refusing to engage in sexual acts with their partner (Katz et al., 2007; Walker, 1997). These women are placed in the difficult situation in which they must decide whether or not they should protect their relationship buy consenting to sex and face the shame and guilt associated with risk-taking sexual behavior or maintain their "pure" status and potentially destroy their relationship. This may be further complicated when one considers the social implications of engaging in or refusing to engage in sexual activity in the context of a traditional female gender role.

Further, research has indicated that people who strive to adhere to traditional gender norms often base their self concept on the approval of others and other external factors (Sanchez, Crocker, & Boike, 2005). Sanchez et al. (2005), "argue that contingent self-worth, specifically, basing self-esteem on others' approval, explains why gender conformists feel they must perform certain roles." For women, this role often includes pleasing one's male partner in order to remain in a romantic relationship (Walker, 1997). They also found that gender role conformists or those who follow traditional gender roles are more likely to base their sense of self-worth on approval from external sources. This may undermine autonomy in relationships with others. Bailey, Hendrick and Hendrick (1987) report, "The data directly showed that self-esteem was positively correlated with masculinity, but was only marginally related to femininity"(p. 646). This may indicate that male socialization reinforces self-esteem though something in female socialization inhibits or fails to build such a sense of self.

In the United States, one's gender greatly impacts how the world interacts with that individual. Research has demonstrated that young girls are often socialized to be passive, conflict

avoidant, gain confidence through their physical appearance and the approval of others, and to be more communally focused or relationship oriented (Bailey et al., 1997; Walker, 1997). The internalization of gender stereotypes and socialized gender roles may make women more susceptible to consenting during a verbally coercive encounter (Walker, 1997). When women are raised to place relationships above one's own preferences, she may consent in order to protect the ever important relationship. This may become more serious when one considers the degree to which obtaining a sexual/romantic partner is central to young women's identities. Women continue to gain status based on their male partner's achievements. Small and Kerns (1993) give support to this theory when they state, "the tendency to yield to the wishes of others to the exclusion of one's own needs may have its roots in cultural stereotypes and socialization patterns which convey to females that femininity is related to pleasing others" (p. 948, As quoted by Walker, 1997).

Research has demonstrated that women, overall, have less decision making power in heterosexual relationships than their male partners due to gender norms and expectations (Sanchez, Crocker, & Boike, 2005). Walker (1997) hypothesizes that a woman's decision to consent to sexual acts are informed by their gender specific socialization. While men are often socialized to expect sexual actions from their partners, women are socialized to both keep their partners happy and maintain a guise of purity. Women may hesitate to damage their relationship by refusing to engage in sexual acts and therefore consent to unwanted interactions.

Perceptions of Coercion and Verbal Sexual Coercion

Sexual coercion is a common concern among all who work with college age individuals especially college staff and clinicians who work within these institutions. Studies have shown that college students do not find sexually coercive behavior to be highly problematic despite the

18

research that says otherwise (Oswald & Russel, 2006). Unfortunately, coercive sexual interactions between men and women are becoming normative as is seen through the many jokes undermining the importance of consent made by individuals as well as media.

Relationship context. The context of a heterosexual relationship has been determined to have an influence on how a woman responds to verbal coercion from a male. Research has shown that women will tolerate less coercive behavior in situations involving a stranger, acquaintance or friend; however in long-term relationships and possibly in marriages women have been shown to tolerate higher levels of all types of coercion (Faulkner et al., 2008). Research has shown that the seriousness of rape is minimized between more closely acquainted people. Could this also be true in terms of coercion which is even more normalized in close relationships between men and women such as verbal sexual coercion? In a study that utilized gender role traditionality as a variable in people's perception of a wide range of coercive encounters, findings indicated that overall marital rape was perceived to be less damaging, less serious, less violent and less of a violation as compared to the other situations which included: rape by a stranger, acquaintance, and a date (Simonson and Subich, 1999). Little research has been conducted that focuses primarily on verbal coercion in different contexts.

Gender-role ideology. Gender not only impacts one's likelihood to be the victim of coercion, it also impacts how the players in these coercive situations are viewed by others. An example of this difference can be found in Oswald and Russel's (2006) study that found that male coercers are often considered aggressive and female coercers are viewed as promiscuous by unaffiliated observers. These views seem to be related to beliefs about men and women based on normative gender roles and scripts that often place the man in position of aggressor and women in the position of gatekeeper. Other studies have shown that men who coerce were viewed as

19

unhappy with the relationship by both male and female participants. Because women are socialized to place great importance on their romantic relationships (Walker, 1997), this view that a partner is unhappy may lead her to consent after her partner uses verbally coercive strategies.

Though the current study focuses on verbal sexual coercion, research that explores how gender role ideology impacts an observer's perception of rape may help the reader to better understand how these viewpoints may apply to all types of sexual coercion. In 1999, Simonson and Subich collected information on how a participant's gender and gender role ideology impacted their perception of a rape situation in which the rapist was male and the victim was female. Their results indicated that observers who identified with more non-traditional gender roles viewed the rape situations to be more serious and were less likely to blame the victim than those who identified with traditional roles (Simonson and Subich, 1999). Gender differences in perception were also evident. Women reported more egalitarian gender roles than did men and saw the rape situations as more serious. Men were more likely to see the victim as unable to control the system and/or presenting as more provocative (Simonson and Subich, 1999).

Due to the physical force associated with rape situations victims may be viewed as having less power and control than victims who may have engaged in sexual activity as a result of verbal coercion. Findings have shown that while both men and women find victims of verbal sexual coercion as at least somewhat responsible for their role in the encounter, male participants placed more of the responsibility on female victims than female participants (Katz, Moore, & Tkachuk, 2007). Their findings suggested that due to the perceived controllability of verbal sexual coercion, female victims of verbal coercion were ascribed more fault or responsibility for their unwanted sexual encounters than women who were raped. The male participants also

perceived the woman victim as less distressed than the female participants (Katz et al., 2007).

These gender differences may suggest that the female participants had a different understanding

of a women's experience of verbal sexual coercion that is based on their gender identification.

'Traditional Sexual Script'

In exploring young women's ideal sexual situations, Elmerstig, Wijma, Sandell and

Bertero (2010) report that traditional sexual expectations, norms and scripts become an obstacle

to young women's achievement of these ideals.

> The women's ideal situations in heterosexual practice were characterized by
>
> sexual pleasure on equal terms, implying that no one dominates and both partners
>
> get pleasure. There were obstacles to reaching this ideal, such as influences from
>
> social norms and demands, and experiences of the partner's "own run" (focus on
>
> one's personal desires and pleasure rather than that of their partner) (Elmerstig et
>
> al., 2012, pg.129).

Traditional sexual script and gender roles. Gender-role socialization and ideology

likely impacts the degree to which an individual adheres to the traditional sexual script. Sexual

scripts dictate the normative manner in which men and women are expected to interact in sexual

situations. The traditional male role is one that focuses on achievement, dominance, physical

strength, and lack of emotional expression. In contrast, the role of the female in the traditional

sexual script is that of emotionality, passivity, submission and nurturance (Byers, 1996). In this

traditional sexual script a woman is more likely to gain status through her male partner rather

than through her own achievements. The romantic relationship is at the center of her identity and

therefore, she must carefully balance a demonstration of purity while maintaining a romantic

relationship with a sexually focused male partner (Bailey et al., 1997).

Gender role socializations dictate the leading sexual script and create the role of man as the initiator and pursuer and women as the limit setter (Byer & Lewis, 1988). This script, in fact, seems to create the space for disagreements over the degree of physical intimacy and verbal coercion to occur as noted on the 1988 study by Byers & Lewis. Some authors have argues that the Traditional Sexual Script makes it extremely difficult for women with traditional gender role ideologies to manage sexual intimacy with men. Livingston et al. state it clearly:

> The traditional sexual script maintains that women should appear at least somewhat sexually willing, while refusing higher levels of sexual intimacy to avoid being viewed as sexually promiscuous. Men, guided by the traditional sexual script, may believe that women engage in token resistance and hence may persist in their attempts at sexual coercion (p. 294).

Bailey, Henderick and Hendrick (1987) highlight the differences in love and sex attitudes between the genders. They state, "Considering findings for love and sex attitudes jointly, the following composite emerges: Males are more game playing, sexually permissive, and instrumental in attitude. Females are more friendship oriented, practical, dependent and sometimes more responsible and communal in attitude" (p. 638). They attribute such differences not to biological gender, but to sex role socialization to the social constructs of masculinity and femininity.

The sexual script perspective accurately predicts that men are more likely to play the role of coercer and women the role of victim, however as several studies show, this may be slowly changing as ideologies begin to shift (Lucke, 1998).

Relationship between Gender role Traditionality and Heterosexual Encounters

The various feminist movements have left an impression on numerous aspects of life within the United States including sexual intimacy in heterosexual relationships. A key aspect of all feminist ideologies is the challenge and critique to traditional sexual scripts and gender role ideology. Presenting and identifying with feminism has been shown to have an impact on some women's relationships with men and other women. Through this portion of the review, we may better understand how this identification impacts a woman's relationships with men, both in terms of how a feminist-identified woman relates to the heterosexual script and how their male partners understand and respond to their feminist identification.

Perceptions of women with nontraditional presentations. Garcia (1984) found that women who displayed nontraditional body language and actions in a non sexual setting were seen as more promiscuous and sexually open than women who displayed more gender conforming behavior. Garcia concluded that people make judgments about one's sexual permissiveness and willingness to engage in sex from non sexual behavior. What does this mean for a woman who displays non traditional roles in the context of verbal sexual coercion? Sexual precedence is one of several reasons identified in the literature for a man's use of coercion (Livingston, Buddie, Testa, and VanZile-Tamsen, 2004). If nontraditional gender role presentation can lead participants to assume sexual openness, it seems possible that men may use such presentations as grounds for having expectations of sexual intimacy.

Women may avoid identifying as feminists and exploration of the feminist ideology due to the various negative stereotypes associated with the term. Research indicates that women who identify as feminists show less traditional gender roles and more confidence in their abilities though they are also viewed as stubborn, anti-male, angry, opinionated, demanding and aggressive (Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007). It is important to explore how men may react to such

23

women. If traditional gender roles place great importance on power and dominance to assert one's masculinity, the male seeking sexual intimacy from a feminist or nontraditional woman may feel threatened.

Impact of women's gender role ideology on sexual encounters. Feminist ideology, though diverse in its various forms, can almost always be linked to a critique of traditional gender-roles and the traditional sexual script (Schick et al., 2008) which is both viewed as disempowering to women. Schick, Zucker and Bay-Cheng (2008) explored how feminist ideology impacts a woman's sense of self-efficacy in sexual relationships through condom use negotiations (Schick et al., 2008). Asking a romantic partner to use a condom may seem straightforward but when one considers the implications of such a request (reducing the man's pleasure, questioning his faithfulness, insinuating he may not be "clean," and running the risk of refusal should he refuse) a woman that adheres to traditional roles may forgo asking for a condom due to the potential negative impact on her relationship (Walker, 1997).

Schick, Zucker, and Bay-Cheng (2008) found that feminist ideology was indirectly related to condom use self-efficacy and women's sexual satisfaction in relationships therefore increasing their overall sexual well-being. As a result of their study, Schick et al. (2008) reported that, "Women who endorsed feminist beliefs more strongly felt a greater sense of sexual subjectivity and were more inclined to have sex as a result of their own sexual interests and wishes rather than in response to extrinsic forces (e.g., their male partners)" (p. 229). It is likely that women who assert their needs and desires are also likely to refuse unwanted sexual activity and recognize verbal pressure as coercion (Schick et al., 2008; Walker, 1997).

In contrast to this idea, a study conducted by Poppen and Segal in 1988, found that a woman's likelihood to give in to coercion had no relationship to her identification with

traditional traits of femininity (Poppen & Segal, 1988). They found similar results with their

male participants. They concluded that biological sex and not necessarily sex-role orientation

influences the likelihood of men to coerce for sexual purposes and for women to yield (Poppen

& Segal, 1988).

