

# Reactions to First Postpubertal Female Same-Sex Sexual Experience in the Kinsey Sample: A Comparison of Minors with Peers, Minors with Adults, and Adults with Adults

Bruce Rind<sup>1</sup> 

Received: 20 February 2016 / Revised: 5 August 2016 / Accepted: 26 September 2016 / Published online: 25 October 2016  
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2016

**Abstract** This study examined reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience in the Kinsey female same-sex sample (consisting of females with extensive postpubertal same-sex experience) as a function of participant and partner ages. As such, it complemented the Rind and Welter (2016) study, which examined the same in the Kinsey male same-sex sample. Data were collected by Kinsey interviewers between 1939 and 1961 ( $M$  year = 1947). Girls under 18 ( $M$  age = 14.9), whose sexual experience was with a woman ( $M$  age = 26.3), reacted positively just as often as girls under 18 ( $M$  age = 14.1) with peers ( $M$  age = 15.0) and women ( $M$  age = 22.7) with women ( $M$  age = 26.3). The positive-reaction rates were, respectively, 85, 82, and 79 %. In a finer-graded analysis, younger adolescent girls ( $\leq 14$ ) ( $M$  age = 12.8) with women ( $M$  age = 27.4) had a high positive-reaction rate (91 %), a rate reached by no other group. For women ( $M$  age = 22.2) with same-aged peers ( $M$  age = 22.3), this rate was 86 %. Girls with peers or women had no emotionally negative reactions (e.g., fear, disgust, shame, regret); women with women rarely did. Results contradicted prevailing clinical, legal, and lay beliefs that minor–adult sex is inherently traumatic and would be distinguished as such compared to age-concordant sex. The findings are discussed in terms of the time period in which the sexual experiences occurred.

**Keywords** Kinsey sample · Female same-sex sex · First postpubertal sex · Adolescent–adult sex · Sexual orientation

## Introduction

Documenting reactions to first postpubertal sexual experiences (i.e., occurring after onset of puberty) is valuable, because such experiences may have immense personal and social significance and influentially shape subsequent sexual and non-sexual adjustment (Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994). The present study examined reactions by females to their first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience using a large and important data set. The chief focus was how postpubertal female minors (i.e., adolescents under age 18) reacted to experiences with female adults and how these reactions compared to those of age-concordant female couples.

In contrast to empirical research on sexual experiences between girls and men, boys and women, and boys and men, research on girl–woman experiences is uncommon, with published findings on reactions rare (Hines & Finkelhor, 2007). The lack of data on girl–woman sexual experiences may reflect a naturally occurring infrequency of this behavior. For example, in one study that investigated all four minor–adult gender combinations, very few cases (<5 %) were of the girl–woman type (Okami, 1991). This dearth may also reflect researcher inattention, given that the other three types of minor–adult sex have generally monopolized public concern. Sax and Deckwitz (1992), who edited a special volume of *Paidika* focused mainly on erotic relations between adolescent girls and women, remarked with surprise that, based on their own investigation and that of the other volume contributors, such relations appear to be substantially more common than previously thought.

Cross-cultural research points to a non-trivial potential for adolescent girl–woman relations, which tend to emerge under particular socioeconomic and social structural arrangements (e.g., de Ras, 1992; Gathorne-Hardy, 1978; Gay, 1986; Vicinus, 1985; Wekker, 1992). This research includes settings and populations as diverse as the English boarding schools of the late nineteenth

✉ Bruce Rind  
brind1998@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> Leipzig, Germany

century to the middle of the twentieth century, the female wing of the German Wandervogel scout movement during the decade after World War I, various female societies in southern Africa during the second half of the twentieth century, and African-based Surinam in South America during the same time period. Cross-species research adds depth to the cross-cultural approach by providing analogues that can help make sense of the human form (Bagemihl, 1999). For example, among bonobos, humans' closest primate relative (along with chimpanzees), adolescent–adult female same-sex sexual behavior and relations are commonplace and appear to be functional for the participants, particularly for the adolescents (Idani, 1991).

To examine reactions to first postpubertal female same-sex sexual experiences, the Kinsey sample was used, following Rind and Welter (2016), who used this sample to profile males' reactions to their first postpubertal same-sex experience. In that study, analysis was confined to the male same-sex (i.e., homosexual) subsample from the original (i.e., non-delinquent) sample.<sup>1</sup> This subsample consisted mainly of participants who had had extensive postpubertal same-sex sexual experiences—generally, only these participants were asked detailed questions about their same-sex behavior. Rind and Welter tabulated rates of positive and negative reactions to these experiences as a function of participants' and partners' relative ages. They found, for example, that adolescent boys involved with men reacted positively in the majority of cases, negatively in a small minority of cases, and just as positively, and no more negatively, than men involved with other men.

In the present study, both the original and delinquent female same-sex subsamples were used in order to achieve adequate numbers of cases in the various subgroups under analysis. As in the Rind and Welter (2016) study, positive and negative reactions were examined in relation to various participant–partner age categories. Reactions were also analyzed in relation to a number of moderating variables, as was done in the Rind and Welter study.

