

Self-reported Effects and Retrospective Perceptions of Sexually Expressed Boyhood Relationships with Older Males: an Internet Convenience Sample

David L. Riegel

ABSTRACT

Boyhood sexual experiences with older males currently are viewed by many professionals and the lay public as generally traumatic when they occur and intensely psychologically damaging afterwards, but the relatively recent research that is used to support these views is largely based on clinical and legal samples. In contrast, research based on non-clinical, non-legal populations indicates that reactions and effects are often more benign. However, these findings have been ignored or dismissed under the dominance of the child sexual abuse paradigm. The present study sought to replicate and extend the earlier research based on non-clinical, non-legal samples. Respondents who are normally inaccessible to researchers because of the taboo of openly discussing this type of sexual relationship outside the accepted discourse of trauma and harm were recruited via the Internet where they could respond anonymously. Results, based on a sample of 103 men aged 18 through their 60s from more than half a dozen countries, were consistent with the earlier non-clinical, non-legal research. Respondents varied widely in their perceptions of consent, reactions at the time, and long-term effects; however, the majority reported that they consented (in the “simple,” non-legal sense), enjoyed the sexual experiences at the time, and experienced no ill effects afterwards. The present sample is unrepresentative of the general population, as are clinical and legal samples; its utility lies in critically testing assumptions of universal trauma and harm found in the victimological paradigm, which it contradicts.

Keywords: Boy, older male, sexual experience, consent, universal trauma.

INTRODUCTION

The effects of sexual relations between children and adults have been the subject of investigations at least since the work of Bender & Blau (1937), but later research has indicated that reactions and effects differ substantially between girls and boys in these relationships (e.g. Rind, Bauserman, & Tromovitch, 1998). These differences indicate the need for separate investigations, and therefore issues involving girls are not addressed in this study.

Sexually expressed relationships specifically between boys and older males first started receiving sustained attention as a social problem in the 1970s, when child sexual abuse became a major social issue (Jenkins, 1998). In the past, a number of researchers have examined non-therapeutic, non-legal samples and concluded that such relations are often not harmful to boys and can even be positive (e.g., Bernard, 1981; Constantine, 1981; Ingram, 1981; Lautmann, 1994; Money & Weinrich, 1983; Sandfort, 1984; Tindall, 1978). Both cross-cultural (Ford & Beach, 1951) and historical (Percy, 1996) studies also found that harm is not a universal feature; nevertheless, researchers working under the child sexual abuse paradigm reject these studies and firmly hold instead that all sexual involvements between minors and older persons are intrinsically and intensely harmful (e.g., Kendall Tackett, Williams, & Finkelhor, 1993; Ondersma, Chaffin, Berliner, Cordon, Goodman, G., & Barnett, 2001). The latter, who refer to

themselves as “victimologists” (Best, 1997; Jenkins, 1998; Rind, Bauserman, & Tromovitch, 2001), came to dominate opinion on this issue beginning in the later 1970s in an atmosphere of developing moral panic over sex abuse in which extreme statements of harm became commonplace and readily accepted among the lay public and professionals alike (Jenkins, 1998; Kutchinsky, 1992; Nathan & Snedeker, 1995).

This dominant opinion should be viewed with skepticism for several reasons. First, as Jenkins (1998) noted, claims by victimologists that age variant sex, where one or both partners are minors, is by nature psychologically ruinous, sprang forth almost overnight in the late 1970s from advocacy, not from science (Money, 1988). As Jenkins documented, victimological claims have been heavily intermixed with ideological and political agendas. Second, as noted above, a series of older studies based on non-therapeutic samples have identified a broad spectrum of reactions and effects, which should be reconciled with assumptions of invariant harm rather than dismissed. Third, victimological research on boy-older male sex has been beset with problems in scientific validity such as inferring from the experience of girls to boys and from clinical and forensic samples to the general population, inferences that are conceptually dubious and empirically unacceptable (Rind et al., 2001).

For the past decade or more, boy/older male sex has been a constant focus of media interest, in which the theories and assumptions of sexual victimology have been presented repeatedly as indisputable fact. The mainstream media have portrayed this type of sex as uniquely injurious and much more widespread than ever before realized, and a sense of urgency is typically attached to this portrayal, expressing or implying a need for rapid and forceful action to intervene. Because of this intense popular concern over boy/older male sex, and because the dominant professional opinion regarding the effects of this behavior has significant weaknesses, further empirical research is indicated, research that attempts to capture comprehensively the nature and effects of these behaviors while avoiding problems such as focusing on clinical and forensic samples (Jenkins, 1998; Okami, 1991, 1997).

The present study therefore sought participants who had boyhood sexual experiences with significantly older males, but who were not psychotherapeutic patients or complainants in the legal context. Victimological conclusions that boys are typically traumatized and severely psychologically injured in the long-term no doubt would find support in clinical or legal samples; therefore it is important to look to broader populations to form the testing ground for these assumptions. To both replicate and expand previous research based on the aforementioned non-therapeutic, non-legal samples, the present study utilized a relatively new venue and asked more in-depth questions than those in earlier studies.

In the current culture, with a moral panic surrounding adult-minor sexual relations (Jenkins, 1998), it is to be expected that recruiting respondents with a wide spectrum of boyhood sexual experiences with older males would be difficult, because those with non-negative or positive experiences—while not rare (Rind et al., 1998)—are likely to be reluctant to describe experiences when such reports are met with incredulity by the public and most professionals. To recruit participants from diversified non-clinical, non-legal populations, as well as to provide anonymity, the Internet was chosen as the survey venue. Various researchers have commented on the merits of using the Internet to reach otherwise inaccessible respondents (e.g., Duffy, 2002; Rhodes, Bowie, & Hergenrather, 2003) and have concluded that the Internet can provide data

that are of equal value in terms of validity and quality to in-person “paper and pencil” studies (e.g., Cronk & West, 2002; Pettit, 2002). Respondents were solicited by posting notices on various Internet newsgroups, also known as the “Usenet.” The convenience sample thus obtained is likely to be unrepresentative of the general population, given that visitors on Internet newsgroups are highly self-selected. But since the basic issues are the assumptions of intrinsic and extreme harm that are typically stated or implied, the sample need not be representative to be useful and appropriate in testing the validity of these claims.

METHODS

Recruitment

The Internet, while recognized as having potential for behavioral sciences research, is not without its limitations and problems. Despite the potential for anonymity, when one is trying to gather data on contentious or taboo issues, neither establishing contact with potential respondents nor obtaining their cooperation in completing a lengthy and intrusive survey is likely to be easily accomplished. From previous experience in Internet research projects in the area of boy/older male sexual contacts, there was little doubt that obtaining detailed responses concerning boyhood sexually expressed relationships with older males from an even remotely unbiased and random sample of this markedly uncommunicative population would pose a serious challenge.

An Internet contact of the researcher volunteered to post brief solicitations on news groups which were selected based on volume of posts and non-relatedness to the topic in question, excluding, for example, “survivors” of sexual abuse (negative bias) or devotees of “boy love” (positive bias). This volunteer was involved only in selecting the news groups based on the above criteria and posting the solicitations; he did not participate in constructing the questionnaire, conducting the surveys, or evaluating the results. Some examples of the newsgroups utilized were: alt.gossip.celebrities, alt.smokers.cigars, rec.arts.comics.strips, rec.motorcycles, rec.travel.cruises, alt.autos.studebaker, alt.war.vietnam, talk.politics.mideast, alt.support.diabetes, alt.food.vegan, and rec.bicycles.soc. Enough of the respondents reported the optional identification of the news group where they encountered the solicitation to make it clear that a very large selection of news groups had in fact been addressed. The spacing over time of these responses also indicates a significant degree of separation between respondents.