Other research has demonstrated little difference between the experiences of women

holding nontraditional and traditional gender role ideologies. Faulkner, Kolts and Hicks (2008)

found that a woman's level of identification with traditional female sex roles did not have a

significant impact on women's termination of coercive acts in their study. In order to explain

such inconsistencies they state, "for some traditionally minded women, their values may play out

in the form of submissiveness to coercive advances, while others may be likely to resist such

advances , at least when they are not made by a marital partner" (pg. 146). It therefore seems

important to understand the context in which the coercion is occurring to better understand if

traditionality has an impact.

Therapists may have to utilize a client's individual gender role ideology in their

experience of sexual coercion. It is possible that some elements of feminist or non-traditional

ideology may be beneficial in prevention and intervention tactics in working towards the

reduction of unwanted sexual activity for women.

Non-traditional gender roles have not always proven to be protective factors in studies

exploring coercion. Faulkner et al. (2008) found no significant relationship between a woman's

gender role ideology and her tolerance of sexual coercion. They acknowledged that their study

failed to capture the results on coercion in a marriage situation and thus may not have accurately

collected data about women who may feel a duty to please her husband but may not feel

similarly with a boyfriend. The authors argue that this may have left both participants with

nontraditional and traditional ideologies to tolerate less coercion due to the sexual self-efficacy/autonomy of non-traditional ideologies and the emphasis on purity in traditional roles for women with traditional values (Faulkner et al., 2008).

Adherence to feminist ideology may not only fail to reduce the likelihood of experiencing coercion and aggression by male partner but increase women's chances of facing such negative experiences. A study conducted by Korman and Leslie (1982) found that contrary to their prediction, a female's adherence to feminist ideology demonstrated no significant difference between that of more traditional women in their reports of male partners' sexual aggression. Though the difference was not found to be significant, their results demonstrated that women who were feminist reported more sexual aggression from their partners. Some studies have suggested that a more androgynous couple (i.e. more fluid gender role ideals/non-traditional couple) may have healthier relationships due to more similar attitudes about sex and love (Bailey, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 1997).

Impacts of masculine traits and stereotypes. The masculine trait of "dominance" has been found to be a predictor of the use of sexual coercion for men (Cvancara & Kinney 2009; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003). What has been the outcome of women enacting power roles or masculine roles in sexual relationships? Lucke (1998) has found that women who express more egalitarian views on gender role ideology have a higher number of partners and therefore are at greater risk for physiological impacts of sexual activity. Lucke held this information in relationship to a study conducted by Pleck, Sonestien and Ku (1993) who found that men with traditional gender role attitudes were also more likely to have a higher number of partners in a year. With both sets of findings in mind, Lucke suggests that the traditional "masculine role" may be associated with having multiple partners (Lucke, 1998). Prevalent research suggests that

male use of verbal coercion is associated with needs for control and acceptance of traditional sex-role stereotypes (Cvancara & Kinney, 2009).

Implications

In her feminist analysis of the presence of sexual coercion in our society, Wendy E. Stock states, "For sexual coercion to cease, women must accrue enough power through increased access to concrete resources, expertise, and status to make it less possible for males to continue to maintain constructs and beliefs that stipulate male domination of females" (p. 73). It is helpful to better understand the behavior associated with verbal sexual coercion in order to develop means to prevent and treat women who have experienced such interactions.

Much of the current research indicate that further study is needed to better understand the correlational relationship between women's sexual assertiveness, gender roles and verbal sexual coercion (Katz and Myhr, 2008; Wright et al., 2010). The present study is aimed at just that; to explore feminist, traditional and nontraditional gender role ideology to better understand relationships to sexual assertiveness and resistance of verbal coercion.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Formulation

The purpose of the present study was to examine how verbal sexual coercion is experienced by young, American women today and to determine if these women's level of adherence to traditional gender impacts this experience. I also explored this experience for women who identify as feminist when compared to women who do not. In order to study this specific area of interest, I collected data about women's experiences of verbal sexual coercion from 217 American women between the ages of 21 and 30, who have played a role in a heterosexual encounter within the past two years. While the subject of sexual coercion has been well studied, there are fewer examples of studies that appear to focus on verbal sexual coercion, rather than physical coercion. Further, there appears to be little research on the impact non-traditional gender roles or feminist ideology may have on women's experiences (Cvancara & Kinney, 2009; Schick et al, 2008). This study aimed to fill that gap.

In order to examine the research question, the study was designed to explore the variables of recent experience, coercive strategies experienced, result of verbal coercion, and lasting impacts of these experiences. In order to explore the relationship between gender role ideology and verbal sexual coercion, young women were asked about their own experiences in heterosexual encounters and their personal reactions to these events. I examined these retrospective reports of women and utilize an anonymous online survey composed of questions

that are based on factors of verbal coercion identified in the literature. This method of data collection has allowed this study to include a large amount of data from a broader and geographically diverse recipient pool.

A quantitative survey design was chosen for this exploratory study in order to examine the relationship between gender role ideology and women experiences of heterosexual verbal coercion. My key hypothesis was that there is a relationship between feminist ideology and experience of verbal sexual coercion. To determine the presence of such a relationship, I utilized correlation statistics. Due to the small amount of research on this relationship, this study aimed to begin to gather information that may inform further study of verbal sexual coercion.

Procedure

Recruitment. Participants were recruited through a snowball technique initiated through my personal social contacts including colleagues and friends as well as the social contacts of my fellow students and family members. I sent recruitment messages from my personal email address as well as my Facebook page explaining the purpose of my study (See Appendix C: Recruitment Email). Several friends and colleagues from around the country were able to forward the recruitment messages and/or post them to their own Facebook pages to help me to recruit a larger and more geographically diverse sample. The messages included a link to the Surveymonkey website which allowed for quick and easy access to my survey.

Though some of my acquaintances may have felt obligated to participate in my study to benefit my research outcomes, I made it clear that due to the anonymous nature of the survey I was not able to determine who completed or did not complete the survey.

Initial Access, Eligibility, & Prescreening. Upon receiving an email message explaining the purpose and the participant's eligibility in the study, each potential participant was

able to decide to participate in the study or disregard the email. As each potential participant demonstrated willingness and determined their eligibility to participate in the study, they were instructed to follow the Surveymonkey link embedded in the message to immediately begin the survey.

Upon opening the Surveymonkey link participants received basic information about the study as well as a second reminder of the criteria for participation (See Appendix B: Welcome Page). At the bottom of the page they read, "If you meet the above criteria and would like to participate in this study click "continue." If you do not wish to participate in this study you may leave the website. Thank you for your time."

Each participant that decided to continue was directed to the "Informed Consent Form" where they were more fully informed of the general purposes of the research project, potential risks and benefits of participation, and their rights as a participant (See Appendix D: Informed Consent"). The participants than demonstrated their willingness to participate in the survey by clicking a button ("I agree") indicating that they agreed to the informed consent and wished to continue to the survey. Those who did not agree with the informed consent form were thanked for their time.

Upon clicking "I agree" on the "Informed Consent Form," each participant was asked to read the directions carefully and to begin to answer survey items by either clicking all that apply, clicking the yes or no button, or choosing a number on a 1 to 5 scale.

Data Collection. Prior to disseminating the survey, three MSW students and a faculty supervisor reviewed the survey items through the Surveymonkey website to ensure that the survey was functioning properly and the survey items were clear. Data collection began on February 12th and ended on March 15th.

Participant spent between 4 and 35 minutes answering demographic items, items determining gender role ideology, and items exploring their experience(s) of emotional sexual coercion. The demographic and gender role ideology data served as sources for creating comparative groups (See Appendix E: Survey). Data collection was anonymously collected through the Surveymonkey website.

As participants completed the survey they were instructed to click the "submit" button at the bottom of the web page. The survey was estimated to take no more than 30 minutes to complete depending on the speed in which participants answer the items. There are about 30 questions in the survey.

Sample. In order understand the experience of verbal sexual coercion in relation to gender role ideology the present study included 217 women between the ages of 21 and 30 years old who reported having had experienced a heterosexual sexual encounter within the last two years. This criteria was chosen in order to provide important information about young adult women who may be more likely to have a more established sense of gender role ideology. Much of the prior research focused on college age women who may be more likely to be swayed by peers and course material. Participants who did not identify as Americans were excluded from the data set to control for cultural influences. Further, all participants were able to read and write in English.

I employed non-probability, snowball sampling by imbedding links into Facebook posts and emails. This means of disseminating the survey allowed for greater opportunity for diversity as well as appeal to the intended age group for participants considering their ease of use, familiarity and access to the internet

Hypothesis

For the purpose of this study, I chose to examine feminism as the key value that may or may not have an impact on experiences of sexual coercion. A primary hypothesis for this study is: There is a positive relationship between persons who identify as feminist and experience of sexual coercion. This hypothesis is based on several findings that demonstrated that women who enact or demonstrate non-traditional gender roles are viewed as more sexually permissive. Another leading hypothesis was that there is a positive relationship between those who do not identify as feminist and negative impacts of verbal sexual coercion.

Data Analysis

Participant's responses were collected and recorded through the Surveymonkey website. Data was then downloaded from the website and analyzed on my personal computer and computers in the Smith College Network. For the purpose of analysis, two groups were created based on participants' self-identification with the term 'Feminist' or 'Non-feminist.' This binary variable acted as a proxy variable to represent variations in personal values and beliefs regarding gender roles.

Dependent variable: Feminist self-identification. A binary variable was used to determine participants' personal values for analysis. Originally I planned to utilize a 10 item assessment utilizing a 5 point Likert scale to determine the gender role ideology of each participant. I created this scale based on the research identified in chapter II. I adjusted coding for the direction of each item and took the sum of each participant's responses (this provided a score from 10 to 50). The mean score for all 218 participants was 42.6 indicating a large majority of responses clustered around the non-traditional gender role ideology score. This indicated a lack in diversity of sample. Though time did not allow for a full complement of respondents, the

32

survey item, "Do you consider yourself to be a feminist (Y/N)?" provided a manner in which I could create two groups for analysis based on the participant's personal values. Analysis compared these two groups in according to their coercion experiences.

Experience. Data frequencies were utilized to determine how many participants from each group reported no experience of verbal sexual coercion within the past year. This information was gleaned from the STRAT variables (1-12) and the open ended items. To determine the difference between the "feminist identified" and "non feminist-identified" groups regarding their experiences of specific coercive strategies, STRAT (1-12) were recorded so that 0 indicated "no experience" and 1 indicated experience. I then utilized crosstabs/ chi square tests to analyze the data.

Degree to which it was upsetting. The differences between the degree to which the two groups found each of the 12 coercive strategies to be upsetting was measured by first recoding each item so that we could compare upsetting versus not upsetting. If they indicated that they had not experienced a particular strategy (selected "0") they were removed from the analysis for the corresponding variable. If they indicated that they found the strategy upsetting (2 or 3) this was collapsed into a nominal score of 2. If they experienced the strategy but did not find it upsetting their score remained a 1. For each strategy listed a crosstab descriptive statistic was conducted to break down each strategy by the two groups (feminist and non-feminist). A CHI Square analysis of difference was run for those strategies for which it was possible.

Personal results of verbal sexual coercion. To measure the degree to which participants acquiesced (GIVEIN) to more sexual activity due to their partner's use of verbal sexual coercion, the Likert scale for the first portion of item 18 was collapsed in to two categories in which a score of 1 or 2 became "disagree" and 4 or 5 being "agree." Scores of 3 (unsure) were removed

33

from analysis. I then performed a T-test to explore differences between the two groups. Item 19 in the online survey (See Appendix #) asked that participants check all that apply to various possible results of verbal sexual coercion. For each of these variables, I ran a crosstab and chi square analysis.