It is important to note that the Kinsey sample, even though involving sexual behavior nearly a century old on average, remains a valuable and relevant source of data. The sample size was large and the sampling diverse. “One hundred percent sampling” was employed for a significant portion of the sample, in which all members of a given club, class, organization, and so on were included (often through repeated requests). This approach helped to reduce biases associated with volunteering and using a non-representative sample (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953). Additionally, the Kinsey interviewers came from diverse professional backgrounds (e.g., biology, psychology, anthropology), which added perspective to their

approach and analysis, and they were trained to elicit sensitive sexual information while at the same time avoiding or minimizing biasing influences by maintaining a strictly non-judgmental demeanor (Gebhard & Johnson, 1979). Finally, relevant to the present study, interviewees in the Kinsey sample grew up and lived their lives in a culture that lacked any significant sexual abuse discourse. Such discourse pervades current culture and can have a biasing influence on how sexual behavior sociolegally defined as abuse is experienced and recalled (Carballo-Díéguez, Balan, Dolezal, & Mello, 2012; Dolezal et al., 2014). As such, the Kinsey data offer to profile reactions absent this influence.

It is also important to note that the Kinsey sample has been criticized for its non-representativeness and over-inclusion of various groups with known biases. Rind and Welter (2014), in their study on reactions to first postpubertal coitus in the Kinsey sample, discussed this issue. They noted that Gebhard and Johnson (1979) reanalyzed the Kinsey data after removing the known biases and reached the same basic conclusions as the original sample. That aside, they noted that representativeness is not a requirement for testing a universal assumption—in their study, that minor–adult sex is intrinsically traumatic or aversive. For testing such an assumption, any sample is useful and the Kinsey sample, with its many advantages, is especially useful. All these points apply to the present study.

As noted previously, research from other time periods in Western societies and more recently in non-Western cultures has documented erotic-based relations between adolescent girls and women as a significant pattern of behavior (de Ras, 1992; Gathorne-Hardy, 1978; Gay, 1986; Vicinus, 1985; Wekker, 1992). These relations were occasioned by socioeconomic and social structural conditions that socially isolated adolescent girls from boys and men, while simultaneously making older females important to the girls for their development and successful transition to womanhood. Under these circumstances, passionate relations between the adolescents and adults not infrequently emerged, often initiated by the adolescents. Sexual expression was common in the non-Western cultures just cited, but was more restricted in the Western examples owing to social disapproval, limited opportunities, and risks for the adult. Nonetheless, the relationships were erotically centered and the adolescent girls involved tended to perceive these relations as personally significant and positive. In the special volume of *Paidika* (1992) edited by Sax and Deckwitz, a series of first-hand accounts (in interviews and autobiographical articles) concerning same-sex experiences during the 1960s and 1970s anecdotally conveyed the passion and value that such relations could take on from the adolescent's point of view.

The foregoing profile contrasts sharply with how these relations are widely viewed in clinical, legal, and lay circles in the contemporary West, where all minor–adult sexual interactions are considered abusive, traumatic, and psychologically injurious by nature. Beliefs regarding intrinsic trauma and inevitable damage arose in the late 1970s and gained near-total dominance by the early 1980s in Anglophone countries, based on politics and

<sup>1</sup> Delinquent participants were those convicted of a misdemeanor or felony, who had served or were serving a sentence—these participants were usually interviewed in prison (Gebhard & Johnson, 1979).

discourse rather than systematic empirical demonstration (Clancy, 2009; Jenkins, 1998). Because this thinking (henceforth referred to as the “dominant view”) has been highly influential since it arose (e.g., in directing media presentations, legislative action), testing its validity using appropriate empirical research is valuable.

Notably, scientifically oriented professionals (e.g., in psychology) tend to hold more nuanced views, especially since the Rind, Tromovitch, and Bauserman (1998, 2001) meta-analyses, which influentially challenged the core tenets of the dominant view. But this thinking also holds minor–adult sex to be abusive by definition and therefore harmful at least to some degree.<sup>2</sup> That is, this latter view (henceforth referred to as “mainstream psychological”) also differs substantially from the profile described previously.<sup>3</sup>

From this background, several competing hypotheses emerge for the present study. First, from the dominant view, it would be expected that adolescent girls with women in their first postpubertal same-sex experience should rarely react positively and usually react negatively and that their pattern of reactions should be substantially worse compared to age-concordant experiences. Second, from the mainstream psychological view, more positive and less negative reactions might be expected than in the dominant view, but with a pattern of reactions clearly worse than that of age-concordant experiences. Third, from the perspective presented previously (cross-cultural, cross-species, non-clinical anecdotal), which does not assume abuse and harm by definition, and from Rind and Welter’s (2016) results regarding males’ first postpubertal same-sex experiences, a higher rate of positive reactions, with few negative reactions, is expected, with a pattern of reactions comparable to that of age-concordant experiences. A fourth hypothesis, coming from an earlier analysis of the Kinsey data on reactions to first postpubertal coitus (Rind & Welter, 2014), in which females exhibited low rates of positive along with low rates of negative reactions regardless of participant–partner relative ages, is that females would exhibit a similar pattern for first postpubertal same-sex experience.

## Method

### Participants

The same-sex sample consisted of  $n = 467$  female participants.<sup>4</sup> Of these,  $n = 316$  came from the original sample ( $N = 6337$ ), constituting 5.0 % of that sample, and  $n = 151$  came from the delinquent sample ( $N = 1388$ ), making up 10.9 % of that sample. Most participants (86.4 %) had extensive same-sex sexual experience, defined by Kinsey as at least 21 different female partners and/or 51 times after having entered puberty. A minority (12.7 %) had more than incidental same-sex experience, defined as 5–20 female partners and/or 21–50 times. Less than 1.0 % had only incidental (i.e., 2–4 female partners and/or 6–20 times) or rare same-sex experience (i.e., 1 female partner and/or 1–5 times).