Measures

General descriptions of the areas of inquiry follow, but to avoid repetitious descriptions of the unusually large number of questions asked and response options offered, Appendix A is used to list specific questions, their multiple response options and values, and topic-specific instructions provided to the respondents. This appendix is broken down into sections which correspond with the equivalent tables, but since it was felt unnecessary to list the routine demographic questions, there is no section A - I. There were 151 questions presented to the participants, 72 of which were selected for this report as being the most relevant and informative. Several optional text boxes were provided for additional unstructured comments, however, due to space limitations, these comments are not reported in this paper.

After the demographic questions, a short series of 5 questions concerning self-perceived general mental health and coping ability were asked (Appendix A - II). The usual standardized mental health question sets were felt to be too cumbersome for an Internet investigation.

The next section gathered information on the circumstances and conditions at the beginning of the relationship. Questions included the economic and social status of the younger and how these compared to the older, about relationships with parents, need for an emotional, physical, and intellectual extra-familial relationship, and the contributions of unacceptable family conditions to a need for such a relationship (Appendix A - III).

The beginning and development of the relationship was addressed next. After instructing the participant that if he had more than one such relationship he should describe the "principal" and most important one, questions included the respondent's age at the beginning of the relationship, the age difference between himself and the older male, how did he initially encounter the older male, and the initial amount of time they were able to spend together (Appendix A - IV).

Further questions addressed the amount of time the parties were able to spend together on a continuing basis, and the occurrence of bonding, joint activities, personal counseling, educational and other support (Appendix A - V).

Another section dealt with desire and willingness in the sexual aspects of the relationship: initial desire and willingness, desire and willingness to continue, any physical coercion, understanding of "simple" and "informed" consent (explained to participants as described in Appendix A - VI), and the relative extent of these forms of consent in the relationship.

The next section covered the age at which specific sex acts began and their frequency (Appendix A - VII).

The last section examined perception of the importance of the relationship, the relative importance of the non-sexual and sexual aspects, the distribution of "power," the question of "child sexual abuse," the degree of positive versus negative overall effects, effect on later sexual orientation, the validity of the decision to participate in sex, and the role of outside interference in the relationship (Appendix A - VIII).

Procedures

When prospective participants visited the website, the entry page advised the visitor about the nature of the survey. No indications were given as to the type of experiences being sought in terms of positive or negative—they were free to report either. Visitors simply were advised that the study was "An empirical investigation into the effects on males of a boyhood relationship with an older male that included a sexual component." On the second page visitors were reminded that they had to be of legal age (at least 18) to participate, and the anonymous nature of the survey was emphasized: they were told that no identifying information would be recorded (e.g., the participant's "Internet Provider" information, etc.) and that, if they felt uncomfortable using their home computers, they could, for example, use a computer at an Internet café, which would be an even more secure guarantor of their anonymity. Terms and conditions plus a disclaimer were stated in accordance with the American Psychological Association's statement of Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct. Visitors were made aware that the customary reports to participants would not be possible because of their anonymity, and

were advised that by proceeding on to the questionnaire they were agreeing to the terms and conditions of the research project.

When visitors arrived at the third page, the questions and pertinent instructions were presented, including a plea for objective truth as opposed to politically correct answers. The mutually exclusive HTML “radio buttons” with which they were to select their responses (Rhodes et al., 2003), were then explained, as well as the fact that the processing software required an answer for every multiple choice question. This software also included a “lockout” that prevented multiple submissions in rapid succession. Additionally, the sheer length of the questionnaire and the time required to complete it mitigates against the probability of repeated submissions by the same person. When respondents completed the questionnaire, they concluded their participation by clicking on a “submit” button.

Participants

From the over 1700 visits to the site and the nearly 800 who went to the second page, there were 108 responses submitted, of which 5 were rejected because the respondent was under 18, or the responses were inconsistent or disjointed; this left 103 valid responses. This ratio of respondents to initial visitors (about 1:16) illustrates the concerns previously described about obtaining participants. As noted earlier, these 103 responses constitute a non-random convenience sample which is subject to all of the limitations inherent in such a survey. One such limitation is the potential, but unavoidable, problem of recall bias; since long term effects are a primary focus of this investigation, the reported experiences of necessity must be a few years to several decades in the past. Also, all participants clearly were computer knowledgeable and either active on the Internet news group where they found the solicitation or were referred by participants from one of those groups. A further bias is indicated by the proportion of exclusively and primarily homosexual and bisexual respondents (N=33) which greatly exceeds customarily accepted percentages in the general population; however, it has been noted in previous investigations by this author that homosexual, bisexual, and pedosexual individuals are much more responsive to investigations of this type, whereas heterosexual adult males, perhaps because of their greater anxiety over the stigma that society attaches to unconventional sexuality, are much less likely to respond. Despite these and other inherent biases, to the researchers' knowledge this survey is of greater depth and detail than any to date.

In all tables, N (all) = 103, F (adult female attracted) = 66, M (adult male attracted) = 25, and O (other) = 12, which for simplicity includes bisexual (8) and minor attracted (4). Since the overall N is so close to 100, raw numbers, which are nearly interchangeable with percentages, are used in tables and text.

Table I presents the demographic and other characteristics of the participants. Sexual attraction is based on the Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin (1948) classifications, collapsed from 7 to 5, with separate categories for attraction to prepubescent or adolescent minors added.

In addition to the previously noted high proportion of homosexual and bisexual respondents, several other characteristics are of interest. Racial participation is heavily skewed toward Whites; geographically, North America, Continental Europe, and the UK account for almost all the respondents, and educational levels also appear to be somewhat high.

Table I: Participant Characteristics

Age	N	F	M	O	Marital status	N	F	M	O
18 – 21	103	66	25	12	Single	103	66	25	12
22 – 29	9	7	2	0	Long term hetero.	46	30	12	4
30 – 39	11	8	1	2	Long term homo.	28	23	1	4
40 – 49	24	14	8	2	Separated	13	1	10	2
50 or more	32	21	6	5	Divorced	3	3	0	0
	27	16	8	3	Widowed	10	7	2	1
Race						3	2	0	1
White	94	59	23	12	Religion				
Black	0	0	0	0	Protestant	30	21	4	5
Asian	1	1	0	0	Catholic	28	16	9	3
Latino	2	1	1	0	Other	12	10	1	1
Other	6	5	1	0	None	33	19	11	3
Residence					How religious				
United States	64	41	15	8	Very	7	6	0	1
Canada	10	5	4	1	Moderate	18	12	3	3
United Kingdom	11	7	3	1	Nominal	22	14	5	3
Continental Europe	7	6	0	1	Minimal	14	9	4	1
Australia/NZ	6	4	2	0	Not at all	42	25	13	4
Other	5	3	1	1	Primary sexual attraction				
Education					Exclusively peer female	36			
< 12 years	3	2	1	0	Primarily peer female	30			
High School Diploma/Equi	20	7	9	4	Equal peer female/male	8			
Some college	22	14	5	3	Primarily peer male	8			
Undergraduate degree	29	21	5	3	Exclusively peer male	17			
Master's or Equivalent	23	19	2	2	Prepubescent female	0			
Doctorate	6	3	3	0	Adolescent female	1			
					Prepubescent male	0			
					Adolescent male	3			

RESULTS

In order to keep this paper focused and of reasonable size, only a portion of the questions are reported, most of which are listed in Appendix A. Results are presented in tabular form and in considerable detail to allow reader analysis of the responses of the various classes of respondents.