CHAPTER IV

Findings

This study explored the relationship between the values and beliefs of young, American women and their experiences of verbal sexual coercion in a heterosexual relationship. Participants completed an online survey that asked questions regarding their adherence to traditional gender role ideology, experiences of verbally coercive strategies, and the impacts of these experiences. This survey collected both quantitative and qualitative data about their experiences. This chapter presents the major findings from the study beginning with the demographics of the sample. The chapter describes the relationship between feminist self-identification and experiences of verbal sexual coercion in heterosexual encounters through an exploration of quantitative data gleaned from the following questions: 1) Do personal values affect the likelihood of experiencing verbal sexual coercion? 2) Do an individual's values impact the degree to which they find experiences of verbal sexual coercive experiences upsetting? 3) Do one's personal values impact one's likelihood to acquiesce as a result of verbal sexual coercion? And 4) Does Gender role ideology impact the results of experiencing verbal sexual coercion? Next, the chapter will describe the qualitative findings provided by two open-ended items in the online survey. This chapter will end with a comparison of quantitative and qualitative data.

Demographics

The data from 218 respondents was used for this study. Although 338 individuals consented to this study only 225 completed the survey. Without marking submit at the end of the

survey, I could not be sure that the participant wished for their data to be included in the study as they were advised that they could discontinue to survey at anytime. I excluded 6 more participants because they had left more than 50% of the survey items blank. The last participant was excluded because she did not meet the participation criteria for age.

The sample was diverse in relationship status and religious identification but not in race. 92.4% of participants self identified as white or Caucasian, 2.4% as black or African American, 1.9% as Latina with the remaining participants identifying various racial identities. Participants relationship statuses were varied with the most common being "committed relationship" (36.3%), "married" (29.3%), single (14%), and casual dating (9.3%). Other relationship statuses included "engaged", "open relationship," and "other" (civil partnership, divorced, polyamorous, open and committed, etc). 46.5% of participants identify as religious. Despite only 46.5% of participants identifying as religious, 66.2% identified with a specific religion. 35.7% of participants identified as Catholic, 17.8% identified as Christian, and 8.9% identified as Jewish. Other identifications included Buddhist, Protestant, spiritual and Wiccan.

Of the 218 respondents, 126 identified as feminists and 89 did not. Two groups were established based on this variable, and were used to guide the analysis. This was utilized as the independent variable to explore the relationship between personal values and experiences of verbal sexual coercion.

Quantitative Data

Impact of personal values on past experience of verbal sexual coercion. Analysis run on the current sample of participants shows no significant difference between the experiences of women who self-identify with feminism when compared to those who did not on whether or not they have experienced verbal sexual coercion in the past two years. Twenty-three percent (n=29)

of those in the "feminist group" reported no experience of verbal sexual coercion in the past year. Similarly, N=24 (26%) of non-feminists reported no verbal sexual coercion within the past year. Of the sample n=165 (75.6%) reported experiencing verbal sexual coercion in the last two years. I utilized Pearson's Chi Square analysis to compare both groups' experiences of 12 different identified strategies of verbal sexual coercion to determine if there was a difference between the coercive strategies these women had experienced. No significant difference was found between the two groups. However, it may be considered notable that two of these strategies (Persistent asking/pleading for more" (sexual activity) and "Made you feel guilty or bad.") were experienced by over half of the total participants.

Impact of personal values on emotional effect of verbal sexual coercion. The differences between the degree to which the two groups found each of the 12 coercive strategies to be upsetting was measured using a crosstab/ CHI square analysis. A CHI Square analysis of difference was run for those strategies for which it was possible (STRAT 2, 8, 11, 12). No significant difference was found for strategies 2,8,11, and 12. However, for Strategy 2, (Persistent asking/pleading for more sexual activity) the difference approached significance (chi square (1)=3.565, p=.059 continuity corrected). A smaller percent of feminists found persistence/pleading upsetting N=45 (69%) than non-feminists N=39 (87%). Though a chi square analysis could not be run on several of the variables due to a small number of participants who have experienced them, it may be notable that differences were found between the scores of the two groups for Strategy 7. Analysis indicated that N=38 (58.5% of those who reported experiencing Strategy 7) of women in the "feminist" group found Strategy 7 (Made you feel obligated or like it was expected) to be upsetting compared to N=27 (41.5%) of respondents in the "non-feminist" group.

Influence of values on results of verbal sexual coercion. In order to compare the two groups' experience in terms of acquiescence, a t-test was run to determine if there was a difference between the two groups in terms of whether they acquiesced to more sexual activity as a result of verbal sexual coercion. No significant difference was found. Overall, N=51 (23.7%) of total participants reported that they feel they engaged in more sexual activity than was comfortable as a result of verbal sexual coercion. Further, crosstab/chi square analyses were run between RESULT variables (i.e. more sexual activity than I was comfortable with, an end to the relationship, a better relationship, difficulties in my later relationships, feelings of guilt or shame, feelings of anger) and feminist versus non-feminist groups. Again no significant difference was found.

Qualitative Data

Two open-ended items appeared in the survey. Of the 218 participants 8 from the non feminist group and 13 from the feminist group responded to the first open-ended item that stated, "Please explain if you feel as though you have experienced another type of verbal pressure to engage in sexual activity." Four of the collected responses were simply commentary about the study or the participant's responses to other items. Others expressed non-verbal pressures such as "He turns to porn to fulfill his sexual desires, makes me feel like an object not a person when we have sex..." and "Not speaking, just doing it, purposefully not giving me a chance to speak." Another participant described physical coercion which does not apply to the findings of the present study. Some themes that were repeated in the remaining 13 responses included: expressing want (i.e."I was his first. He would allude to the fact that he really wanted to"), expressing health or gender based need (i.e."He "needed" sex to be mentally healthy.") obligation or guilt (i.e. "[you] should be putting my physical needs above everything. I'm a man,

you know." and "But we haven't had sex in...(Amount of time) and accusation. One feminist identified respondent reported that a male had utilized her personal beliefs and values to try to convince her to engage in a sexual act that she had previously refused.

A majority of those who responded to the question: "If you indicated above that you found one or more experiences to be negative/upsetting, please describe what you found to be most negative/upsetting about this (these) experience(s)?" were respondents who identified as feminists. Respondents identified a wide range of aspects of verbal sexual coercion that they personally found to be most upsetting. Nine respondents from the non-feminist group offered responses and 36 respondents from the feminist group responded. Though this left little room for comparison, some trends did surface. Eight primary themes emerged from this data. These themes included: 1) Negative emotions directed inwards due to the participant's acquiescence in the encounter, 2) Negative emotions directed inward due to refusal of sexual activity, 3) Negative impact on the current relationship, 4) Feeling objectified/devalued, 5) Feeling trapped/forced, 6) Anger directed outwards, 7) Fear of negative impacts of refusal, and 8) lasting impacts on respondent's sexual life. Interesting outliers included one participant who reported she feels "selfish" for not having sex with her husband more frequently. Another outlier was a woman who reported that she utilizes verbally coercive strategies to convince her partner to engage in sexual activity.

The feminist-identified participants (n=36) most frequently reported the following themes: 1) negative emotions directed inwards due to the participant's acquiescence in the encounter (12) For example, one participant stated " I felt that I wasn't standing my ground, that I was letting him control the situation. I placed the anger, shame, and negativity on me, not him." 2) and/or because of their refusal (11) "I was more upset by my guilt or shame in saying "no"

39

after initially saying "yes". I strongly believe that anyone is allowed to change their mind and should not feel ashamed for it." as well as; 3) anger turned outwards either towards the coercer or society (11). For example, another 'feminist-identified' participant reported, "Disappointment in myself for giving in, disappointment in humanity because he was a friend of people I trusted, avoiding events in which I might see him even if I would have normally wanted to go." The non-feminist identified group (n=9) most commonly reported the themes of feeling trapped (4) and feeling objectified/devalued (3) such as, " I felt invalidated and devalued when the guy implied that I'm less feminine (and therefore as sexually appealing) because I don't engage in certain behaviors." and "It made me feel like I was a bad person, like I didn't have real value, and at times like my life was in danger." Two participants from the 'non-feminist' group reported no experience of verbal sexual coercion stating, "This survey and what you plan on doing with it makes me more uncomfortable then any sex/pressure. Women are taken care of, why don't you do one for men who get raped by the state, and their kids taken from them????" and " I have never had a man come onto me in a bad way nor ever pressure me of force anything on me. Only boyfriends and they all weren't as sexual as me and I'm the one who gets upset or mad that they won't have sex." A participant from the 'feminist group shared, " Not so much pressure from partner, but internal pressure/guilt that if we didn't have enough sex he would be unhappy/unsatisfied. Partner didn't do anything to encourage this idea; I think it came more from society."

Summary of Findings

Overall, the findings demonstrate that a large majority of the sample reported experiencing verbal sexual coercion within the past two years. Both the "feminist-identified" group and the "non feminist-identified" group demonstrated that a variety of strategies had been

used to convince them to continue further sexual activity. The qualitative data collected identifies other verbal coercive strategies for consideration. There was no significant difference in the degree to which both groups found verbal sexual coercion to be upsetting. It may be important to note that some strategies seemed to be more upsetting to this sample than others. There was no significant difference between women with differing belief systems regarding the impacts of verbal sexual coercion on the individual being coerced. Qualitative data may demonstrate that there may be a difference in the aspects of verbal sexual coercion that the two groups find most upsetting.

CHAPTER V

Discussion

This study surveyed women age 21 to 30 in order to identify their personal values and their sexual experiences with men in the past two years. In addition, the survey explored the impacts and outcomes of verbal sexual coercion on the participants. The purpose of this study was to find out if there is a relationship between women's personal values and their experiences of verbal sexual coercion in heterosexual encounters. In order to do this, study participants were divided into two groups based on participant self-identification as either "feminist" or "non-feminist." The findings found little difference between the experiences of women in this sample based on their self-identification with feminism. At least in this study, these findings may suggest that women's personal beliefs and values do not impact their experience of verbal sexual coercion.

The results of this research study suggest that within this sample of women 1) possessing a value as 'feminist' appears to have little impact on whether or not they have experienced verbal sexual coercion; 2) the personal value of feminism appears to have no significant influence on the degree to which they found specific strategies of verbal sexual coercion to be upsetting; 3) nor did they have a significant impact on the results of having experienced verbal sexual coercion; 4) Women identified a range of verbal sexual coercion techniques used by their partners regardless of one's personal values; and finally 5) feminist identified women and non-feminist identified women differed in the aspects of verbal sexual coercion that they found most

upsetting. This chapter further explains and synthesizes these findings through comparison with findings of other studies identified in chapter two. This chapter also describes the limitations and strengths of this research, the insight gained, as well as the clinical and research implications that can be gleaned from this study.

Key Findings

The key finding in relation to the research question is that a woman's personal identification with feminism does not impact her likelihood to experience verbal sexual coercion nor does it seem to impact the outcomes and results of these encounters. In the present study, no significant difference was found between the experiences of women who self-identify as feminists and those who do not. A possible reason for this lack in difference in experiences between 'feminist' and non-feminist' groups may be that despite one's personal beliefs, most women in this society are socialized to enact gender roles (Small & Kerns, 1993; Walker, 1997) despite their own critique of these roles. This could be considered contrary to the implications of the study conducted by Schick et al. (2008) who, as a result of their findings, believed that, "feminist ideology may play a role in the promotion of women's sexual well-being (p.225)." The present study seems to indicate that protection from the experience of verbal sexual coercion and it's negative impacts is not an aspect of this "sexual well-being."

Another major finding of the present study is that 75.6% of participants expressed having experienced verbal sexual coercion in the past two years. This is consistent with the findings of Struckman-Johnson et al. (2003) who found that 78% of women respondents had experienced verbal sexual coercion since the age of 16. Though this data does not directly relate to the research question at hand, it emphasizes the prevalence of verbal sexual coercion among the sample. As stated in previous research, many studies and prevention efforts focus on college age

43

women (Oswald & Russel, 2006; Wright et al., 2010). This key finding demonstrates that verbal sexual coercion is also experienced by women after college. Future research may further explore if there is a difference in likelihood to acquiesce or a difference in impact based on age (college vs. 20's). These findings are unexpected and fill a gap in the literature. Most studies on verbal sexual coercion focus solely on college age women. This study demonstrates that this phenomenon occurs in the next stage of life.