A portion of participants (36.1 %) in the same-sex sample rated their sexual orientation on a scale from “00” (*exclusively heterosexual*) to “60” (*exclusively homosexual*), with five-point increments in between—henceforth referred to as Kinsey self-rating scores.<sup>5</sup> Of these participants, 27.3 % had Kinsey self-ratings from 00 to 15 (i.e., mostly heterosexual), 24.2 % from 20 to 40 (i.e., generally bisexual), and 48.5 % from 45 to 60 (i.e., mostly homosexual). Because only a minority provided Kinsey self-ratings, as in Rind and Welter (2016) two proxy measures were included for sexual orientation, to which most participants responded: “sexually aroused: seeing females” and “sexually aroused: seeing males” (with scale values: 1 = *none*, 2 = *little*, 3 = *some*, 4 = *much*).<sup>6</sup> For participants with Kinsey self-ratings, the correlations between these ratings and the proxy measures were significant in the expected direction. Lower Kinsey self-ratings (i.e., more heterosexually oriented) were associated with more arousal in seeing males,  $r(167) = -.48, p < .001$ , and higher Kinsey self-ratings (i.e., more homosexually oriented) were associated with more arousal in seeing females,  $r(279) = .19, p = .02$ . After dichotomizing these proxies (i.e., no arousal versus any degree of arousal) and then cross-tabulating them, 25.2 % of participants were sexually aroused only when seeing males, 24.1 % when seeing males or females, 26.5 % only when

<sup>2</sup> Foreexample, since 1999, in response to attacks associated with its publishing the Rind et al. (1998) meta-analysis, the American Psychological Association has taken the official position that minor–adult sex is always abusive and harmful.

<sup>3</sup> In clinical–forensic samples and non-clinical–forensic samples alike, the latter being the focus of meta-analyses such as Rind et al. (1998, 2001), cases of sexual relations between girls and women are generally rare or absent. Nevertheless, being minor–adult in structure, such relations are equally assumed in the mental health field and the law to be harmful (e.g., Hines & Finkelhor, 2007), thus being subsumed under the dominant view.

<sup>4</sup> This figure, representing all participants for whom age at first postpubertal same-sex experience and partner’s age were recorded, is only slightly different from Gebhard and Johnson’s (1979) count of  $n = 475$ .

<sup>5</sup> The traditional Kinsey heterosexual–homosexual scale ranges from 0 (*exclusively heterosexual*) to 6 (*exclusively homosexual*), which constitutes researcher-scored values, as opposed to the participant-scored values discussed in the text, with their range from 00 to 60. Traditional Kinsey scores, however, were not available in the computerized dataset used for the current analysis.

<sup>6</sup> In addition to the scale values listed in the text, these variables also had scale values of: 5 = none now, formerly more; 6 = little now, formerly more; 7 = some now, formerly more; and 8 = none plus comment. These responses were recorded here as 1 = none, 2 = little, 3 = some, and 4 = none, respectively.

seeing females, and 24.3 % were not aroused seeing either. Thus, the Kinsey female same-sex sample was mixed in terms of dominant sexual attractions, but with a clear or slight majority, depending on the measure used, being same-sex attracted at least to some degree.

Participants comprising the same-sex sample were interviewed face-to-face by a Kinsey team member between 1939 and 1961, with 89.1 % interviewed by 1950. Participants' mean age at time of interview was 29.09 (SD = 10.61), with a range from 12 to 67—10.5 % of interviewees were minors under age 18. Participants were born on average in 1917 (SD = 10.38), with 8.8 % born before 1900, 16.9 % between 1900 and 1909, 27.8 % between 1910 and 1919, 44.1 % from 1920 to 1929, and 2.4 % from 1930 to 1937. Participants' mean age of puberty was 12.45 (SD = 1.43), with ages ranging from 9 to 18. Most participants were White (75.8 %), followed by Black (23.8 %), and then small numbers of Hispanics, Asians, and others (0.4 %). Protestants were the largest group (73.2 %), followed by Catholics (18.0 %), Jews (7.5 %), and none (1.1 %).

## Measures

The measures employed, the same as in the Rind and Welter (2016) study, were taken from the Kinsey interview schedule contained in Albright's (2006) edited work *The Kinsey Interview Kit: Code Book*, which contains the complete set of questions and response/coding options for the computerized data available from the Kinsey Institute. The key measures used here (with some recoding of categories in certain cases to facilitate analysis, as explained below) are as follows:

### Enjoyment

Positive reactions were assessed based on the question, "Did subject enjoy first homosexual experience," which had these response options: 1 = no; 2 = little; 3 = some; 4 = much.

### Emotionally Negative Reactions

Negative reactions were assessed based on a follow-up question, which asked participants whether they had any reason for not enjoying their experience, regardless of how much enjoyment they indicated in the previous question. Six basic reasons were coded: (1) fearful, upset, shocked; (2) disgusted; (3) painful; (4) novelty, strange, surprise; (5) guilt, regret, shame; and (6) drunk. For present purposes, of interest was to assess whether participants had *emotionally* negative reactions, widely assumed in clinical, legal, and lay circles to characterize minors' response to sexual experiences with older persons. If a participant endorsed either item 1, 2, or 5 (e.g., fearful, disgusted, or guilt), she was counted as having an emotionally negative reaction.