Self-reported aspects of mental health and functioning are presented in Table II.

Table II: Mental health cf. Appendix A - II.

General mental health	N 103	F 66	M 25	O 12
Extremely poor	1	0	1	0
Very poor	2	1	1	0
Less than average	9	6	2	1
Average	34	22	8	4
Above average	15	11	2	2
Very good	25	13	9	3
Excellent	17	13	2	2
Job performance				
Not employed	14	10	2	2
Not good	2	1	0	1
Below average	4	2	2	0
Average	16	12	2	2
Above average	55	32	18	5
Outstanding	12	9	1	2
Get along at work				
Not employed	14	10	2	2
Not very well	1	0	0	1
Fairly well	7	4	3	0
Average	17	13	3	1
Very well	46	26	14	6
Extremely well	18	13	3	2
Get along at home				
Live alone	14	10	4	0
Not very well	1	0	0	1
Fairly well	10	8	2	0
Average	27	13	8	6
Very well	37	24	11	2
Extremely well	14	11	0	3
Cope with problems				
Poorly	0	0	0	0
Not very well	6	4	2	0
Fairly well	46	28	12	6
Very well	44	30	10	4
Extremely well	7	4	1	2

While these are non-standardized measures and also are subject to self-reporting bias, the respondents appear to perceive themselves as well-adjusted overall. Only 12 perceived their general mental health as below average, and only about one-fourth rated themselves below average in job performance or in getting along well with others at home or work.

Table III presents information on the circumstances and conditions at the time of the beginning of relationships; i.e., the economic and social status of the younger and how these compared to the older, relationships with parents and siblings, need for an emotional, physical, and intellectual non-familial relationship, and contributions of unacceptable conditions to the need for such a relationship.

Both respondents and the older males were mostly of average or middle-class socioeconomic status; more than moderate inequality between the respondents and older males was rare, and when inequality existed the respondents were almost as likely to rate their own social or economic status as higher rather than lower. Not unusual for boys of this age (see Table IV for ages at which the relationships began), respondents were closer to their mother than their father. However, the majority of both parental relationships were based on at least the "usual" level of attention. Desires for an emotional and physical (non-sexual) relationship were moderate, but somewhat higher for an intellectual (mentoring) relationship. Unacceptable family,

economic, and/or social circumstances appeared to contribute very little to the desire for a relationship with an older male.

Table III: Circumstances and conditions at the beginning of relationships. cf. Appendix A - III.

Family economic status	N 103	F 66	M 25	O 12
Poverty	4	3	1	0
Below average	20	14	5	1
Average	42	25	10	7
Comfortable	35	22	9	4
Wealthy	2	2	0	0
Older economic status				
Significantly inferior	3	3	0	0
Somewhat inferior	16	12	2	2
About the same	60	33	18	9
Somewhat superior	16	11	4	1
Significantly superior	8	7	1	0
Family social status				
Lower	10	7	3	0
Lower middle	20	16	2	2
Middle	52	30	16	6
Upper middle	18	10	4	4
Upper	3	3	0	0
Older social status				
Significantly inferior	5	4	0	1
Somewhat inferior	13	7	3	3
About the same	60	35	18	7
Somewhat superior	18	13	4	1
Significantly superior	7	7	0	0
Relationship to father				
No such male	11	9	2	0
Abusive	8	4	3	1
Ignored	9	7	1	1
Some attention	24	17	6	1
Usual attention	27	13	8	6
Felt important	24	16	5	3
Relationship to mother	N 103	F 66	M 25	O 12
No such female	1	1	0	0
Abusive	10	5	5	0
Ignored	2	1	1	0
Some attention	12	7	3	2
Usual attention	30	20	7	3
Felt important	48	32	9	7
Desire for emotional rel.				
Not at all	24	12	6	6
Only a little	21	16	5	0
Some	27	19	4	4
A lot	25	15	8	2
Intensely	6	4	2	0
Desire for physical rel.				
Not at all	25	16	6	3
Only a little	20	12	5	3
Some	29	17	4	8
A lot	25	17	8	0
Intensely	4	2	2	0
Desire for intellectual rel.				
Not at all	19	15	4	0
Only a little	16	8	6	2
Some	30	19	5	6
A lot	34	21	10	3
Intensely	4	3	0	1
Unacceptable circumst.				
Not in any way unaccept.	47	29	12	6
Not significantly	32	20	8	4
Only a little	9	5	3	1
Some	8	7	1	0
A lot	6	4	1	1
Very much so	1	1	0	0

Table IV deals with the actual beginning of the relationships.

Table IV: The beginning of the relationships. cf. Appendix A - IV.

Age at beginning	N 10 3	F 66	M 25	O 12	At time of meeting, he was:	N 10 3	F 66	M 25	O 12
<7	0	0	0	0	Total stranger	18	9	7	2
7	6	6	0	0	Casual acquaintance	23	16	4	3
8	8	6	0	2	Family friend	17	14	2	1
9	5	3	1	1	Relative	12	10	2	0
10	4	3	1	0	Teacher	4	2	1	1
11	13	10	2	1	Clergy	4	2	1	1
12	21	12	8	1	Scout leader	2	0	1	1
13	17	8	6	3	Other youth leader	3	1	2	0
14	6	3	1	2	Baby sitter	2	2	0	0
15	13	8	4	1	Other	48	10	5	3
16	6	3	2	1					
17	4	4	0	0	Initial time together				
					Less than once a month	25	16	7	2
Age differential					Once a week to once a month	21	11	7	3
3 or 4 years older	25	16	6	3	More than once a week	38	26	8	4
5 through 9 years older	20	14	5	1	Most every day	14	8	3	3
10 through 14 years older	13	7	4	2	We lived together	5	5	0	0
15 through 19 years older	15	9	5	1					
20 or more years older	30	20	5	5					

The median and modal age at the beginning of these relationships was 12 ($M = 12.14$, $SD = 2.63$); half (51) of the respondents began at 11 through 13, around the onset of puberty; and 13 at age 15, perhaps the age when "adult-like" homosexual experimentation may commence; there was no other particular pattern. The distribution of age differential was bimodal, however, with about one-fourth only 3-4 years older (suggesting that they were older adolescents), and almost one-third 20 or more years older. Crosstabulation of age at beginning versus age differential showed no discernable pattern with the exception of eight 13-year-olds whose relationships were with older adolescents, and the Pearson r for these two factors was not significant at 0.043, $p < (2\text{-tailed signif.}): 0.6644$. The publicly perceived categories of males frequently involved in such relationships, i.e., teachers, clergy, and youth leaders, were poorly represented, with "other" being the most frequent; 40 of the older males were casual acquaintances or family friends. The modal category for initial time together was more than once a week.

Continuing time together, bonding, joint activities, personal counseling and other support are described in Table V.

13 of the respondents felt that no "bonding" took place, but of the 90 who reported any level whatsoever of emotional connectedness or bonding, 67 characterized this factor as "some"(3) or greater. Personal counseling ($M = 2.25$, $SD = 1.15$) and hobbies ($M = 2.20$,

Table V: The development of the relationships. cf. Appendix A - V.