An encouraging finding is that n=164 (76.3%) of participants reported that, in the past two years, verbal sexual coercion has not lead to unwanted sexual activity. However n= 82 (38.1%) of participants reported that these experiences resulted in feelings of "guilt or shame." This latter statistic further underlines the importance of social workers and clinicians' understanding of this prevalent issue.

Feminist Self-identification

The original plan for determining the participants' values was to assess gender role ideology utilizing a scale that I created based on the current literature. The scale was composed on 10 statements about gender that asked participants to indicate their agreement on a 5 point Likert scale. The frequencies for this variable demonstrated that a significant majority of participants were clustered around non-traditional ideologies and therefore this scale could not be utilized for analysis. This may be caused by an insufficient sampling due to time restrictions, a weak scale for measurement, and/or a shift away from traditional values in modern heterosexual relationships. This shift has been identified by Lucke in 1998.

It is unclear whether the high rate of participants with non-traditional beliefs about gender reflects a lack in diversity in the sample or lack of reliability and validity in the scale that I created. None the less, participants' values proved difficult to define when operationalized in

this manner and therefore the data resulting from this scale may not have been the best way to assess women's values. In future research I would recommend identifying a pre-existing scale that has been tested for reliability and validity in assessment of this variable.

As the data was collected, there was an opportunity to utilize the feminist self-identification item from the demographics section of the survey for analysis of difference (which the Ideology Scale that I created did not supply). As the 'feminist' item also identifies one's personal values, it provided a means for exploring the research question: "Does a woman's personal values regarding her gender impact her experience of verbal sexual coercion?"

Feminist Self-identification and Women's Likelihood to Experience Verbal Sexual Coercion

The findings of the present study demonstrated that, in this sample, women experience sexual coercion regardless of their self-identification with feminism. In fact, a large majority of respondents in both the "feminist" and "non-feminist" groups reported having experienced verbal sexual coercion in the past 2 years. This finding demonstrates that regardless of their feminist self-identification, the majority of participants have experienced a male pressuring them for sexual activity. This may indicate that a woman's identification with feminism has no impact on a man's decision to utilize coercive strategies. Korman and Leslie (1982) found similar results in their early 1980's study. They state, "Contrary to the hypotheses, adherence to feminist ideology and the sharing of dating expenses are shown not to be associated with fewer reports of offense on dates" (p.114).

Another implication of these findings is that male partners may not treat women differently based on her personal values. A coercive man may be likely to utilize tactics of coercion regardless of his female partners' attitudes and beliefs. It may also be the case that

45

personal values and beliefs do not impact one's choice of partner. The "traditional sexual script" normalizes the male's role as coercer and alternative scripts may not be widely recognized. Though the "traditional sexual script" continues to be challenged, it remains a foundation on which many individuals base their expectations within a relationship (Byers, 1996).

Luis T. Garcia (1984) found that women who present with more feminist attitudes are viewed as more sexual and promiscuous than women who present as more traditional. In their 2004 study of verbal sexual coercion, Livingston, Buddie, Testa and Van-Zile-Tamsen found that women who have demonstrated precedence (have had sexual relations before) and those without both experience verbal sexual coercion, however, there is a difference in the strategies used by their partners. If men are making assumptions about women who present with feminist values, it might be assumed that they are likely utilize verbal sexual coercion in different or more aggressive strategies. For this reason, the present study explored whether or not there was a difference in the strategies of verbal coercion used by the male sexual partners. Interestingly there was no significant difference between the two groups and the types of coercive strategies their partners utilized.

On the other hand, men may be unable to determine the personal values of the women with whom he is interacting and utilizes coercive strategies without regard or understanding of the woman's beliefs. The qualitative data from the present study highlights the disappointment of women who self-identify as feminists in their failure to avoid coercive experiences with men. One participant stated, " I found it negative that some of the men who said things that felt pressuring to me were just not what I expected them to be (i.e. to be gentlemen who are respectful of the woman's desires) and that was embarrassing to me. However, I will say that I

did not allow these men to have vaginal intercourse with me so I am overall proud of myself for sticking to my values."

Two strategies were found to be experienced most commonly experienced by both groups. The coercive strategies most experienced by the sample were "Persistent asking/pleading for more" (sexual activity) and "Made you feel guilty or bad." were experienced by over half of the total participants. It may be important to further understand why these strategies are more common. In many ways these two strategies fit within the traditional sexual script.

Asking and pleading for more sexual activity between established couples as well as in more casual situations supports the findings that men often have been found to want more sexual contact/intimacy than their partners (as noted by Wright, Norton, & Matusek, 2010). Many participants also reported that they were made to feel guilty for not giving in as a coercive strategy. This also fits the "traditional sexual scripts" in that it reflects a commonly held belief that men need/deserve sex within certain relationships. In both non-feminist and feminist groups women reported a high level of male partners utilizing persistence to obtain sexual activity. Livingston et al. (2004) conducted a qualitative study in which they interviewed 114 young women about their experiences of verbal coercion. They report, "In a majority of transcripts, the man's persistence played a key role in convincing the woman to comply with his sexual advances" (p. 291).

Degree to which Specific Coercive Strategies were found to be Upsetting

The findings of the present study demonstrate that there was no significant difference in the degree to which each verbal sexually coercive strategy was considered upsetting between the "feminist" and "non-feminist" groups. Interestingly, one coercive strategy approached significance of difference between the two groups. Of those who reported experiencing

47

persistent asking/pleading for more sexual activity (N= 84), more non-feminists found this strategy to be upsetting (n=39, 87%) than respondents in the 'feminist group (n= 45, 69). This finding may have various implications many of which depend on the participant's definition of the term 'upsetting.' Further research is needed to better understand the differences in the reasons or specific ways in which feminist and non-feminist women find verbal coercion to be upsetting.

The qualitative findings in this study may offer insight into the different experiences of these two groups despite both groups finding this experience upsetting. For example, women who self-identify as feminists reported more negative feelings about themselves and society (shame, guilt and anger) for their ways in handling the situation. They also reported feelings of disappointment in society. Participants who did not identity as feminists seemed to find being objectified, disrespected, devalued and being/feeling trapped as most upsetting. These differences seem to demonstrate that those in the 'feminist' group look for changes that can be made or feelings of disappointment as though they should have known better. They are more critical of the behaviors of men, themselves and others than those in the 'non-feminist' group. For example one participant from the 'feminist' group stated, "I felt like I had made a mistake in judging my partner's character. I felt like I should have known better - that he was the type of man who would not respect my choices. And then angry that I was blaming myself for his actions." The 'non-feminist' group's responses seemed to highlight a sense of feeling helpless and loss in self-esteem as a result of their partners' actions vs. their own actions. A participant from this group stated, "I felt invalidated and devalued when the guy implied that I'm less feminine (and therefore as sexually appealing) because I don't engage in certain behaviors." Another stated, "It made me feel like I was a bad person, like I didn't have real value, and at times like my life was in danger."

Results of Having Experienced Verbal Sexual Coercion

The present study showed no significant difference in the outcomes and impacts of having experienced verbal sexual coercion. Both groups reported various impacts with the most common being feelings of guilt or shame, more sexual activity than they wanted, and feelings of anger. This finding is surprising when one considers the study by Schick et al. (2008) who, based on their findings, were lead to believe "that efforts to promote women's sexual well-being may be strengthened by a feminist critique of gender norms" (p. 229). They purport that women who identify with feminist values have "a greater sense of sexual subjectivity' (p.229).

Other Strategies Used by Male Partners

The qualitative data shed light on several other techniques of verbal sexual coercion that were not utilized in the verbal strategies portion of my survey however most seemed to be other possible examples of strategies that had already been laid out. One new strategy was convincing the female partner that she is unhealthy. One respondent reported, "He told me I would need to see a therapist because I clearly had "problems" when it came to sex..." Another strategy that is slightly different than those in the survey was the notion that some men need sex for their mental health and by engaging in a monogamous relationship and withholding sex, the woman was keeping him from receiving the care he needs.

One of these strategies appealed directly to the norms as laid out by the "traditional sexual script." The respondent reported that her partner said, "I'll leave you and find someone who will be the way a woman should be, you're selfish and should be putting my physical needs above everything. I'm a man, you know." In contrast, a woman, when asked to report the aspect of the coercive experience she found most upsetting, reported that, "As a liberal-minded, intelligent woman it was hurtful to have a man not protect my emotions under the premise of

apparently being the more liberal-minded one and being into liberation for both genders. I was just supposed to accept that polyamory is great, even though his male privilege doesn't disappear just because he is poly." It seems that knowledge of a woman's identification or lack of identification with feminist values can simply be another tool for coercion. This may provide further explanation for reasons why there was very little difference between the experiences of both groups.

Aspects of verbal sexual coercion that they find most upsetting

Many of the respondents from the 'feminist' group seemed to reflect on how their beliefs and values (specifically feminism) may hurt future relationships or may have hurt prior relationships. It may be the case that women who hold feminist values recognize the consequences of adhering to them in the context of their relationships. They may lose relationships or struggle to find partners who accept their refusal to enact elements of the "traditional sexual script." If then, they engage in sexual activity to preserve relationships, those who identify as 'feminist' may feel more intense guilt for acting against their personal values. Women who identify as 'feminists' but wish to engage in a heterosexual relationship seem to struggle with this difficult choice according to the responses offered by various feminist-identified participants. These participants hold themselves to a high standard that leaves them with few options of possible dating partners in modern dating/hook-up culture as demonstrated by one participant who stated, "Unfortunately, since this experience, I am far more reluctant (and skeptical) about 'first dates' and I think I am even more outspoken about my values (and feminism)... This has led to more men questioning my sexuality, rather than realizing that my perspective matters and I make my own sexual decisions - not men or greater society. In

50

actuality, this probably makes me less sexually repressed, but it makes it more challenging to find partners."

Feelings of shame and guilt seemed to be present both when 'feminists' acquiesced and refused. When these women adhere to their ideologies and refuse the coercion they may then feel shame for feeling shame and guilt for refusing. One respondent indicated this exact phenomenon when she stated, "I guess the most upsetting thing about this is that the sum of these experiences has made me feel emotionally tarnished and they have made me feel guilty for it all while knowing that I shouldn't feel guilty - and feeling shame for feeling guilty."

Limitations

The use of the snow-ball sampling method may have also lead to a lack of diversity in gender role ideology in my sample. Due to time restrictions I relied on my personal social contacts and he social contacts of friends, fellow students, and family to gather potential participants. Though efforts were made to reach various regions of the United States, women of color and diverse religious groups little variation is present throughout the sample in race and gender role ideology or beliefs. The non-probability, snowball sampling method may have limited the generalizability and representativeness of the study and therefore the study was intended as an exploratory survey only with no claims for causality. Future studies examining the relationship of personal values and verbal sexual coercion might enhance generalizability through seeking out a more diverse sample in the areas of race and socioeconomic status.

The present sample consisted primarily of non-religious or Christian participants of Caucasian decent, which limits generalizability to more diverse groups. To reduce the possibility for confounding variables, future studies exploring this same topic may chose to narrow the criteria to more accurately identify the factors that influence one's experience of verbal sexual

coercion while utilizing sampling techniques aimed at reducing the homogeneity of participants. This process may involve exploring the phenomenon in only one relationship context such as marriage, dating relationships or casual encounters (as noted by Faulkner et al., 2008).

The feminist identification variable did not fully explore the intended area of personal values and beliefs that I had hoped to explore. Due to the usage of feminist self-identification as the independent variable, there may be questions as to whether feminist self-identification is an accurate representation of one's personal values. According to a study conducted by Roy and Miller (2007) women who identify with feminist values may not self-identify as feminists due to the negative stereotypes associated with the term in modern culture. There may have been a potential bias toward non-traditional gender role ideologies in this sample due to identification with non-traditional ideologies without identification with "feminist." In future research it may be helpful to utilize an up to date, established method to determine traditionality of values regarding gender and sexual activity.