### Initiative

Participants were asked who initiated the experience. Response options were the participant, the partner, mutual, participant was forced, or participant forced partner—no participant indicated the last category. In the present analysis, these categories were collapsed in two ways. In the first, initiative was trichotomized: (1) participant or mutual; (2) partner; (3) participant was forced. In the second, it was dichotomized along the dimension of force: (1) participant was forced or (2) not.

### Relationship to First Partner

A partner's relationship to a participant was recorded as: stranger, acquaintance, friend (or roommate, companion, playmate, etc.), relative, person in charge of participant to some degree (e.g., teacher), partner was homosexual prostitute (i.e., the participant paid her), or partner was a client (i.e., the participant was paid by the partner).

### Technique of First Contact

The most "extensive" sex technique (in Kinsey's terminology) that occurred on the first contact was coded, which could be oral sex, body contact, masturbation, or petting (i.e., non-genital contact, including hug, kiss, breast contact). Coded also was whether the interaction was passive, mutual, or active from the participant's perspective. In the present analysis, the passive–active dimension was ignored. Focus was on whether the technique counted as "intercourse" (i.e., oral sex in this sample) or "outercourse" (i.e., body contact, masturbation, or petting). In clinical, legal, and lay thinking, intercourse is viewed as more "severe" and thus traumatizing, and the present analyses tested this view.

### Participant–Partner Relative-Age Categories

Participants were asked their age at first postpubertal same-sex experience and their partner's age.<sup>7</sup> From this information, following Rind and Welter (2016), three basic participant–partner relative-age categories were constructed:<sup>8</sup> (1) *minor–peer* participant was under 18, and partner's age was within 4 years; (2) *minor–adult* participant was under 18, and partner was at

<sup>7</sup> Age of first partner could be coded as "actual age," "around respondent's age," or "considerably older than respondent." For the last of these, the partner's age was estimated as the participant's age plus 10 years. It might be suspected that for adolescents ( $\leq 14$ ) with adult partners, their memories or perceptions of their partner's age might often fail them, so that "considerably older" would be chosen. Contrary to this concern, actual partner ages were given in more than 95 % of cases.

<sup>8</sup> Minors with minors younger by five or more years ( $n = 1$ ) and adults with minors younger by five or more years ( $n = 1$ ) were also categories but were not analyzed because of too few cases.



least 5 years older;<sup>9</sup> (3) *adult–adult* participant and partner were both at least 18 years old.

For additional finer-graded analyses, the approach used by Rind and Welter (2016) was adopted. The minor–adult category was subdivided into two subcategories: (1) *minor* ( $\leq 14$ )–*adult* participant was 14 or under, and partner was at least 5 years older; (2) *minor* (15–17)–*adult* participant was 15–17, and partner was at least 5 years older. The adult–adult category was also subdivided into two subcategories: (1) *adult–peer adult* both participant and partner were adults (at least 18), and partner was within 4 years of participant’s age; (2) *adult–older adult* both participant and partner were adults (at least 18), and participant was at least 5 years younger than partner.<sup>10</sup>

## Procedure

After selecting relevant variables from *The Kinsey Interview Kit: Code Book* (Albright, 2006), SPSS code for this and related studies was written, permission from the Kinsey Institute for the research was obtained, the code was submitted to the institute’s programmer, and he then ran it.

## Statistical Analyses

In the statistical analyses, three types of significance tests were performed on the reaction data. In one, mean reactions of degree of enjoyment in the different participant–partner age groups were compared via analysis of variance, followed by a Hochberg post hoc test, which is appropriate when sample sizes differ substantially (Field, 2013). Correlation effect sizes (*rs*) were also computed to assess the size of the difference in mean reactions. Following Cohen (1988), these effect sizes were interpreted as small, medium, and large with *rs* = .10, .30, and .50, respectively. In the second, proportions of participants with positive (or negative) reactions were compared across multiple groups via chi-square tests. Exact tests (two-sided), an SPSS procedure appropriate for contingency tables with more than two rows and/or columns, were performed to obtain accurate estimates of *p* values when one or more expected cell frequencies were <5, when probabilities based on chi-square distributions become unreliable (Metha & Patel, 2011). When post hoc pairwise contrasts were performed, Bonferroni-adjusted *z* tests were used. In the third type of significance test, correlational analyses via Pearson’s *r* were used, which were two-tailed. For all tests, *p* values are reported; those  $\leq .05$  are considered to be statistically significant (referred to in the text simply as “significant”).

<sup>9</sup> Technically, the *minor–adult* category is more precisely a *minor–older person* category, because, if the minor was less than 13, the older partner could have been a minor as well. In practice, all older partners in this category were adults aged 18 or above.

<sup>10</sup> An *adult–younger adult* category was not included because of too few cases (*n* = 9), with even fewer cases answering the key measures on reactions (*n* = 4).