Continuing time together	N 103	F 66	M 25	O 12
Rel. lasted < one year	32	20	8	4
Less than once a month	13	11	2	0
Once a week to once a month	15	7	6	2
More than once a week	28	16	6	6
Most every day	11	8	3	0
We lived together	4	4	0	0
Extent of bonding				
Not at all	13	9	3	1
Very little	23	15	6	2
Some	35	21	8	6
Quite a bit	23	13	8	2
A great deal	9	8	0	1
Engaged in hobbies together				
Not at all	39	26	11	2
Only a little	25	16	6	3
Some	23	15	5	3
A lot	11	5	2	4
Main common interest	5	5	4	1
Personal counseling	N 103	F 66	M 25	O 12
Never	35	26	8	1
Rarely	27	14	9	4
Fairly often	24	17	3	4
Quite often	14	6	5	3
Extensively	3	3	0	0
Material support				
Never	47	35	9	3
Rarely	37	20	13	4
Fairly often	13	7	1	5
Quite often	2	1	1	0
Extensively	4	3	1	0
Decisions/activities (nonsex)				
Didn't last	19	13	5	2
He did	13	11	2	0
He did, considered me	15	10	3	2
Mutual	48	26	16	6
I did, considered him	2	2	0	0
I did	5	3	0	2

SD = 1.20) (See Appendix A - V for scales) seemed to be the most important activities, followed in decreasing importance by sports, trips, and manual skills. However, none of these had importance even approaching the "some" (3) level. The mean for material support was 1.82, between "never" and "rarely." Nonsexual activity decisions in the ongoing relationship tended to be shared; almost half the respondents characterized them as "mutual."

Table VI reports desire, initiation, and willingness in the sexual aspect of the relationship.

Some degree of preexisting interest in a sexual encounter with an older male was reported by almost two-thirds (66) of the participants. Questions about desire and willingness, which are similar but not identical, were asked separately, and some degree of initial desire to participate in the sexual aspects of this specific relationship was reported by 81 respondents; 55 characterized their initial willingness as having consented to or initiated the activities, and a passive attitude was reported by 41. The presence of some degree of physical force, mostly minor, was reported by 11, whereas 92 reported none. Some degree of desire to continue was reported by 83 respondents, and some degree of willingness to continue by 65. In response to the questions about "simple" and "informed" consent (these terms were defined for the respondents, see Appendix A - VI), moderate to complete capability to understand and give simple consent at that time was reported by 83, and moderate to complete capability to understand and give informed

Table VI: Initiation and Willingness in Sexual Activities. cf. Appendix A - VI

Preexisting desire	N 103	F 66	M 25	O 12
Never occurred to me	37	27	4	6
Only slightly	12	8	4	0
Somewhat	11	6	4	1
Quite a bit	17	9	7	1
Intensely	26	16	6	4
Whose initial idea				
Completely mine	3	2	0	1
Mostly mine	11	8	1	2
Mutual	37	19	13	5
Mostly his	37	26	8	3
Entirely his	15	11	3	1
Initial desire				
Not at all	1	1	0	0
Not very much	2	2	0	0
I was unsure	19	12	5	2
A little bit	27	21	4	2
Very much	54	30	16	8
Initial willingness				
I objected strongly	0	0	0	0
I objected a little bit	7	5	1	1
I was passive	41	29	9	3
I expressed consent	41	23	11	7
I initiated the activities	14	9	4	1
Physically forced				
Entirely	1	0	1	0
Very much	0	0	0	0
Moderately	2	1	1	0
Only a little	8	7	1	0
Not at all	92	58	22	12
Desire to Continue				
One or two experiences	11	5	3	3
Not at all	0	0	0	0
Not very much	1	1	0	0
I was unsure	8	6	2	0
A little bit	22	17	3	2
Very much	61	34	17	10
Willingness to Continue				
One or two experiences	9	5	2	2
I objected strongly	1	0	1	0
I objected a little bit	6	6	0	0
I was passive	22	15	5	2
I expressed consent	51	31	14	6
I initiated the activities	14	9	3	2
Capable of Simple Consent				
Not at All	9	6	2	1
Only a little	11	8	2	1
Moderately	18	13	3	2
Very Much	28	19	7	2
Completely	37	20	11	6
Capable of Informed Consent				
Don't understand concept	11	8	2	1
Not at all	13	7	4	2
Minimally	14	11	1	2
Moderately	20	13	6	1
Very much	21	13	6	2
Completely	24	14	6	4
Nature of Consent Given				
Don't understand concept	8	7	0	1
I objected	2	0	1	1
I was passive	21	15	4	2
Entirely simple	12	9	2	1
Mostly simple	22	12	8	2
Equal informed and simple	16	10	6	0
Mostly informed	6	5	1	0
Entirely informed	16	8	3	5

consent by 65. For the specific relationship, some degree of active simple and/or informed consent was considered to have been given by 72 of the respondents, while 21 reported passive acceptance.

In addition, three questions were asked concerning the use of sex to please or obtain favors. On a 5 point decreasing scale, with higher scores indicating that the factor was *less* important (see Appendix A - VI), the mean for pleasing was 3.74 (SD 1.42), for spending more time, 3.78 (SD 1.25), and for obtaining money or material things, 3.93 (SD 1.23).

Specific sexual activities, the number who participated, age when began, median frequency, and Pearson correlation of frequency to overall effect are presented in Table VII.

Table VII: Sexual Activities. cf. Appendix A – VII.

Activity	N	Age began		Median Frequency	Correlation of frequency to overall effect (all two tailed Pearson r's)
		Mean	SD		
Touched by older male	103	12.14	2.96	-	-
Touched older male	97	12.41	2.69	-	-
Masturbated by older	100	12.23	2.71	10-49	$r(100) = .290 p < .003$
Masturbated older male	92	12.47	2.76	10-49	$r(92) = .286 p < .006$
Received oral sex	78	12.63	2.49	10-49	$r(78) = .306 p < .007$
Performed oral sex	74	13.01	2.66	10-49	$r(74) = .276 p < .017$
Received anal sex	50	13.20	2.70	<10	$r(50) = .126 p < .384$
Performed anal sex	28	14.10	2.52	10-49	$r(28) = .225 p < .250$

These relationships typically were extensively sexual in terms of both frequency of encounters and variety of sexual interactions. However, if the level of physical intimacy of sexual contacts is considered to increase as contacts progress from touching to masturbation to oral sex to anal sex, then increasingly intimate contacts are reported by fewer participants and occur at older ages. There were positive correlations between the perceived overall effect and the frequency of the respondent masturbating or being masturbated by the older male or receiving oral sex, i.e., more frequent sexual contacts of these types were associated with more positive overall effects. However, performing oral sex and performing or receiving anal sex were not associated with perceived positive overall effects. Excluding the 20 who continued sex past age 17, the mean age for last sexual experience with the principal male was 13.87 (SD 2.65), as noted earlier, the mean age at the beginning was 12.14 (2.63).

Table VIII reports retrospective evaluations of the effects of the relationships.

Moderate or greater importance was ascribed to their relationship by 67 respondents, and the relative importance of sexual to non-sexual activities was perceived as equal or greater by 82. "Power" was regarded as shared equally by 37, with another 48 regarding it as shared considerably by either the older male or the respondent. Some three-fourths of the respondents characterized their experiences as not at all constituting "child sexual abuse," whereas 18 reported it as "a little," and 6 as more than a little. Overall effects were described as positive by

Table VIII: Effects and perceptions. cf. Appendix A - VIII.