Implications for further study

In future studies that aim to explore the relationship between feminism and sexual coercion, researchers may want to explore how relationship context impacts this experience. In the present study, this may have acted as a confounding variable (as noted by Faulkner, et al. 2008). The present study explored the relationship of women's personal values on their experience of verbal sexual coercion in heterosexual encounters. Further research should be directed at investigating women's responses to verbal sexual coercion in relation to their ideologies. Though the current study explored the relationship between experiencing verbal coercion and personal values it did not fully explore the relationship between values and the

52

likelihood to "give in." This Further research may also include investigating the male perspective of women's identification with feminism and its impact on their use of coercion.

Conclusion

The present study provided data that may support and guide further research on the phenomenon of verbal sexual coercion. Though it did not explore gender role ideology as was originally intended, the study provided insight into the phenomenon of verbal sexual coercion and its impacts on women through the use of feminist self-identification as the independent variable. This study highlighted that the phenomenon of verbal sexual coercion is experienced by women between the ages of 21 to 30, not just those in the college age group. The findings may indicate that regardless of feminist self-identification, a large majority of women continue to experience verbal sexual coercion and may experience negative consequences of these experiences.

As more is understood about the role women's personal values play in verbally coercive sexual interactions, we may develop ways to reduce the occurrence of verbal sexual coercion and minimize its impact. As a result of this study clinicians may become aware of the high rate of verbal sexual coercion occurring among women even after college. Clients may struggle to identify these experiences as problematic due to the acceptance and reinforcement of verbal coercion in American culture. Clinicians may begin to work with both male and female clients to deconstruct the" traditional sexual script" to better understand their individual wishes of their clients vs. the normative expectations a perpetuated by many forms of entertainment, education and overall culture.

REFERENCES

Aronson, K. M. R. & Buchholz, E. S. (2001). The post-feminist era: Still striving for equality in relationships. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 29*, 109–124.

Bailey, W.C., Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. S (1987). Relation of sex and gender role to love, sexual attitudes, and self-esteem. *Sex Roles, 16, 637-648.*

Byers, E. S. (1996). How well does the traditional sexual script explain sexual coercion? Review of a program of research. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 8, 7-25.*

Byers, E.S. & Glenn, S.A. (2012). Gender differences in cognitive and affective responses to sexual coercion. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27(5), 827-845.*

Byers, E. S., and Lewis, K. (1988). Dating couples' disagreements over the desired level of sexual intimacy. *The Journal of Sex Research, 24, 15-29.*

Cvancara, K.E. and Kinney, T. A. (2009) Cognitions, coercion, and IPV: Sex differences in pursuing resisted physical intimacy. *Personal Relationships, 16, 329-341.*

Elmerstig, E., Wijma, B., Sandell, K, & Berterö, C. (2012). "Sexual pleasure on equal terms": Young women's ideal sexual situations. *Journal of Psychosmatic Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 33,3, 129-134.*

Faulkner, G.E., Kolts, R.L., & Hicks, G.F. (2008) Sex role ideology, relationship context and response to sexual coercion in college females. *Sex Roles, 59, 139-150.*

Katz, J., Moore, J. A., and Tkachuk, S. (2007) Verbal sexual coercion and perceived victim responsibility: Mediating effects of perceived control. *Sex roles, 57, 235-247.*

Katz, J. and Myhr, L. (2008). Perceived conflict patterns and relationship quality associated with

    verbal sexual coercion by male dating partners. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23:*

    178, 798-814.

Korman, S. K. & Leslie, G. R. (1982). The relationship of feminist ideology and date expense

    sharing to perceptions of sexual aggression in dating. *The Journal of Sex Research, 18,*

    114-129.

Livingston, J. A., Buddie, A.M., Testa, M., and Vanzile-Tamsen, C. (2004). The role of sexual

    precedence in verbal sexual coercion. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28, 287-297.*

Lottes, I.L. (1993) Nontraditional gender roles and the sexual experiences of heterosexual

    college students. *Sex Roles, 29, 645-669.*

Lucke, J.C. (1998) Gender roles and sexual behavior among young women. Sex Roles, 39 3/4,

    273-297.

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Cook, S. W. (1988). Men's self-reports of unwanted sexual activity.

    Journal of Sex Research, 24, 58-72.

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Falcon, P.L. (1990). Men's heterosexual skill and attitudes towards

    women as predictors of verbal sexual coercion and forceful rape. *Sex Roles, 23, 5/6, 241-*

    259.

Mulenhard, C. L. & Schrag, J. L. (1991). Nonviolent sexual coercion. In A. Parrot & L. Bechofer

    (Eds.) Acqaintance rape: The hidden crime. (pp. 115-128). New York: Wiley.

Oswald, D. L. and Russel, B.L. (2006). Perceptions of sexual coercion in heterosexual dating

    relationships: The role of aggressor gender and tactics. *Journal of Sex Research. Feb.*

    2006, Vol. 43 Issue 1, p87-95.

Poppen, P.J. and Segal, N.J.(1988). The influence of sex and sex role orientation on sexual coercion. *Sex Roles, 19, 689-701.*

Roy, R.E., Weibust, K.S., & Miller, C.T. (2007). Effects of stereotypes about feminists on feminist self-identification. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31, 146-156.

Sanchez, D.T, Crocker, J., & Boike, K.R. (2005). Doing gender in the bedroom: Investing in gender norms and the sexual experience. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31, 1445 - 1455.*

Schick, V.R., Zucker, A.N., and Bay-Cheng, L.Y.(2008). Safer, bettersex through feminism: The role of feminist ideology in women's sexual well-being. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32, 225-232.

Simonson, K. and Subich, L.M. (1999). Rape perception as a function of gender-role traditionality and victim-perpetrator association. Sex Roles, 40, 7/8, 617-634.

Small, S. A., & Kerns, D. (1993). Unwanted sexual activity among peers during early and middle adolescence: Incidence and risk factors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 55,* 945-952.

Struckman-Johnson, c., Strurckman-Jonhnson, D., & Anderson, P. B. (2003). Tactics of sexual coercion: When men and women won't take no for an answer. *Journal of Sex Research, 40, 76-87.*

Walker, S.J. (1997). When "no" becomes "yes": Why girls and women consent to unwanted sex. *Applied and Preventative Psychology 6,157-166. Cambridge University Press.*

Wright, M. O., Norton, D. L., and Matusek, J.L. (2010) Predicting verbal coercion following sexual refusal during a hookup: Diverging gender patterns. Sex Roles 62, 647-660.

APPENDIX A

HSR Approval Letter

School for Social Work
Smith College
Northampton,
Massachusetts 01063
T (413) 585-7950
F (413) 585-7994

January 19, 2014

Shawna Hershberger

Dear Shawna,

You did a very nice job on your revisions. Your project is now approved by the Human Subjects Review Committee.

Please note the following requirements:

Consent Forms: All subjects should be given a copy of the consent form.

Maintaining Data: You must retain all data and other documents for at least three (3) years past completion of the research activity.

In addition, these requirements may also be applicable:

Amendments: If you wish to change any aspect of the study (such as design, procedures, consent forms or subject population), please submit these changes to the Committee.

Renewal: You are required to apply for renewal of approval every year for as long as the study is active.

Completion: You are required to notify the Chair of the Human Subjects Review Committee when your study is completed (data collection finished). This requirement is met by completion of the thesis project during the Third Summer.

Congratulations and our best wishes on your interesting study.

Sincerely,

Marsha Pruett, Ph.D., M.S.L.

Co-Chair, Human Subjects Review Committee

CC: Elaine Kersten, Research Advisor

APPENDIX B

Welcome Page

Welcome!

Human connection can be an important part of life for most people. One of the most significant types of connection is romantic relationships. For young women in the United States, some experiences in romantic relationships vary greatly from extremely positive to extremely negative. This study explores what factors may lead to some aspects of positive romantic relationships. In particular, I will be looking at verbal pressure from men to engage in sexual intimacy.

In this study, I will ask for some information on your personal beliefs as well as questions about encounters in your past experiences with verbal pressure from men. I will also be asking some basic questions about you and some of your personal values and beliefs.

I ask that you be as open as possible in all your responses. The information that I gather will be kept completely anonymous. I, the researcher, will have no means of knowing who participates in this study. You will have the right to withdraw your participation at any time by simply exiting the survey and not completing it. Nothing you enter in the survey will be saved until you click 'Complete' at the end. On the next page you can choose to participate by checking "I agree" and then the survey will begin.

To be eligible to complete this survey you must be: a woman between the ages of 21 and 30 who has been romantically involved with a man in the past two years. For the purposes of this study, "romantically involved" refers any romantically charged/flirtatious social interaction whether it be simply a single date or meeting (i.e. meeting someone at a party with whom there may be potential for something more) to a committed marriage or long-term relationship.

If you meet the above criteria and would like to participate in this study click "continue" at the bottom of this page. If you do not wish to participate in this study you may exit the website. Thank you for your time

By clicking the button below labeled, "Continue" you are indicating that you meet the criteria for this study. Upon clicking, "Continue" you will be brought to the "informed Consent" page that will give you more detailed information about this study and will inform you of your rights as a participant. At the end of the Informed Consent, you will be asked if you wish to participate. If you do, you will be taken to the study survey.

Continue

APPENDIX C

Recruitment Email

Hello,

My name is Shawna Hershberger and I am a Master's degree student at the Smith College School for Social Work. I am currently conducting research for my thesis and I am interested in better understanding the impact of verbal pressure from men for sexual intimacy on young women ages 21 to 30. I am looking for participants who are women between the ages of 21 to 30, have had at least one heterosexual encounter (meeting, date, etc. with a man) in the last two years, and would like to participate in a voluntary, completely anonymous survey that explores young women's perceptions and attitudes around verbal pressure for sexual intimacy in relationships with men. The decision to participate is entirely optional and confidential. I, the researcher, will have no means of knowing who participated and who chose not to participate. The survey is developed in such a way as to protect knowledge of who you are, and also, allows participants to exit at any time without completing it, at which time, anything entered will be eliminated. The survey should take you up to, but not more than, 30 minutes and is entirely voluntary.

If you feel comfortable, I would greatly appreciate if you could forward this email to any of your contacts who may meet the criteria for this survey.

Thank you for your time,

Shawna Hershberger
Smith College School For Social Work
Class of 2014

SMITH COLLEGE
Informed Consent

Consent to Participate in a Research Study
Smith College School for Social Work ● Northampton, MA

……………………………………………………………………….

Title of Study: Feminist Identification in Heterosexual Encounters: Exploring the Relationship between Women's Personal Values and their Experiences of Verbal Sexual Coercion

Investigator: Shawna Hershberger, MSW Program

……………………………………………………………………….

Introduction

You are being asked to be in a research study of young women and their recent heterosexual experiences. You were selected as a possible participant because you are self-identified woman between the ages of 21 to 30 years old who may have experienced a heterosexual romantic encounter in the past two years. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the a study is to better understand the types and impacts of heterosexual relationships on young women in the United States of America today. This study is being conducted as a research requirement for my master's in social work degree. Ultimately, this research may be published or presented at professional conferences.

Description of the Study Procedures

After reviewing and agreeing to this "Informed Consent Form" you will be taken to the survey web page. You will answer the survey items by either clicking all that apply, clicking the yes or no button, or choosing a number on a 1 to 5 scale. There is an optional item at the end of the survey in which you may choose to further explain your experience. When the survey is completed you will click the "submit" button. After clicking this button you may leave the web page and the survey will be complete. The survey will take up to 30 minutes to complete depending on the speed in which you answer the items. There are 38 items in the survey.

Risks/Discomforts of Being in this Study

The study has the following risk. This study asks questions regarding the sexual experiences of the participant which may lead you to feel uncomfortable or may bring up uncomfortable memories. If any question or subject begins to make you uncomfortable, you have the option to withdrawal your participation at any point during or after the study (up to February 30th, 2014).

Benefits of Being in the Study

The benefits of participation are the opportunity to gain insight about one's sexual experiences and attitudes. The benefits to social work/society are advancement of our understanding of the impact of experiences of verbal sexual coercion. The findings of this study may also have important implications for sexual coercion prevention education for young women and young men.