Analyses of the reaction data were done in two main stages. First, comparisons were made among the three basic groups (minor–peer, minor–adult, and adult–adult), which is the traditional approach, which permits testing age-discrepancy versus age-concordance. Second, comparisons were made among the finer-graded groups. This permitted examining whether reactions were worse for younger versus older minors involved with adults, which the dominant and mainstream psychological views would predict.

## Results

### Three Basic Participant–Partner Relative-Age Groups

Numbers of participants in the minor–peer, minor–adult, and adult–adult groups, respectively, were 210, 48, and 199, representing 45.8, 10.5, and 43.4 % of first same-sex experiences. Mean ages of participants and partners, respectively, in the minor–peer group were 14.05 (SD = 1.78) and 14.99 (SD = 2.30); in the minor–adult group, 14.94 (SD = 2.10) and 26.33 (SD = 7.82); and in the adult–adult group, 22.70 (SD = 5.13) and 26.26 (SD = 7.54).

### Enjoyment

Enjoyment was analyzed in a 2 (sample: original, delinquent)  $\times$  3 (age group: minor–peer, minor–adult, adult–adult) between-subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA). No main effects emerged for sample,  $F(1, 190) < 1$ , or age group,  $F(2, 190) = 1.15, p > .10$ , and the interaction was also nonsignificant,  $F(2, 190) < 1$ . Table 1 shows the means, collapsed across samples, for the three age groups along with pairwise correlation effect sizes. Across all age groups, participants mostly enjoyed the experience. Between-group differences in terms of effect size were all small, especially between minors with adults and adults with adults.

**Table 1** Mean enjoyment of first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience, in Kinsey female same-sex sample, by three basic participant–partner age groups

	Minor–peer	Minor–adult	Adult–adult
<i>M</i>	3.74	3.62	3.54
<i>SD</i>	0.59	0.94	0.99
<i>n</i>	78	26	92
<i>r</i>			
Minor–peer		0.08	0.14
Minor–adult			0.04

Enjoyment measured from 1 = *no* to 4 = *much*. Means were not significantly different. Correlation effect sizes (*rs*) in bottom two rows are positive if row group has a higher mean than column group

**Table 2** Rates of positive reactions (enjoyed “much”) and emotionally negative reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience, in Kinsey female same-sex sample, by three participant–partner age groups

	Enjoyed “much”		Emotionally negative	
	%	N	%	N
Minor–peer	82.1	78	0.0	64
Minor–adult	84.6	26	0.0	24
Adult–adult	79.3	92	4.8	83
Total	81.1	196	2.3	171

For much enjoyment,  $\chi^2(2) = 0.44$ ,  $p > .10$ . For emotionally negative reactions,  $\chi^2(2) = 4.34$ ,  $p > .10$ . Within each analysis, proportions did not differ significantly

### “Much” Enjoyment

A clear indicator of enjoyment, as well as a conservative measure of positive reactions, was when participants answered “much” (the top scale value) on the enjoyment measure—this response is henceforth discussed as a “positive” reaction. Positive reactions did not differ as a function of age group in the original, delinquent, or combined samples. Table 2, left panel, shows the proportions in the combined sample. Notably, the rate of positive reactions in the minor–adult group was high (85 %) and not less than in the other two groups, contrary to expectations from the dominant view.

### Emotionally Negative Reactions

In separate analyses of the two samples, proportions of participants with emotionally negative reactions did not differ as a function of age group. Hence, the samples were combined, with overall rates of emotionally negative reactions shown in the right-hand panel of Table 2. Here, proportions also did not differ as a function of age group. Notably, minors with peers and minors with adults reported no negative reactions.

In the moderator analyses to follow, only the combined sample is considered and only positive reactions are analyzed, given the comparability of the original and delinquent samples in terms of reactions and the near absence of emotionally negative reactions.

### Outercourse Versus Intercourse

Table 3 shows proportions of participants, by age group, with positive reactions to outercourse and intercourse. Numbers having intercourse were low, so the results should be seen as tentative. Nevertheless, they indicate that intercourse (here, oral sex) was at least as positive as outercourse.

### Relationship to Partner

Table 4 shows rates of positive reactions, by age group, as a function of the partner’s relationship to the participant. In the

**Table 3** Rates of positive reactions (enjoyed “much”) to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of outercourse versus intercourse, in Kinsey female same-sex sample, by three participant–partner age groups

	Outercourse	Intercourse	$\chi^2(1)$	$p$	$r$
Minor–peer					
%	82.6	100.0	1.04	.31	−.12
$n$	69	5			
Minor–adult					
%	83.3	100.0	.39	.53	−.08
$n$	24	2			
Adult–adult					
%	76.0	87.5	.34	.56	−.04
$n$	75	7			

Outercourse consisted of non-penetrative contact (body contact, masturbation, petting); intercourse was oral sex. The effect size ( $r$ ) is positive if outercourse proportion is higher than intercourse proportion

$n$  = number of cases having given type of sex, % = percent of these cases enjoying “much”

analyses, rates of positive reactions differed only in the adult–adult group, although pairwise contrasts were not significant in a post hoc test. The table indicates that contacts with friends and companions were most frequent. For minors with adults, 5 of 8 contacts were with friends or companions, while 3 of 8 were with strangers or persons in charge of them to some degree.