Duration	N 103	F 66	M 25	O 12
Less than one month	11	6	3	2
One through 2 months	5	4	0	1
Three through five months	1	0	1	0
Six through eleven months	11	8	3	0
One through two years	27	19	6	2
Three through five years	26	13	8	5
Six through 10 years	8	4	2	2
More than ten years	3	3	0	0
Still exists	11	9	2	0
Importance				
Only slight	23	19	4	0
Somewhat	13	8	1	4
Moderate	23	15	5	3
Very	31	16	13	2
Extreme	13	8	2	3
Relative importance				
Non-sex major	7	7	0	0
Non-sex much more	4	3	1	0
Non-sex some more	10	6	1	3
Non-sex equal to sex	23	13	7	3
Sex some more	20	11	7	2
Sex much more	22	16	4	2
Sex major	17	10	5	2
Power				
All his	17	11	5	1
Most his, considerate	40	28	8	4
Shared equally	37	21	10	6
Most mine, considerate	8	6	2	0
All mine	1	0	0	1

Child sex abuse	N 103	F 66	M 25	O 12
Not at all	78	50	19	9
A little	18	12	4	2
Some	1	1	0	0
A lot	2	2	0	0
Completely	4	1	2	1
Overall effect				
Very negative	5	1	3	1
Somewhat negative	8	2	6	0
Neither neg. nor pos.	31	22	6	3
Somewhat positive	34	22	8	4
Very positive	25	14	7	4
Influenced orientation				
Not at all	58	42	12	4
A little	20	17	3	0
Some	12	6	1	5
A lot	8	1	6	1
A whole lot	5	0	3	2
Validity of decision				
Objected	1	0	1	0
Passive	10	6	2	2
Bad decision	4	2	2	0
Reasonable – more info	17	14	2	5
Good – more info	22	12	6	4
Good – sufficient info	17	13	4	0
Good – no misgivings	32	19	8	5

59 and as neutral (neither positive nor negative) by 31, therefore 9 of every 10 respondents did not report their experiences as negative. Little or less influence on adult sexual orientation was reported by 78, and the validity of the decision to engage in sex was characterized as "good" by 71 and "reasonable" by another 17. These and all other responses must be considered in the light of the previously mentioned possibility of recall bias.

Interference in the relationship by parents or other adults was characterized as "some" through "excessive" by 10 respondents, "minimal" by 16, and "none" by 77. This interference

broke up 4 of the relationships, had "some" or "considerable" effect on 5, "minimal" effect on 15, with the remainder unaffected. Three of the older partners were arrested, and two of them were imprisoned (Appendix A - VIII). It is noteworthy that although most of these relationships lasted more than a year and were extensively sexual (involving multiple contacts and more "advanced" sexual activities), legal involvement occurred in only a handful.

To explore the association between self-perceived overall effect and other aspects of the relationships, crosstabulations and Pearson *r*'s for a variety of characteristics are presented in Table IX. Additional correlations were tested but not found to be of any significance.

Table IX: Crosstabulations and Pearson correlations with overall long term effect

	N	Very negative	Somewhat negative	Neutral	Somewhat positive	Very positive
Age at beginning (Appendix A - IV)						
<10	19	1	4	7	1	6
10-11	17	2	2	3	6	4
12-13	38	2	0	13	13	10
14-15	19	0	1	7	8	3
16-17	10	0	1	1	6	2
$r(103) = .138 p < .165$, two-tailed						
Age differential (Appendix A - IV)						
3-4	25	0	1	9	12	3
5-9	20	2	2	5	4	7
10-14	13	0	0	3	5	5
15-19	15	0	0	5	5	5
>19	30	3	5	9	8	5
$r(103) = .116 p < .245$, two-tailed						
Adult sexual orientation (cf. Table I)						
Exclu. fem.	36	2	5	10	13	6
Pri. female	30	0	1	12	9	8
Bisexual	8	0	0	2	4	2
Pri. male	8	1	1	2	2	2
Exclu. male	17	1	1	4	6	5
Other	4	1	0	1	0	2
$r(103) = .045 p < .652$, two-tailed						
	N	Very negative	Somewhat negative	Neutral	Somewhat positive	Very positive
Type of consent given (Appendix A - VI)						
<i>Don't under.</i>	8	0	1	4	3	0
Objected	2	2	0	0	0	0
Passive	21	2	4	5	5	5
Ent. simple	12	1	2	4	3	2
Most. simple	22	0	1	3	10	8
Sim. = infor.	16	0	0	7	6	3
Most. infor.	6	0	0	3	1	2
$r(95) = .294 p < .004$, two-tailed						
Initial willingness (Appendix A - VI)						
Obj. strongly	0	0	0	0	0	0
Obj. little bit	7	1	1	2	1	2
Neutral	41	4	5	11	12	9
Exp. consent	41	0	2	15	15	9
Initiated	14	0	0	3	6	5
$r(103) = .238 p < .015$, two-tailed						
Continuing willingness (Appendix A - VI)						
<i>Once/twice</i>	9	1	2	4	2	0
Obj. strongly	1	1	0	0	0	0
Obj. little bit	6	1	1	4	0	0
Neutral	22	2	3	7	4	6
Exp. consent	51	0	2	13	19	17
Initiated	14	0	0	3	9	2
$r(94) = .400 p < .000$, two-tailed						

Note: response options in *italics* were excluded in calculating correlations.

Neither age at the beginning of the relationship, age differential, nor adult sexual orientation were associated with overall effects. However, type of consent given and willingness to continue the sexual activities were significantly associated with perceived overall effects, and initial willingness was marginally associated. The higher levels of perceived consent or of willingness in these latter three correlations were associated with positive evaluations of the relationship, but it must be noted that, as with any correlation, this association does not prove a causal relationship.

DISCUSSION

The primary focus of this study was to examine self-reported effects and retrospective perceptions of sexual contacts between boys and older males using a non-clinical and non-forensic sample. Professional and public perceptions of these experiences have been dominated for several decades by the victimological paradigm which co-evolved with the developing moral panic of the 1970s (Jenkins, 1998). The validity and objectivity of victimology and its assumptions were questioned by Money, who described it as "... science only in the etymology of its name. In practice it is a branch of the sexosophy of the judicial and punishment industry, not of sexology, the science of sex and sex research. Victimologists are, de facto, the new social-science police. Social-science practitioners have never before been accorded the prestige of having so much power over people's lives." (1988, p. 9). Also noted by Money were the many parallels between the now defunct masturbation hypothesis (Hare, 1962) and the victimological child sexual abuse hypothesis as being "an example of those who have not learned from history being condemned to repeat it, replete with all its dreadful consequences." (1985, p. 97).

The statements of harm concerning persons defined by victimological assumptions as sexual victims tend to be extreme, but nevertheless are generally accepted without question by both the lay public and professionals, and usually are propagated uncritically by the media. These statements, especially in the case of boys, do not center on empirical findings but are largely derived from ideological positions (Jenkins, 1998). Presumptions by victimologists regarding the effects of boyhood sexual experiences with older males were often drawn by inference from the experiences of girls with older males, both in non-familial situations and in incest, and valid harmful effects reported in boys in clinical and legal samples were extrapolated to apply unconditionally to all boys who have such experiences. These assumptions and extrapolations have been made repeatedly by victimological researchers, despite the presence of a number of non-clinical, non-legal studies that indicate little or no harm and in some cases even reports of benefits (e.g., Bernard, 1981; Constantine, 1981; Ingram, 1981; Money & Weinrich, 1983; Sandfort, 1984; Tindall, 1978). These considerations lie behind the present study's attempt to re-examine this topic by means of an Internet survey directed to respondents who are outside the clinical and legal populations.

This sample was obtained through solicitations listed on Internet "news groups," which were chosen for having no obvious connection with the topic at hand. This venue and approach are not claimed to be optimum or ideal, but were used by default, because there seemed no other reasonable way to reach a sample of such men in the present social climate. Those who participated were indeed not representative of the general male population, differing in various important ways, including a relative absence of minorities: 94 out of 103 were White. The sample was skewed towards men from English-speaking countries, but appears to be more diverse than all other known studies of this subject in terms of nationalities involved and religious tendencies. Traditional religious belief was not present in nearly half the sample, with a third reporting no religion at all, and more than half were minimally or less influenced by religion in their attitudes and decisions. The educational level was high on average, and, as a group, the men self-reported mostly good mental health and coping skills. All these characteristics show that the present sample was quite different from the clinical and forensic samples which have been so popular among researchers, and which also differ from the general population. Because of these differences, the findings in this paper need to be viewed with

caution in terms of their generalizability, and are most relevant to populations consisting of generally English-speaking White males who are more educated and less religiously oriented.