Confidentiality

This study is anonymous. We will not be collecting or retaining any information about your identity. Your name and e-mail address will in no way be linked to the following survey.

Payments/gift

You will not receive any financial payment for your participation.

Right to Refuse or Withdraw

The decision to participate in this study is entirely up to you. You may refuse to take part in the study *at any time* (up to the date noted below) without affecting your relationship with the researchers of this study or Smith College. Your decision to refuse will not result in any loss of benefits (including access to services) to which you are otherwise entitled. You have the right not to answer any single question, as well as to withdraw completely up to the date noted below. If you choose to withdraw, I will not use any of your information collected for this study. You must notify me of your decision to withdraw by email or phone by February 30th, 2014. After that date, your information will be part of the thesis, dissertation or final report.

Right to Ask Questions and Report Concerns

You have the right to ask questions about this research study and to have those questions answered by me before, during or after the research. If you have any further questions about the study, at any time feel free to contact me, Shawna Hershberger at Shawna.mia@gmail.com or by telephone at 610-416-8173. If you would like a summary of the study results, one will be sent to you once the study is completed. If you have any other concerns about your rights as a research participant, or if you have any problems as a result of your participation, you may contact the Chair of the Smith College School for Social Work Human Subjects Committee at (413) 585-7974.

Consent

By clicking the button labeled, "I Agree" below you are demonstrating that you have decided to volunteer as a research participant for this study, and that you have read and understood the information provided above

………………………………………………………………………………….

Survey

Sex-role Ideology

The following questions have to do with your personal value systems

1- I strongly disagree, 2- I somewhat disagree, 3- I am unsure, 4- I somewhat agree, 5- I strongly agree

In my personal opinion (not that of society)...

___- The government should be responsible for making sure that all women receive an

equal chance at employment and education to that of men.

___- It is better for women to stay at home than to work outside the home when their

children are age 5 or younger.

___- Women usually make better care-takers of children than men.

___ -The man's role in the family is to protect and to provide; the woman's role is to

provide emotional strength and support.

___- If the husband is working outside of the home and his wife is caring for the children

full time, the husband has the right to chose how the money is spent.

___- It is more understandable for men to have had sexual partners before marriage than it

is for women.

___- It is best for women (not men) to abstain from sexual intercourse until married.

___- Women and men should be paid equally for the same work.

__- Girls and women have not been treated as well as boys and men in our society.

__- It is acceptable for women to express their sexual desires and pleasures just as much

as it is for men.

Types of verbal strategies used by men after a woman has refused further sexual actions

In the past two years, you may have experienced a man pressuring you to engage in or continue unwanted sexual intimacy (kissing, intercourse, sexual touching, anal or oral sex etc) after you have already refused. Your refusal may have been verbal (saying "no" or "stop," etc) or physical (pushing away, moving away, etc). This man may have been a new friend, good friend, boyfriend, fiancé, or husband. After refusing sexual activity, you may have experienced one or more of the following emotional tactics to try to change your mind. From the experiences below, report what you have experienced when interacting with a man in the past two years and the degree to which you found this encounter negative/upsetting (meaning there has been a negative impact on you, your self-esteem, your relationships, feelings of self worth, or ability to trust as a result of this experience.)

1. Arguments about doing a sexual action, anger including swearing, put-downs, (etc).

I have not experienced this in the past 2 years,

I experienced this and did not find this negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and found this somewhat negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and I found this very negative/upsetting

2. Persistent asking/pleading for more

I have not experienced this in the past 2 years,

I experienced this and did not find this negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and found this somewhat negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and I found this very negative/upsetting

3. Threat to end the relationship or cheat on you.

I have not experienced this in the past 2 years,

I experienced this and did not find this negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and found this somewhat negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and I found this very negative/upsetting

4. told you a lie (i.e. "I really love you." "You won't get pregnant."; "I want a

relationship.")

I have not experienced this in the past 2 years,

I experienced this and did not find this negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and found this somewhat negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and I found this very negative/upsetting

5. Questioned your sexuality (i.e. called you a lesbian, cold or a prude)

I have not experienced this in the past 2 years,

I experienced this and did not find this negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and found this somewhat negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and I found this very negative/upsetting

6. Threaten to hurt himself if you did not give in to more sexual activity.

I have not experienced this in the past 2 years,

I experienced this and did not find this negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and found this somewhat negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and I found this very negative/upsetting

7. Made you feel obligated or like it was expected (i.e. "If you really loved me..." "you're my girlfriend/friend/wife it's your job/duty," or pouting)

I have not experienced this in the past 2 years,

I experienced this and did not find this negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and found this somewhat negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and I found this very negative/upsetting

8. Made you feel guilty or bad. Made "I'll get blue balls" or "but you got me so aroused" "Don't be a tease")

I have not experienced this in the past 2 years,

I experienced this and did not find this negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and found this somewhat negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and I found this very negative/upsetting

9. Compared you with other women or what is "normal" (i.e. "the last person I was with did that..." or "everyone does it")

I have not experienced this in the past 2 years,

I experienced this and did not find this negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and found this somewhat negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and I found this very negative/upsetting

10. Made you feel like you should do something because you already did with him or another person (i.e. "We already had sex" or "You had sex with your last boyfriend")

I have not experienced this in the past 2 years,

I experienced this and did not find this negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and found this somewhat negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and I found this very negative/upsetting

11. Told you it would make the relationship better

I have not experienced this in the past 2 years,

I experienced this and did not find this negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and found this somewhat negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and I found this very negative/upsetting

12. Asked you to do a different or less intimate/risky sexual act. (i.e. "If you won't have sex with me, than you should at least (oral sex, etc)...")

I have not experienced this in the past 2 years,

I experienced this and did not find this negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and found this somewhat negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and I found this very negative/upsetting

-Other- Please explain if you have ever experienced a different form of verbal coercion.

_____

I have not experienced this in the past 2 years,

I experienced this and did not find this negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and found this somewhat negative/upsetting,

I experienced this and I found this very negative/upsetting

Please rate the following as they relate to your personal experience in relationships

1- I strongly disagree, 2- I somewhat disagree, 3- I am unsure, 4- I somewhat agree, 5- I strongly agree

In the past two years, I have continued unwanted sexual actions after experiencing one or more of the above experiences after already refusing at least once.

In the past two years, I have had these experiences more often within my committed relationships than with more casual interactions.

These experiences resulted in (Check all apply):

- more sexual activity than I was comfortable with

- an end to the relationship

- a better relationship,

- difficulties in my later relationships

- feelings of guilt or shame

- feelings of anger

If you indicated above that you found one or more experience to be negative/upsetting, please describe what you found to be most negative/upsetting about this (these) experience(s)? (Describe in your own words) (Space to describe further)

TABLE I

Demographics

Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	missing	1	.5	.5	.5
	21	4	1.8	1.9	2.3
	22	5	2.3	2.3	4.6
	23	11	5.0	5.1	9.7
	24	21	9.6	9.7	19.4
	25	26	11.9	12.0	31.5
	26	28	12.8	13.0	44.4
	27	30	13.8	13.9	58.3
	28	30	13.8	13.9	72.2
	29	41	18.8	19.0	91.2
	30	18	8.3	8.3	99.5
	33	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	216	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.9		
Total		218	100.0		

Are you sexually active?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	201	92.2	92.6	92.6
	no	16	7.3	7.4	100.0
	Total	217	99.5	100.0	
Missing	99	1	.5		
Total		218	100.0		

Race

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Caucasian/White	195	89.4	92.4	92.4
	2	5	2.3	2.4	94.8
	3	2	.9	.9	95.7
	4	4	1.8	1.9	97.6
	5	1	.5	.5	98.1
	6	1	.5	.5	98.6
	7	1	.5	.5	99.1
	9	1	.5	.5	99.5
	10	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	211	96.8	100.0	
Missing	99	7	3.2		
Total		218	100.0		

Do you self identify as a religious person?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	101	46.3	46.5	46.5
	no	116	53.2	53.5	100.0
	Total	217	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.5		
Total		218	100.0		

If you answered 'yes' to the above question, how do you identify?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Jewish	14	6.4	8.9	8.9
	Catholic	56	25.7	35.7	44.6
	Buddhist	2	.9	1.3	45.9
	Protestant	4	1.8	2.5	48.4
	Christian	28	12.8	17.8	66.2
	N/A	53	24.3	33.8	100.0
	Total	157	72.0	100.0	
Missing	99	61	28.0		
Total		218	100.0		

Do you consider yourself to be a feminist?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	126	57.8	58.6	58.6
	no	89	40.8	41.4	100.0
	Total	215	98.6	100.0	
Missing	99	3	1.4		
Total		218	100.0		

Chose the item that best describes your current relationship status (Choose one):

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	single	30	13.8	14.0	14.0
	casual dating	20	9.2	9.3	23.3
	committed relationship	78	35.8	36.3	59.5
	open relationship	2	.9	.9	60.5
	engaged	17	7.8	7.9	68.4
	married	63	28.9	29.3	97.7
	unsure	5	2.3	2.3	100.0
	Total	215	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.4		
Total		218	100.0		

TABLE II

Experience Strategy One

Crosstab					
			identify as feminist		Total
			yes	no	
1. Arguments about doing a sexual action, anger including swearing, put-downs, (etc)	not experienced	Count	96	64	160
		% within 1. Arguments about doing a sexual action, anger including swearing, put-downs, (etc)	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	76.2%	72.7%	74.8%
	experienced	Count	30	24	54
		% within 1. Arguments about doing a sexual action, anger including swearing, put-downs, (etc)	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	23.8%	27.3%	25.2%
Total		Count	126	88	214
		% within 1. Arguments about doing a sexual action, anger including swearing, put-downs, (etc)	58.9%	41.1%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.329[a]	1	.566		
Continuity Correction[b]	.171	1	.679		
Likelihood Ratio	.328	1	.567		
Fisher's Exact Test				.632	.338
Linear-by-Linear Association	.328	1	.567		
N of Valid Cases	214				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.21.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE III

Experience Strategy Two

Crosstab					
			identify as feminist		Total
			yes	no	
2. Persistent asking/pleading for more	not experienced	Count	61	43	104
		% within 2. Persistent asking/pleading for more	58.7%	41.3%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	48.4%	48.9%	48.6%
	experienced	Count	65	45	110
		% within 2. Persistent asking/pleading for more	59.1%	40.9%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	51.6%	51.1%	51.4%
Total		Count	126	88	214
		% within 2. Persistent asking/pleading for more	58.9%	41.1%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.004[a]	1	.948		
Continuity Correction[b]	0.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.004	1	.948		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.529
Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.948		
N of Valid Cases	214				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 42.77.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE IV

Experience Strategy Three

Crosstab				identify as feminist		
				yes	no	Total
3. Threat to end the relationship or cheat on you.	not experienced	Count		111	76	187
		% within 3. Threat to end the relationship or cheat on you.		59.4%	40.6%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist		88.1%	85.4%	87.0%
	experienced	Count		15	13	28
		% within 3. Threat to end the relationship or cheat on you.		53.6%	46.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist		11.9%	14.6%	13.0%
Total		Count		126	89	215
		% within 3. Threat to end the relationship or cheat on you.		58.6%	41.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.336[a]	1	.562		
Continuity Correction[b]	.140	1	.708		
Likelihood Ratio	.333	1	.564		
Fisher's Exact Test				.681	.352
Linear-by-Linear Association	.335	1	.563		
N of Valid Cases	215				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.59.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE V