### Initiative

It is often assumed that minors are passive agents in sexual contacts with adults, whereas persons more age-equal exhibit more active agency. This assumption was examined by first combining cases where participants showed agency (i.e., by initiating the contact or getting mutually involved) and then comparing proportions in this category with proportions in the other two categories that occurred (i.e., partner initiated, partner forced participant). Table 5 shows the proportions for each participant–partner age group. The test of independence was significant,  $\chi^2(1) = 10.65$ ,  $p = .02$  (exact test), meaning that the distributions of initiative differed across the three age groups.

Two post hoc contrast analyses were conducted to explore these differences. In the first, minors with adults showed a rate of agency (57.9 %) that was marginally significantly higher than minors with peers and adults with adults combined (36.4 %),  $\chi^2(1) = 3.08$ ,  $p = .08$ . In the second, minors with adults compared to minors with peers and adults with adults combined were not forced significantly more often (5.3 vs. 0.0 %, respectively),  $\chi^2(1) = 5.25$ ,  $p = .16$  (exact test). These results contradict traditional assumptions on agency.

**Table 4** Rates of positive reactions (enjoyed “much”) to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of partner’s relationship to participant, in original Kinsey female same-sex sample, by three participant–partner age groups

	Stranger	Acquaintance	Friend, companion	Relative	Person in charge	Client	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>
Minor–peer								
%		100.0	84.2				.19	1.00
<i>n</i>		1	38					
Minor–adult								
%	100.0		90.0		66.7	0.0	6.22	.23
<i>n</i>	3		10		3	1		
Adult–adult								
%	33.3	50.0	85.2	100.0	0.0	100.0	11.61	.05
<i>n</i>	3	2	54	1	1	3		

“Person in charge” included teachers, etc., of participant; “client” meant participant was paid by partner. chi-squares had *dfs* = 1, 3, and 5, respectively, and *p* values are from exact tests. No pairwise contrasts (via Bonferroni-adjusted *z* tests) were significant

*n* = number of cases having a particular type of relationship, % = percent of these cases that were enjoyed much

**Table 5** Initiative in first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience, in Kinsey female same-sex sample, by three participant–partner age groups

	Initiative (%)			<i>n</i>
	Participant or mutual	Partner	Partner used force	
Minor–peer	47.8	52.2	0.0	23
Minor–adult	57.9	36.8	5.3	19
Adult–adult	32.9	67.1	0.0	76

For test of independence (age group by initiative),  $\chi^2(4) = 10.65$ , *p* = .02 (exact test)

### Sexual Orientation

Next, it was of interest to examine positive reactions in relation to sexual orientation. In a first analysis, the Kinsey self-ratings were used to divide participants into heterosexual (scores 0–15), bisexual (scores 20–40), and homosexual (scores 45–60) groups. Positive-reaction rates across these sexual orientation groups were compared separately for each age group. Table 6 shows these rates and the significance results. Rates of positive reactions did not differ based on sexual orientation (via Kinsey self-ratings) for minors with peers or adults with adults, although they did differ for minors with adults—the bisexual group had a lower rate. Overall, heterosexual participants responded positively on par with homosexual participants.

In a second analysis, a proxy measure for sexual orientation (i.e., sexual arousal when seeing females) was used, for which data were recorded for most participants. In this analysis, participants were divided into those who had at least some sexual arousal when seeing females and those who had no arousal. Proportions of positive reactions in these two groups were compared in separate analyses for each age group. Table 7 shows the proportions and significance results. No differences emerged based on this proxy measure of sexual orientation.

### Five Finer-Graded Participant–Partner Relative-Age Groups

Following Rind and Welter (2016), analysis of finer-graded age groups was conducted to examine how younger minors reacted to sexual contacts with adults, where the dominant and mainstream psychological views would assume greater rates of negative response. Numbers of participants in the four new age subgroups were: *n* = 20, minor (≤14)–adult; *n* = 28, minor (15–17)–adult; *n* = 122, adult–peer adult; and *n* = 68, adult–older adult. Mean ages of participants and partners in these 4 subgroups were, respectively, 12.75 (SD = 1.25) and 27.45 (SD = 10.76), minor (≤14)–adult; 16.50 (SD = 0.69) and 25.54 (SD = 4.82), minor (15–17)–adult; 22.17 (SD = 4.52) and 22.34 (SD = 4.54), adult–peer adult; and 22.31 (SD = 4.11) and 33.28 (SD = 6.60), adult–older adult.

### Enjoyment

In a 2 (sample) × 5 (age group) between-subjects ANOVA, a significant main effect occurred for age group,  $F(4, 182) = 4.07$ , *p* = .003. The main effect for sample was nonsignificant,  $F(1, 182) = 1.97$ , *p* = .16, and the sample × age group interaction was

**Table 6** Rates of positive reactions (enjoyed “much”) as a function of sexual orientation based on Kinsey self-rating scores, in Kinsey female same-sex sample, by three participant–partner age groups

	Sexual orientation			$\chi^2(2)$	<i>p</i>
	Heterosexual	Bisexual	Homosexual		
Minor–peer					
%	69.6	72.7	85.2	1.86	.45
<i>n</i>	23	11	27		
Minor–adult					
%	100.0	50.0	100.0	7.72	.03
<i>n</i>	4	6	9		
Adult–adult					
%	76.9	58.3	84.4	3.36	.16
<i>n</i>	13	12	32		

Heterosexual = Kinsey scores 0–15, bisexual = Kinsey scores 20–40, homosexual = Kinsey scores 45–60