This study replicates findings of research conducted mostly before the ascendancy of victimology. Those older studies generally concluded that such relations are not innately negative and harmful, and can even be beneficial (e.g., Money & Weinrich, 1983; Sandfort, 1984; Tindall, 1978). However, this study extends that earlier research by collecting and reporting more recent and much more detailed information on this type of relationship. The findings from this sample offer little support for the hypothesis that boyhood sexual relations with older males are typically involuntary, experienced traumatically, and generally lead to maladjustment. Victimology holds that all forms of boy/older male sexual contact are injurious to the younger participant (Finkelhor, 1984), events which were commonplace in this sample. Therefore ample evidence of coercion, trauma, and harm should have become apparent, but such evidence did not emerge. To the contrary, the respondents indicated that consent, in the "simple" sense, was common; enjoyment was more characteristic than displeasure or trauma; encouragement rather than resistance on the part of the younger participant characterized sexual interactions, especially after the first several encounters; feelings that the sex was best described as "child sexual abuse" were in the minority; perceptions of sharing power rather than being dominated in the relations were frequent; and self-perceptions of positive rather than negative short-term or long-term effects were characteristic. Finally, self-reports of current mental health indicated that most participants felt that they were emotionally healthy, coped fairly well with life's problems, and had good social relations with others. These results are inconsistent with victimological assumptions of trauma and harm as central, universal features of this kind of sexual interaction.

When considering the results and implications of this investigation, it is relevant to keep in mind that the prevalent "harm" model of sexually expressed boyhood relationships with older males likely has pervaded the socialization of most—if not all—of the respondents. This likelihood suggests that each respondent who views his experiences as other than harmful is, within the anonymity provided in this survey, questioning and essentially rejecting that which society has attempted to infuse into him regarding his perception of his sexual experiences as a boy.

While instances of unwanted and severely negative experiences are sparse in the current sample, they dominate media reports of sexually expressed boy/older male relationships. Radford (2003) described the media as "myth makers," a characterization demonstrated in the use of pejorative terminology and sensationalism in such reports. But even myths must start somewhere, and it is useful to explore—without in any way claiming to be definitive—various possibilities for their origins. If the younger participant is still a minor, it is possible that the reports of harm originated not from the boy but from parents and other adults purporting to speak for him, or that any testimony from the boy may have been under duress (although the possibility of real trauma clearly must not be denied). If the complainant is now an adult, it could be that his boyhood sexual contacts may, in fact, have been unwanted, forced, or even severely traumatic, although again, such were infrequent in the current study. However, there are at least three other plausible scenarios: (a) Various studies (Asch, 1955; Baron, Vandello, & Brunsman, 1996, etc.) have shown "conformity" to be a powerful psychological influence, and even though someone may have evaluated his boyhood sexual experiences as benign or positive at the time, in later life he may, at least publicly, express positions and attitudes that are more socially acceptable and

politically correct as well as much less likely to invite scorn and ridicule; (b) In order to try to obtain monetary compensation from an “abuser” who has sufficient assets, or from his organization, there are those who claim that their boyhood sexual contacts—which some may simply invent (Martin, 2003)—were “abuse;” and (c) The complainant may have significant underlying and unrelated emotional or psychological issues, and, perhaps at the suggestion—or even urging—of his professional mental health consultant, he has seized upon his boyhood sexual contacts as a convenient excuse for all of his other problems.

It is important to reiterate that the sample presented here can not and is not claimed to be representative of the populations from which it was drawn; there is no practical way of determining the degree to which it may or may not be. However, even with the uncontrolled nature of the survey procedures and the self-selection bias of those who use the Internet, anyone who became aware of the questionnaire was free to participate, the only prerequisites were being male, of legal age, and having had a boyhood sexual encounter with an older male, whether negative, neutral, or positive. Also, data examined by Rind et al. (1998) indicate that some 17% of adult males as boys had sexual contacts with older persons, the majority of whom reported their experiences as nonnegative and thus presumably to some degree willing. This is a figure which, because of the likely underreporting due to the stigma associated with such contacts if the older partner is male, must be seen at best as an estimated minimum; logic tells us that the actual percentage must be higher. But applying even this minimal percentage to census numbers produces in the US alone a figure of some fifteen million of what some would label as “male victims of child sexual abuse,” but which others, apparently including many – perhaps even a majority – of the participants, consider to be adequately consensual, factually non-abusive, and thus personally satisfactory, sexual contacts. The presence of these fifteen million men who had largely non-negative boyhood sexual experiences with older persons would seem to reinforce the possibility that the present sample actually may well be much more representative than can be empirically demonstrated.

But even if the sample is only minimally representative, since the goal of the research was limited to examining the validity of the universalistic claims of victimology, there is no requirement that the sample be broadly representative, only that it show that indeterminate portions of boyhood sexual experiences with older males are more typically self-perceived as voluntary, positively experienced, generally free from outside interference, and neutral or positive in their effects. Studies based on clinical and legal samples tend to show, instead, just the opposite, i.e., that such relations are often forced or coerced, are negatively or traumatically experienced, and are harmful in the long term. The problem with the latter findings is not that they are invalid (they clearly are valid in particular cases), but that they are interpreted as applying universally to all such boyhood sexual experiences with older males. This is not only empirically untenable, but discourages much-needed research into the full range of the characteristics of such experiences. One benefit of the present study is in encouraging more unbiased investigations by showing that such factors as reactions and effects or power and motivations are much more varied and complex than the narrow views found in victimological assumptions, which views tend to be accepted much too uncritically by professionals, the media, and the lay public.

REFERENCES

- Asch, S. (1955). Opinions and Social Pressure. *Scientific American*, 193, 31-35.
- Baron, R., Vandello, J., & Brunsman, B. (1996). The forgotten variable in conformity research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 915-927.
- Bender, L. & Blau, A. (1937). The reaction of children to sexual relations with adults. *Am. J. Orthopsychiatry*, 7, 500-518.
- Bernard, F. (1981). Pedophilia: Psychological Consequences for the Child. In L. Constantine & F. Martinson (Eds.) *Children and Sex: New Findings, New Perspectives*. Boston: Little-Brown
- Best, J. (1997). Victimization and the victim industry. *Society*, 34(4): 9-17.
- Constantine, L. (1981). The Effects of Early Sexual Experiences. In L. Constantine & F. Martinson (Eds.) *Children and Sex: New Findings, New Perspectives*. Boston: Little-Brown.
- Cronk, B., & West, J. (2002). Personality research on the Internet: A comparison of Web-based and traditional instruments in take-home and in-class settings. *Behavior research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 34(2), 177-180.
- Duffy, M. (2002). Methodological Issues in Web-based Research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 34(1), 83-88.
- Finkelhor, D. (1984). *Child sexual abuse. New theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Ford, C. and Beach, F. (1951). *Patterns of Sexual Behavior*. Harper & Brothers.
- Hare, E. (1962). Masturbatory insanity: the history of an idea. *Journal of Mental Science*, 108, 1-25.
- Ingram, M. (1981). Participating victims: A study of sexual offenses with boys. In L. L. Constantine, and F. M. Martinson (Eds.) *Children and sex*. Boston: Little, Brown, 177-187.
- Jenkins, P. (1998). *Moral panic: Changing concepts of the child-molester in modern America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kendall Tackett, K.A., Williams L. M., & Finkelhor, D. (1993). Impact of sexual abuse on children: a review and synthesis of recent empirical studies. *Psychological Bulletin* 113, 164-180.
- Kinsey, A., Pomeroy, W., & Martin, C., (1948) *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Philadelphia, W. B. Saunders Company.
- Kutchinsky, B. (1992). The child sexual abuse panic. *Nordisk Sexologi*, 10, 30-42.
- Lautmann, R. (1994). *Die Lust am Kind*. [Attraction to children] Hamburg: Ingrid Klein.
- Martin, Y. (2003, July 23). Sex-case brothers asked to return. *Press*, Christchurch, New Zealand. Retrieved August 10, 2003, from http://www.peterellis.org/church/2003/2003-0723_Press_SexCase.htm.