Experience Strategy Four

Crosstab					
			identify as feminist		Total
			yes	no	
4. Told you something that you later realized was false (i.e. "You can't get pregnant." States, "I want a relationship" and stops talking to you shortly after)	not experienced	Count	95	63	158
		% within 4. Told you something that you later realized was false (i.e. "You can't get pregnant." States, "I want a relationship" and stops talking to you shortly after)	60.1%	39.9%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	75.4%	70.8%	73.5%
	experienced	Count	31	26	57
		% within 4. Told you something that you later realized was false (i.e. "You can't get pregnant." States, "I want a relationship" and stops talking to you shortly after)	54.4%	45.6%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	24.6%	29.2%	26.5%
Total		Count	126	89	215
		% within 4. Told you something that you later realized was false (i.e. "You can't get pregnant." States, "I want a relationship" and stops talking to you shortly after)	58.6%	41.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.569[a]	1	.451		
Continuity Correction[b]	.357	1	.550		
Likelihood Ratio	.566	1	.452		
Fisher's Exact Test				.531	.274
Linear-by-Linear Association	.566	1	.452		
N of Valid Cases	215				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 23.60.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE VI

Experience Strategy Five

Crosstab					
			identify as feminist		
			yes	no	Total
5. Questioned your sexuality (i.e. called you a lesbian, cold or a prude)	not experienced	Count	104	70	174
		% within 5. Questioned your sexuality (i.e. called you a lesbian, cold or a prude)	59.8%	40.2%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	82.5%	79.5%	81.3%
	experienced	Count	22	18	40
		% within 5. Questioned your sexuality (i.e. called you a lesbian, cold or a prude)	55.0%	45.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	17.5%	20.5%	18.7%
Total		Count	126	88	214
		% within 5. Questioned your sexuality (i.e. called you a lesbian, cold or a prude)	58.9%	41.1%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.306[a]	1	.580		
Continuity Correction[b]	.140	1	.708		
Likelihood Ratio	.304	1	.582		
Fisher's Exact Test				.597	.352
Linear-by-Linear Association	.304	1	.581		
N of Valid Cases	214				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.45.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE VII

TABLE VII

Experience Strategy Six

Crosstab					
			identify as feminist		
			yes	no	Total
6. Threatened to hurt himself if you did not give in to more sexual activity.	not experienced	Count	121	85	206
		% within 6. Threatened to hurt himself if you did not give in to more sexual activity.	58.7%	41.3%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	96.0%	95.5%	95.8%
	experienced	Count	5	4	9
		% within 6. Threatened to hurt himself if you did not give in to more sexual activity.	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	4.0%	4.5%	4.2%
Total		Count	126	89	215
		% within 6. Threatened to hurt himself if you did not give in to more sexual activity.	58.6%	41.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.036[a]	1	.850		
Continuity Correction[b]	0.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.036	1	.850		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.554
Linear-by-Linear Association	.036	1	.850		
N of Valid Cases	215				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.73.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE VIII

Experience Strategy Seven

Crosstab					
			identify as feminist		Total
			yes	no	
7. Made you feel obligated or like it was expected (i.e. "If you really loved me..." "But I really love you" "you're my girlfriend/friend/wife it's your job/duty," or pouting)	not experienced	Count	79	59	138
		% within 7. Made you feel obligated or like it was expected (i.e. "If you really loved me..." "But I really love you" "you're my girlfriend/friend/wife it's your job/duty," or pouting)	57.2%	42.8%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	62.7%	67.0%	64.5%
	experienced	Count	47	29	76
		% within 7. Made you feel obligated or like it was expected (i.e. "If you really loved me..." "But I really love you" "you're my girlfriend/friend/wife it's your job/duty," or pouting)	61.8%	38.2%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	37.3%	33.0%	35.5%
Total		Count	126	88	214
		% within 7. Made you feel obligated or like it was expected (i.e. "If you really loved me..." "But I really love you" "you're my girlfriend/friend/wife it's your job/duty," or pouting)	58.9%	41.1%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.428[a]	1	.513		
Continuity Correction[b]	.259	1	.611		
Likelihood Ratio	.429	1	.512		
Fisher's Exact Test				.563	.306
Linear-by-Linear Association	.426	1	.514		
N of Valid Cases	214				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 31.25.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE IX

Experience Strategy Eight

Crosstab					
			identify as feminist		
			yes	no	Total
8. Made you feel guilty or bad. (i.e."I'll get blue balls" or "but you got me so aroused" "Don't be a tease.")	not experienced	Count	57	47	104
		% within 8. Made you feel guilty or bad. (i.e."I'll get blue balls" or "but you got me so aroused" "Don't be a tease.")	54.8%	45.2%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	45.2%	52.8%	48.4%
	experienced	Count	69	42	111
		% within 8. Made you feel guilty or bad. (i.e."I'll get blue balls" or "but you got me so aroused" "Don't be a tease.")	62.2%	37.8%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	54.8%	47.2%	51.6%
Total		Count	126	89	215
		% within 8. Made you feel guilty or bad. (i.e."I'll get blue balls" or "but you got me so aroused" "Don't be a tease.")	58.6%	41.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.197[a]	1	.274		
Continuity Correction[b]	.913	1	.339		
Likelihood Ratio	1.198	1	.274		
Fisher's Exact Test				.332	.170
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.192	1	.275		
N of Valid Cases	215				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 43.05.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE X

Experience Strategy Nine

Crosstab					
			identify as feminist		
			yes	no	Total
9. Compared you with other women or what is "normal" (i.e. "the last person I was with did that..." or "everyone does it")	not experienced	Count	98	71	169
		% within 9. Compared you with other women or what is "normal" (i.e. "the last person I was with did that..." or "everyone does it")	58.0%	42.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	77.8%	79.8%	78.6%
	experienced	Count	28	18	46
		% within 9. Compared you with other women or what is "normal" (i.e. "the last person I was with did that..." or "everyone does it")	60.9%	39.1%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	22.2%	20.2%	21.4%
Total		Count	126	89	215
		% within 9. Compared you with other women or what is "normal" (i.e. "the last person I was with did that..." or "everyone does it")	58.6%	41.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.124[a]	1	.725		
Continuity Correction[b]	.033	1	.855		
Likelihood Ratio	.124	1	.724		
Fisher's Exact Test				.866	.430
Linear-by-Linear Association	.123	1	.726		
N of Valid Cases	215				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.04.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE XI

Experience Strategy Ten

Crosstab					
			identify as feminist		Total
			yes	no	
10. Made you feel like you should do something because you already did it with him or another person (i.e. "We already had sex" or "You had sex with your last boyfriend")	not experienced	Count	103	71	174
		% within 10. Made you feel like you should do something because you already did it with him or another person (i.e. "We already had sex" or "You had sex with your last boyfriend")	59.2%	40.8%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	82.4%	79.8%	81.3%
	experienced	Count	22	18	40
		% within 10. Made you feel like you should do something because you already did it with him or another person (i.e. "We already had sex" or "You had sex with your last boyfriend")	55.0%	45.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	17.6%	20.2%	18.7%
Total		Count	125	89	214
		% within 10. Made you feel like you should do something because you already did it with him or another person (i.e. "We already had sex" or "You had sex with your last boyfriend")	58.4%	41.6%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.236[a]	1	.627		
Continuity Correction[b]	.095	1	.758		
Likelihood Ratio	.234	1	.628		
Fisher's Exact Test				.722	.377
Linear-by-Linear Association	.235	1	.628		
N of Valid Cases	214				
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.64.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

TABLE XII

Experience Strategy Eleven

Crosstab			identify as feminist		Total
			yes	no	
11. Told you it would make the relationship better	not experienced	Count	96	68	164
		% within 11. Told you it would make the relationship better	58.5%	41.5%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	77.4%	76.4%	77.0%
	experienced	Count	28	21	49
		% within 11. Told you it would make the relationship better	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	22.6%	23.6%	23.0%
Total		Count	124	89	213
		% within 11. Told you it would make the relationship better	58.2%	41.8%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.030[a]	1	.862		
Continuity Correction[b]	.000	1	.993		
Likelihood Ratio	.030	1	.862		
Fisher's Exact Test				.870	.495
Linear-by-Linear Association	.030	1	.863		
N of Valid Cases	213				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.47.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE XIII

Experience Strategy Twelve

Crosstab					
			identify as feminist		Total
			yes	no	
12. Asked you to do a different or less intimate/risky sexual act (i.e. "If you won't have sex with me, than you should at least (oral sex, etc)...")	not experienced	Count	81	58	139
		% within 12. Asked you to do a different or less intimate/risky sexual act (i.e. "If you won't have sex with me, than you should at least (oral sex, etc)...")	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	64.3%	65.2%	64.7%
	experienced	Count	45	31	76
		% within 12. Asked you to do a different or less intimate/risky sexual act (i.e. "If you won't have sex with me, than you should at least (oral sex, etc)...")	59.2%	40.8%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	35.7%	34.8%	35.3%
Total		Count	126	89	215
		% within 12. Asked you to do a different or less intimate/risky sexual act (i.e. "If you won't have sex with me, than you should at least (oral sex, etc)...")	58.6%	41.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.018[a]	1	.894		
Continuity Correction[b]	0.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.018	1	.894		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.506
Linear-by-Linear Association	.018	1	.894		
N of Valid Cases	215				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 31.46.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE XIV

Strategy One Upsetting/Not Upsetting

Crosstab			identify as feminist		
			yes	no	Total
1. Arguments about doing a sexual action, anger including swearing, put-downs, (etc)	not upsetting	Count	1	1	2
		% within 1. Arguments about doing a sexual action, anger including	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as	3.3%	4.2%	3.7%
	upsetting	Count	29	23	52
		% within 1. Arguments about doing a sexual action, anger including	55.8%	44.2%	100.0%
		% within identify as	96.7%	95.8%	96.3%
Total		Count	30	24	54
		% within 1. Arguments about doing a sexual action, anger including	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.026[a]	1	.872		
Continuity Correction[b]	0.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.026	1	.872		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.696
Linear-by-Linear Association	.025	1	.873		
N of Valid Cases	54				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .89.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE XV

Strategy Two Upsetting/Not Upsetting

Crosstab					
			identify as feminist		
			yes	no	Total
2. Persistent asking/pleading for more	not upsetting	Count	20	6	26
		% within 2. Persistent	76.9%	23.1%	100.0%
		% within identify as	30.8%	13.3%	23.6%
	upsetting	Count	45	39	84
		% within 2. Persistent	53.6%	46.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as	69.2%	86.7%	76.4%
Total		Count	65	45	110
		% within 2. Persistent	59.1%	40.9%	100.0%
		% within identify as	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.479[a]	1	.034		
Continuity Correction[b]	3.565	1	.059		
Likelihood Ratio	4.725	1	.030		
Fisher's Exact Test				.041	.027
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.438	1	.035		
N of Valid Cases	110				
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.64.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

TABLE XVI

Strategy Three Upsetting/Not Upsetting

<table>
<tr><th colspan="9">Crosstab</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td colspan="2">identify as feminist</td><td rowspan="2">Total</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>yes</td><td>no</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">3. Threat to end the relationship or cheat on you.</td><td rowspan="2">not upsetting</td><td>Count</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>2</td></tr>
<tr><td>% within 3. Threat to end the relationship or</td><td>50.0%</td><td>50.0%</td><td>100.0%</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>% within identify as</td><td>6.7%</td><td>7.7%</td><td>7.1%</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">upsetting</td><td>Count</td><td>14</td><td>12</td><td>26</td></tr>
<tr><td>% within 3. Threat to end the relationship or</td><td>53.8%</td><td>46.2%</td><td>100.0%</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>% within identify as</td><td>93.3%</td><td>92.3%</td><td>92.9%</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Total</td><td></td><td>Count</td><td>15</td><td>13</td><td>28</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>% within 3. Threat to end the relationship or</td><td>53.6%</td><td>46.4%</td><td>100.0%</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>% within identify as</td><td>100.0%</td><td>100.0%</td><td>100.0%</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Chi-Square Tests</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Value</td><td>df</td><td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td><td>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</td><td>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Pearson Chi-Square</td><td>.011[a]</td><td>1</td><td>.916</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Continuity Correction[b]</td><td>0.000</td><td>1</td><td>1.000</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Likelihood Ratio</td><td>.011</td><td>1</td><td>.916</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Fisher's Exact Test</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1.000</td><td>.722</td></tr>
<tr><td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td><td>.011</td><td>1</td><td>.918</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>N of Valid Cases</td><td>28</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .93.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">b. Computed only for a 2x2 table</td></tr>
</table>