*n* = number of cases in condition having reaction data, % = percent of *n* with positive reactions. *p* values are based on exact tests

**Table 7** Rates of positive reactions (enjoyed “much”) as a function of sexual arousal seeing females, in Kinsey female same-sex sample, by three participant–partner age groups

	Sexual arousal seeing females		$\chi^2(2)$	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>
	No	Yes			
Minor–peer					
%	77.3	83.9	0.48	.52	.06
<i>n</i>	22	56			
Minor–adult					
%	80.0	85.7	0.10	1.00	.04
<i>n</i>	5	21			
Adult–adult					
%	77.8	81.8	0.22	.64	.04
<i>n</i>	36	55			

Sexually aroused “yes” includes *only aroused when seeing females* and *aroused when seeing either males or females*. The effect size (*r*) is positive if “yes” proportion is higher than “no” proportion

*n* = number of participants in condition, % = proportion of them enjoying “much” their first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience

also nonsignificant,  $F(4, 182) = 1.91, p = .11$ . Table 8 shows mean enjoyment, collapsed across sample, for the five age groups, along with pairwise correlation effect sizes. Minors ( $\leq 14$ ) with adults, the group expected in the dominant view to exhibit the least enjoyment, exhibited as much enjoyment as any other group. In terms of significance, a Hochberg post hoc test revealed just one difference: minors with peers enjoyed the experience significantly more than adults with older adults. Based on effect sizes (see lower panel, right-hand column in Table 8), adults with older adults were distinguished to about the same degree in lesser enjoyment compared to all other age groups.

#### “Much” Enjoyment

Table 9, in the left-hand panel, shows rates of positive reactions for the five age groups for both samples combined. These

rates did not differ significantly. Notably, minors ( $\leq 14$ ) with adults reacted positively in 91 % of cases—a very high rate that was not exceeded by any other group.

#### Emotionally Negative Reactions

Table 9, right-hand panel, shows rates of emotionally negative reactions. These rates did not differ significantly. Minors ( $\leq 14$ ) with adults had no emotionally negative reactions, nor did minors with peers or older minors with adults.

In short, regarding younger minors with adults (especially germane for assessing the dominant and mainstream psychological views), the results for degree of enjoyment and rates of positive and negative reactions sharply contradict traditional assumptions.



**Table 8** Mean enjoyment of first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience, in Kinsey female same-sex sample, by five finer-graded participant–partner age groups

	Minor–peer	Minor ( $\leq 14$ )–adult	Minor (15–17)–adult	Adult–peer adult	Adult–older adult
<i>M</i>	3.74 <sub>a</sub>	3.73 <sub>ab</sub>	3.53 <sub>ab</sub>	3.67 <sub>ab</sub>	3.23 <sub>b</sub>
<i>SD</i>	.59	.90	.99	.87	1.19
<i>n</i>	78	11	15	58	30
<i>r</i>					
Minor–peer		0.01	0.11	0.05	0.32
Minor ( $\leq 14$ )–adult			0.14	0.03	0.31
Minor (15–17)–adult				–0.08	0.20
Adult–peer adult					0.29

Enjoyment measured from 1 = *no* to 4 = *much*. Means without a common subscript are significantly different in Hochberg post hoc test. Correlation effect sizes (*rs*) in bottom four rows are positive if row group has a higher mean than column group

**Table 9** Rates of positive and negative reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience, in Kinsey female same-sex sample, by five finer-graded participant–partner age groups

	Enjoyed “much”		Emotionally negative	
	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>
Minor–peer	82.1	78	0.0	64
Minor ( $\leq 14$ )–adult	90.9	11	0.0	10
Minor (15–17)–adult	80.0	15	0.0	14
Adult–peer adult	86.2	58	5.4	56
Adult–older adult	63.3	30	4.3	23
Total	80.7	192	2.4	167

For enjoyed “much,”  $\chi^2(4) = 7.78, p = .10$ . For emotionally negative reactions,  $\chi^2(4) = 4.64, p > .10$

### Minors’ Reactions as a Function of Partner Age Difference

It is commonly assumed that increasing age difference, from a minor’s perspective, is increasingly problematic. If so, it would be expected that positive reactions should systematically decrease and negative reactions systematically increase with increasing age difference. This expected pattern clearly did not obtain for negative reactions, which were absent among minors with both peer and adult partners. In this section, the expected pattern for positive reactions was assessed. All participants were included, who had their first experience as a minor. These participants were divided into two groups, one that had their first experience at age 14 or before, and the other with first experience between ages 15 and 17. Age difference was divided into seven categories, with a difference of not  $>1$  year (i.e.,  $-1$  to  $1$ ) serving as the base category (i.e., age-equal), against which the age-discrepant categories could be compared.

Table 10 shows the proportions of participants reacting positively across the seven categories of age difference, displayed separately for participants 14 or under at time of experience and those 15–17. For participants 14 or under, reactions were consistently positive across age difference categories, and the chi-square

test was nonsignificant. Also, the correlation between age difference and positive reactions was nonsignificant and near zero,  $r(56) = .03, p > .10$ . For participants 15–17, age difference was marginally significantly correlated with positive reactions,  $r(44) = -.26, p = .08$ , and positive reactions differed significantly in a chi-square test, but with an uneven pattern across the age difference categories. That is, positive reactions were reduced compared to the base category when partners were 2–4 and 15–19 years older, but not when they were from 5 to 14 years older.