- Money, J. & Weinrich, J. D. (1983). Juvenile, pedophile, heterophile: Hermeneutics of science, medicine and law in two outcome studies. *International Journal of Medicine and Law*, 2, 39-54.
- Money, J. (1985). *The destroying angel*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Money, J. (1988). Commentary: current status of sex research. *Journal of psychology and human sexuality*, 1, 5-15.
- Nathan, D., & Snedeker, M. (1995). *Satan's silence: Ritual abuse and the making of a modern American witchhunt*. New York: Basic Books.
- Okami, P. (1991). Self-Reports of "Positive" Childhood and Adolescent Sexual Contacts with Older Persons: An Exploratory Study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 20(5), 437-457.
- Okami, P. (1997). Sexual Experiences in Early Childhood: 18-Year Longitudinal Data from the UCLA Family Lifestyles Project. *Journal of Sex Research*, 34(4), 339-347.
- Ondersma, S. J., Chaffin, M., Berliner, L., Cordon, I., Goodman, G., & Barnewitt, D. (2001). Sex with children is abuse: Comment on Rind, Tromovitch, and Bauserman (1998), *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 707-714.
- Percy, W. (1996). *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Pettit, F. (2002). A comparison of World-Wide Web and paper-and-pencil personality questionnaires. *Behavior research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 34(1), 50-54.
- Radford, B. (2003). *Media Myth Makers*. Amherst NY, Prometheus.
- Rhodes, S., Bowie, K., & Hergenrather, K. (2003) Collecting behavioral data using the world wide web: considerations for researchers. *Journal of Epidemiological Community Health*, 57, 68-73.
- Rind, B., Bauserman, R., & Tromovich, P. (1998). A meta-analytic examination of assumed properties of child sexual abuse using college samples. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(1), 22-53.
- Rind, B., Tromovitch, P., & Bauserman, R. (2001). The validity and appropriateness of methods, analyses, and conclusions in Rind et al. (1998): A rebuttal of victimological critique from Ondersma et al. (2001) and Dallam et al. (2001). *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 734-758.
- Sandfort, T. (1987). *Boys on their Contacts with Men*. Elmhurst, NY: Global Academic Press.
- Tindall, R. H. (1978) The male adolescent involved with a pederast becomes an adult. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 3(4), 373-382.

APPENDIX A

Response option values used in analyses are shown in parentheses.

A - II: Mental health and Functioning.

How would you evaluate your own present state of general mental health?

Extremely poor(1), Very poor(2), Less than average(3), Average(4), Above average(5), Very good(6), Excellent(7)

How would you describe your ability now to do the things that are expected of you in your job or business?

I am neither employed nor self employed(0), Not good(1), Below average(2), About average(3), Above average(4), Outstanding(5).

How well do you now get along with the other people at your job, or business?

I am neither employed nor self employed(0), Not very well(1), Fairly well(2), Average(3), Very well(4), Extremely well(5).

How well do you now get along with the other people where you live?

I live alone(0), Not very well(1), Fairly well(2), Average(3), Very well(4), Extremely well(5).

How well do you now cope with the problems of every day life?

Poorly(1), Not very well(2), Fairly well(3), Very well(4), Extremely well(5).

A – III: Circumstances and Conditions at the Beginning of Relationships

Note: The phrase "at that time" refers to the time when your relationship with this principal older male was beginning.

How would you describe your family's economic status at that time?

Poverty(1), Below average(2), Average(3), Comfortable(4), Wealthy(5).

How would you describe this principal older male's economic status at that time compared to that of your family?

Significantly inferior (1), Somewhat inferior(2) About the same(3), Somewhat superior(4), Significantly superior (5).

How would you describe your family's social status at that time?

Lower(1), Lower middle(2), Middle(3), Upper middle(4), Upper(5).

How would you describe this principal older male's social status at that time compared to that of your family?

Significantly inferior (1), Somewhat inferior(2) About the same(3), Somewhat superior(4), Significantly superior (5).

How would you describe the way you were treated by your father, stepfather, or other equivalent

male at that time?

I had no such male in my life(0), He was physically and/or emotionally abusive(1). He largely ignored me(2), He sometimes paid attention to me(3), He usually paid attention to me(4), He made me feel as though I was important to him(5).

How would you describe the way you were treated by your mother, stepmother, or other equivalent female at that time?

I had no such female in my life(0), She was physically and/or emotionally abusive(1). She largely ignored me(2), She sometimes paid attention to me(3), She usually paid attention to me(4), She made me feel as though I was important to her(5).

At that time, how much did you feel a desire or need for an emotional relationship with an older male mentor?

Not at all(1), Only a little(2), Some(3), A lot(4), Intensely(5).

At that time, how much did you feel a desire or need to be touched, hugged, cuddled, and provided with other non-sexual forms of physical intimacy from an older male?

Not at all(1), Only a little(2), Some(3), A lot(4), Intensely(5).

At that time, how much did you feel a desire or need for an intellectual relationship with an older male mentor, i.e., someone from whom you could learn both general and specific skills?

Not at all(1), Only a little(2), Some(3), A lot(4), Intensely(5).

To what degree do you feel that your unacceptable family, economic, and/or social circumstances contributed to your desire or need for a relationship with an older male?

My family, economic, and/or social circumstances, were not so unacceptable as to be a factor(0), Not at all(1), Only a little(2), Some(3), A lot(4), Very much so(5).

A - IV: The Beginning of the Relationships

Note: Because "friend" and "friendship" have strong, specific connotations, and could possibly create bias in a scientific survey, the terms "principal relationship" and "principal older male" will be used.

How old were you when this principal relationship began? (In this and other similar questions, if you are not sure of the exact age when an event occurred, use your best guess.)

Less than 7 (6), 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17.

How much was this principal male older than you?

3 or 4 years older(1), 5 through 9 years older(2), 10 through 14 years older(3), 15 through 19 years older(4), 20 or more years older(5).

When you became acquainted with him, was this principal older male a:

Total stranger(1), Casual acquaintance(2), Family friend(3), Relative(4), Teacher(5), Clergy(6), Scout leader(7), Other youth/sports coach or leader(8), Baby sitter(9), Other(10).

At the beginning of the relationship, how often did you get to spend time together?

Less than once a month(1), More than once a month, but less than once a week(2),
More than once a week, but not every day(3), Most every day(4), We lived
together(5).

A - V: The Development of the Relationship

After the first year or so, how often did you get to spend time together?

The relationship didn't last a year(0), Less than once a month(1), More than once a
month, but less than once a week(2), More than once a week, but not every day(3),
Most every day(4), We lived together(5).

To what extent did a strong and vital sense of bonding, or emotional connectedness develop in
this principal relationship?