TABLE XVII

Strategy Four Upsetting/Not Upsetting

Crosstab					
			identify as feminist		
			yes	no	Total
4. Told you something that you later realized was false (i.e. "You can't get pregnant." States, "I want a relationship" and stops talking to you shortly after)	not upsetting	Count	2	1	3
		% within 4. Told you something that you later realized was false	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	6.5%	3.8%	5.3%
	upsetting	Count	29	25	54
		% within 4. Told you something that you later realized was false	53.7%	46.3%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	93.5%	96.2%	94.7%
Total		Count	31	26	57
		% within 4. Told you something that you later realized was false	54.4%	45.6%	100.0%
		% within identify as	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.193[a]	1	.661		
Continuity Correction[b]	0.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.197	1	.657		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.567
Linear-by-Linear Association	.189	1	.664		
N of Valid Cases	57				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.37.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE XVIII

TABLE XVIII

Strategy Five Upsetting/Not Upsetting

Crosstab				identify as feminist		
				yes	no	Total
5. Questioned your sexuality (i.e. called you a lesbian, cold or a prude)	not upsetting	Count		3	3	6
		% within 5. Questioned your sexuality		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist		13.6%	16.7%	15.0%
	upsetting	Count		19	15	34
		% within 5. Questioned your sexuality		55.9%	44.1%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist		86.4%	83.3%	85.0%
Total		Count		22	18	40
		% within 5. Questioned your sexuality		55.0%	45.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.071[a]	1	.789		
Continuity Correction[b]	0.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.071	1	.790		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.565
Linear-by-Linear Association	.070	1	.792		
N of Valid Cases	40				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.70.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE XIX

Strategy Six Upsetting/Not Upsetting

Crosstab			identify as feminist		
			yes	no	Total
6. Threatened to hurt himself if you did not give in to more sexual activity.	upsetting	Count	5	4	9
		% within 6. Threatened to hurt himself if you did not give in to	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	5	4	9
		% within 6. Threatened to hurt himself if you did not	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests	
	Value
Pearson Chi-Square	.a
N of Valid Cases	9

a. No statistics are computed because 6. Threatened to hurt himself if you did not give in to more sexual activity. is a constant.

TABLE XX

Strategy Seven Upsetting/Not Upsetting

Crosstab			identify as feminist		
			yes	no	Total
7. Made you feel obligated or like it was expected (i.e. "If you really loved me..." "But I really love you" "you're my girlfriend/friend/wife it's your job/duty," or pouting)	not upsetting	Count	9	2	11
		% within 7. Made you feel obligated or like it was expected	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	19.1%	6.9%	14.5%
	upsetting	Count	38	27	65
		% within 7. Made you feel obligated or like it was expected	58.5%	41.5%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	80.9%	93.1%	85.5%
Total		Count	47	29	76
		% within 7. Made you feel obligated or like it was expected	61.8%	38.2%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.175[a]	1	.140		
Continuity Correction[b]	1.298	1	.255		
Likelihood Ratio	2.385	1	.123		
Fisher's Exact Test				.189	.126
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.146	1	.143		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.20.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE XXI

Strategy Eight Upsetting/Not Upsetting

Crosstab				identify as feminist		
				yes	no	Total
8. Made you feel guilty or bad. (i.e."I'll get blue balls" or "but you got me so aroused" "Don't be a tease.")	not upsetting	Count		14	7	21
		% within 8. Made you feel guilty or bad.		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist		20.3%	16.7%	18.9%
	upsetting	Count		55	35	90
		% within 8. Made you feel guilty or bad.		61.1%	38.9%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist		79.7%	83.3%	81.1%
Total		Count		69	42	111
		% within 8. Made you feel guilty or bad.		62.2%	37.8%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.223[a]	1	.636		
Continuity Correction[b]	.050	1	.824		
Likelihood Ratio	.226	1	.634		
Fisher's Exact Test				.804	.417
Linear-by-Linear Association	.221	1	.638		
N of Valid Cases	111				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.95.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE XXII

Strategy Nine Upsetting/Not Upsetting

Crosstab					
			identify as feminist		Total
			yes	no	
9. Compared you with other women or what is "normal" (i.e. "the last person I was with did that..." or "everyone does it")	not upsetting	Count	4	2	6
		% within 9. Compared you with other women or what is "normal"	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	14.3%	11.1%	13.0%
	upsetting	Count	24	16	40
		% within 9. Compared you with other women or what is "normal"	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	85.7%	88.9%	87.0%
Total		Count	28	18	46
		% within 9. Compared you with other women or what is "normal"	60.9%	39.1%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.097[a]	1	.755		
Continuity Correction[b]	0.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.099	1	.753		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.564
Linear-by-Linear Association	.095	1	.758		
N of Valid Cases	46				
a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.35.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

TABLE XXIII

Strategy Ten Upsetting/Not Upsetting

Crosstab			identify as feminist		
			yes	no	Total
10. Made you feel like you should do something because you already did it with him or another person (i.e. "We already had sex" or "You had sex with your last boyfriend")	not upsetting	Count	4	1	5
		% within 10. Made you feel like you should do something because you already did it	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	18.2%	5.6%	12.5%
	upsetting	Count	18	17	35
		% within 10. Made you feel like you should do something because you already did it	51.4%	48.6%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	81.8%	94.4%	87.5%
Total		Count	22	18	40
		% within 10. Made you feel like you should do something because you already did it	55.0%	45.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.443[a]	1	.230		
Continuity Correction[b]	.519	1	.471		
Likelihood Ratio	1.555	1	.212		
Fisher's Exact Test				.355	.240
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.407	1	.236		
N of Valid Cases	40				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.25.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE XXIV

Strategy Eleven Upsetting/Not Upsetting

Crosstab

			identify as feminist		
			yes	no	Total
11. Told you it would make the relationship better	not upsetting	Count	14	7	21
		% within 11. Told you it would make the	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within identify as	50.0%	33.3%	42.9%
	upsetting	Count	14	14	28
		% within 11. Told you it would make the	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as	50.0%	66.7%	57.1%
Total		Count	28	21	49
		% within 11. Told you it would make the	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
		% within identify as	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.361[a]	1	.243		
Continuity Correction[b]	.766	1	.382		
Likelihood Ratio	1.375	1	.241		
Fisher's Exact Test				.382	.191
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.333	1	.248		
N of Valid Cases	49				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE XXV

Strategy Twelve Upsetting/Not Upsetting

Crosstab				identify as feminist		
				yes	no	Total
12. Asked you to do a different or less intimate/risky sexual act (i.e. "If you won't have sex with me, than you should at least (oral sex, etc)...")	not upsetting	Count		9	7	16
		% within 12. Asked you to do a different or less intimate/risky sexual act		56.3%	43.8%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist		20.0%	22.6%	21.1%
	upsetting	Count		36	24	60
		% within 12. Asked you to do a different or less intimate/risky sexual act		60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist		80.0%	77.4%	78.9%
Total		Count		45	31	76
		% within 12. Asked you to do a different or less intimate/risky sexual act		59.2%	40.8%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.074[a]	1	.786		
Continuity Correction[b]	0.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.073	1	.787		
Fisher's Exact Test				.783	.502
Linear-by-Linear Association	.073	1	.788		
N of Valid Cases	76				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.53.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TABLE XXVI

Continue Unwanted Encounter

T-Test

[DataSet1] H:\students\2014\shawna FINAL.sav

Group Statistics

identify as feminist		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
continued unwanted encounter	yes	124	2.00	1.487	.134
	no	88	2.25	1.510	.161

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
continued unwanted encounter	Equal variances assumed	.465	.496	-1.198	210	.232	-.250	.209	-.661	.161
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.195	185.701	.234	-.250	.209	-.663	.163

TABLE XXVII

Results of Verbal Sexual Coercion

Crosstabs RESULT by FEMINIST

More sexual activity * identify as feminist

Crosstab				identify as feminist		
				yes	no	Total
more sexual activity	not checked	Count		100	64	164
		% within more sexual activity		61.0%	39.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as		79.4%	71.9%	76.3%
	checked	Count		26	25	51
		% within more sexual activity		51.0%	49.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as		20.6%	28.1%	23.7%
Total		Count		126	89	215
		% within more sexual activity		58.6%	41.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.602[a]	1	.206		
Continuity Correction[b]	1.217	1	.270		
Likelihood Ratio	1.588	1	.208		
Fisher's Exact Test				.255	.135
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.595	1	.207		
N of Valid Cases	215				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.11.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

End to relationship * identify as feminist

Crosstab

			identify as feminist		Total
			yes	no	
end to relationship	not checked	Count	108	68	176
		% within end to relationship	61.4%	38.6%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	85.7%	76.4%	81.9%
	checked	Count	18	21	39
		% within end to relationship	46.2%	53.8%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	14.3%	23.6%	18.1%
Total		Count	126	89	215
		% within end to relationship	58.6%	41.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as feminist	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.044[a]	1	.081		
Continuity Correction[b]	2.450	1	.118		
Likelihood Ratio	3.003	1	.083		
Fisher's Exact Test				.105	.059
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.030	1	.082		
N of Valid Cases	215				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.14.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Better relationship * identify as feminist

			identify as feminist		Total
			yes	no	
better relationship	not checked	Count	118	83	201
		% within better	58.7%	41.3%	100.0%
		% within identify as	93.7%	93.3%	93.5%
	checked	Count	8	6	14
		% within better	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
		% within identify as	6.3%	6.7%	6.5%
Total		Count	126	89	215
		% within better	58.6%	41.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.013[a]	1	.909		
Continuity Correction[b]	0.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.013	1	.909		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.560
Linear-by-Linear Association	.013	1	.909		
N of Valid Cases	215				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.80.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Difficulties in relationship * identify as feminist

Crosstab

			identify as feminist		
			yes	no	Total
difficulties in relationship	not checked	Count	109	75	184
		% within difficulties in	59.2%	40.8%	100.0%
		% within identify as	86.5%	84.3%	85.6%
	checked	Count	17	14	31
		% within difficulties in	54.8%	45.2%	100.0%
		% within identify as	13.5%	15.7%	14.4%
Total		Count	126	89	215
		% within difficulties in	58.6%	41.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.212[a]	1	.645		
Continuity Correction[b]	.069	1	.792		
Likelihood Ratio	.210	1	.646		
Fisher's Exact Test				.696	.394
Linear-by-Linear Association	.211	1	.646		
N of Valid Cases	215				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.83.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Feelings of guilt or shame * identify as feminist

Crosstab

			identify as feminist		Total
			yes	no	
feelings of guilt or shame	not checked	Count	82	51	133
		% within feelings of	61.7%	38.3%	100.0%
		% within identify as	65.1%	57.3%	61.9%
	checked	Count	44	38	82
		% within feelings of	53.7%	46.3%	100.0%
		% within identify as	34.9%	42.7%	38.1%
Total		Count	126	89	215
		% within feelings of	58.6%	41.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.337[a]	1	.248		
Continuity Correction[b]	1.027	1	.311		
Likelihood Ratio	1.333	1	.248		
Fisher's Exact Test				.258	.155
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.331	1	.249		
N of Valid Cases	215				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.94.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Feelings of anger * identify as feminist

Crosstab

			identify as feminist		
			yes	no	Total
feelings of anger	not checked	Count	100	64	164
		% within	61.0%	39.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as	79.4%	71.9%	76.3%
	checked	Count	26	25	51
		% within	51.0%	49.0%	100.0%
		% within identify as	20.6%	28.1%	23.7%
Total		Count	126	89	215
		% within	58.6%	41.4%	100.0%
		% within identify as	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.602[a]	1	.206		
Continuity Correction[b]	1.217	1	.270		
Likelihood Ratio	1.588	1	.208		
Fisher's Exact Test				.255	.135
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.595	1	.207		
N of Valid Cases	215				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.11.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table