Not at all(1), Very little(2), Some(3), Quite a bit(4), A great deal(5).

To what degree did you and this principal older male engage in hobbies?

Not at all(1), Only a little(2), Some(3), A lot(4), It was our main common interest(5).

Questions similar to the above, with similar scales, were asked concerning sports, trips, help with
homework, personal counseling, and manual skills

To what degree did this principal older male provide financial help—buy food, clothes, toys,
provide small amounts of spending money, etc.?

Never(1), Rarely(2), Fairly often(3), Quite often(4), Extensively(5).

After the first few times, who generally decided upon and initiated nonsexual activities?

The relationship didn't last(0), He did(1), He did, but he also considered my desires(2),
Such decisions were mutual(3), I did, but I also considered his desires (4), I did (5).

A - VI: Initiation and Willingness in Sexual Activities

When you began this relationship, to what extent did you have a desire for sexual activities with
an older male?

The idea never occurred to me(1), Only slightly(2), Somewhat(3), Quite a bit(4),
Intensely(5).

Whose initial idea was it to engage in sexual activities?

Completely mine(1), Mostly mine, but he cooperated(2), Mutual(3), Mostly this
principal older male's, but I cooperated(4), Completely this principal older male's(5).

To what extent did you want to engage in sexual activities the first time or two [with this
principal older male]?

I didn't want to at all(1), I didn't want to very much(2), I felt ambivalent and unsure(3),
I wanted to a little bit(4), I wanted to very much(5).

To what extent did you openly object to or were willing to engage in sexual activities the first

time or two?

I objected strongly(1), I objected a little bit(2), I neither objected nor consented(3), I clearly expressed my consent(4), I initiated the activity(5).

The first time or two, to what degree were you physically forced, against your will and after you had objected, to engage in sexual activities with this principal older male?

My participation in sexual activities was entirely the result of being physically forced(1), Very much(2), Moderately(3), Only a little(4), I was not at all physically forced to engage in sexual activities(5).

After the first few times, how much did you want to continue to engage in sexual activities?

We only had sex once or twice (0), I didn't want to at all(1), I didn't want to very much(2), I felt ambivalent and unsure(3), I wanted to a little bit(4), I wanted to very much(5).

To what extent did you openly object to or consent to continuing to engage in sexual activities?

We only had sex once or twice(0), I objected strongly(1), I objected a little bit(2), I neither objected nor consented(3), I clearly expressed my consent(4), I initiated the activity(5).

"Simple consent" occurs when you want to do something, either because you initiated it or you agree to it. To what degree do you feel that you personally, at that time, were capable of withholding or giving your simple consent concerning sexual activities with this principal older male?

Not at all (1), Only a little (2), Moderately (3), Very much (4), Completely (5).

"Informed consent," as opposed to "simple consent," occurs when you are reasonably aware of the significant factors that are relevant to a decision, and have a reasonable ability to foresee the potential effects of that decision. To what degree do you feel that you personally, at that time, were capable of withholding or giving such "informed consent" concerning sexual activities with this principal older male?

I do not feel that I understand these different terms well enough to answer this question (0). Not at all (1), Only a little (2), Moderately (3), Very much (4), Completely (5).

How would you describe the nature of the consent you gave to engage in sexual activities with this principal older male?

I do not feel that I understand these different terms well enough to answer this question (0). I objected and did not at all consent(1), I was passive, and neither objected nor consented (2), I gave entirely simple consent (3), I gave mostly simple consent, but partly informed consent (4), I gave equally simple consent and informed consent (4), I gave mostly informed consent, but partly simple consent (5), I gave entirely informed consent (6).

To what extent did you engage in sex simply in order to please this principal older male?

It was a major factor on my part(1), It was a minor factor on my part(2), It was not a factor on my part(3), I felt confident that it was not necessary(4), I felt confident that it

was not necessary, I simply wanted and enjoyed the sexual activities(5).

Two questions similar to the one above were asked concerning engaging in sex in order to get the principal older male to spend time with the respondent, or to get money or other material benefits.

A - VII: Sex in the Relationship

The first question below was asked about "touching," and the first and second were asked about masturbation, oral sex, and anal sex in both passive and active roles, for a total of 14 questions, the question about last experience makes 15.

How old were you when you first (specific activity)?

It never happened (0), less than 7(6), 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17.

How many times while you were less than 18 were you (specific activity)?

It never happened(0), Less than 10(1), 10 through 49(2), 50 through 99(3), More than 100(4).

How old were you when you had your last sexual experience with this principal older male?

6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 or older (18).

A - VIII: Effects of relationships

How long did your principal relationship, not necessarily including sexual activities, last?

Less than one month(1), One month or more, but less than three months(2), Three months or more, but less than six months(3), Six months or more, but less than one year(4), One through two years(5), Three through five years(6), Six through ten years(7), More than ten years (8), The relationship still exists (9).

How important was this principal relationship to you?

Only slightly(1), Somewhat(2), Moderately(3), Very(4), Extremely(5).

What was the relative importance of the non-sexual and sexual aspects of this principal relationship to you?

The non-sexual aspect was of major importance to me, and the sexual aspect of very little importance(1), The non-sexual aspect was much more important to me than the sexual aspect(2), The non-sexual aspect was somewhat more important to me than the sexual aspect(3), The non-sexual and sexual aspects were of equal importance to me(4), The sexual aspect was somewhat more important to me than the non-sexual aspect(5), The sexual aspect was much more important to me than the non-sexual aspect(6), The sexual aspect was of major importance to me, and the non-sexual aspect of very little importance(7).

The issue of an "imbalance of power" in a relationship between a boy and an older male is very controversial. In your principal relationship, how do you feel this "power" was

distributed, i.e., who had the most influence over maintaining the relationship, frequency of meetings, choosing activities, etc.?

He had essentially all the power, and I had very little if any input (1), He had most of the power, but was also considerate of what I wanted (2), The power was essentially shared equally (3), I had most of the power, but was also considerate of what he wanted (4), I had essentially all the power, and I almost always got what I wanted (5).

Some people would describe your relationship as "child sexual abuse." Do you agree that it was?
Not at all(1), A little(2), Some(3), A lot(4), Completely(5).

What was the overall effect of this principal relationship on you as a person?
Very negative(1), Somewhat negative(2), Neither positive nor negative(3), Somewhat positive(4), Very positive(5).

To what extent do you feel your principal relationship influenced or altered your adult sexual orientation?
Not at all(1), A little(2), Some(3), A lot(4), A whole lot(5).

Looking back at your decision to consent to and/or initiate sexual activity with this principal male, to what degree do you feel that decision was valid and correct?
I objected and did not consent in any way (0), I was passive, and neither objected nor consented (1), It was a bad decision and I wish I had decided otherwise (2), It was at best a reasonable decision considering the limited information I had at that time(3), It was a good decision, but I could have used more information (4), It was a good decision, and I feel that I had sufficient information to make it (5), It was a good, valid, and correct decision based on adequate information, and I have no misgivings about having made it (6).

To what extent was there interference with your principal relationship by parents or other adults?
There was no interference at all (1), There was minimal interference(2), There was some interference(3), There was considerable interference(4), There was excessive interference(5).

What was the effect of this interference?
There was no interference (1), It had minimal effect(2), It had some effect(3), It had considerable effect(4), It broke up the relationship(5).

If there was an investigation, what happened to this principal older male?
There was no investigation (1), Nothing (2), He was questioned but not arrested (3), He was arrested but subsequently released without going to trial (4), He was tried but acquitted (5), He was convicted but not sent to prison (6), He was sent to prison (7).