Returning to younger minors ( $\leq 14$ ), for whom expectations of reduced positive reactions with greater age difference are strongest in traditional thinking, the results obtained are contradictory. Also, the unclear pattern for older minors fails to offer clear support for this thinking.

### Minors’ Reactions as a Function of Their Exact Age

Another common assumption is that younger adolescents, being less physically, sexually, and cognitively mature than older adolescents, experience sexual interactions with more difficulty. If so, it would be expected that reactions should be increasingly less positive and more negative the younger the

**Table 10** Minors' positive reactions (enjoyed "much") to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of age difference with partner, in Kinsey female same-sex sample, shown separately for participants  $\leq 14$  and 15–17 at the time of the experience

Age at first experience	Age difference in years (partner age minus participant age)						
	$\leq -2$	-1 to 1	2–4	5–9	10–14	15–19	$\geq 20$
$\leq 14$							
%	100.0	80.8	85.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	75.0
<i>n</i>	1	26	20	3	3	1	4
15–17							
%	100.0 <sub>a</sub>	94.1 <sub>a</sub>	54.5 <sub>b</sub>	90.0 <sub>a</sub>	100.0 <sub>a</sub>	33.3 <sub>b</sub>	
<i>n</i>	3	17	11	10	2	3	0

For  $\leq 14$ ,  $\chi^2(6) = 2.02$ ,  $p = .96$  (exact test); for 15–17,  $\chi^2(5) = 12.73$ ,  $p = .03$  (exact test). For 15–17 in pairwise contrasts via Bonferroni-adjusted  $z$  tests, proportions with different subscripts are significantly different

$n$  = number of cases in a given age difference, % = percent of these cases with a positive reaction

**Table 11** Minors' positive reactions (enjoyed "much") to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of age at experience, in original Kinsey female same-sex sample, shown separately for minor–peer and minor–adult groups

	Age at first female postpubertal same-sex sexual experience						
	$\leq 11$	12	13	14	15	16	17
Minor–peer							
%	66.7	100.0	84.6	73.7	69.2	90.9	85.7
<i>n</i>	3	12	13	19	13	11	7
Minor–adult							
%	100.0	100.0	100.0	75.0	100.0	66.7	80.0
<i>n</i>	1	1	5	4	2	3	10

For minor–peer,  $\chi^2(6) = 6.17$ ,  $p = .41$  (exact test); for minor–adult,  $\chi^2(6) = 2.83$ ,  $p = .85$  (exact test)

$n$  = number of cases in a given age, % = percent of these cases with a positive reaction

age of the adolescent, particularly if the older partner is an adult.

Negative reactions were rare and so are not analyzed here. Table 11 shows rates of positive reactions separately for minors with peers and minors with adults as a function of age of the minor. Age was divided into seven categories, the first being age 11 and under, and the next six being 12, 13, and so on up to 17. For both age groups (i.e., minors with peers, minors with adults), rates of positive reactions did not vary significantly as a function of age at time of experience in chi-square tests of independence. Notably, for minors with adults, all reactions were positive for the youngest ages ( $\leq 13$ ) and there was a nonsignificant trend for a higher rate of positive reactions with younger ages of the minors,  $r(24) = -.21$ ,  $p > .10$ . In short, the reaction data in this sample contradicted the traditional view that younger minors are likely to have more problematic reactions.

## Discussion

Empirical research on adolescent girls' reactions to sexual experiences with adult females is rare (Hines & Finkelhor, 2007). When conducted, such research has provided data on very few

cases (e.g., Okami, 1991). Anecdotal or case study research has been conducted but has also been uncommon (e.g., Sax & Deckwitz, 1992). The present study addressed this lacuna. It provided reaction data on a sizable number of adolescent girl–woman cases ( $n = 26$ ) involving first postpubertal same-sex sexual experiences. The analysis was considerably strengthened by having meaningful comparison groups, whose participants had the same type of experience (i.e., first postpubertal same-sex) but with age-concordant partners. The data were drawn from the Kinsey female same-sex sample, which consisted of participants who mostly had had extensive same-sex sexual experience after the onset of puberty.

Several competing hypotheses were discussed that predicted distinctly different patterns of reactions for the adolescent–adult contacts. From the dominant view (i.e., dominant in clinical, legal, and lay thinking), mostly negative reactions, especially of an emotional kind, along with very few positive reactions were expected. From the mainstream psychological view, more scientifically informed than the dominant view but also based on the premise that all minor–adult sex is abusive and therefore problematic, more mixed reactions were expected. From the third view, based on a broad perspective (e.g., cross-cultural, cross-species, non-clinical anecdotal), which also includes relevant empirical results from the Rind and Welter (2016) analysis

of first postpubertal same-sex experiences in the Kinsey *male* same-sex sample, a relatively high proportion of positive and low proportion of negative reactions were expected. In a fourth hypothesis, suggested from the analysis of female reactions to first postpubertal coitus in the Kinsey sample (Rind & Welter, 2014), relatively few positive but also few negative reactions were expected.

Results matched the third view, the broad perspective. Most girls with women reacted positively, and none reacted emotionally negatively. Their rate of positive response (85 %) was as high as that of girls with peers (82 %) and women with women (79 %). In a finer-graded analysis, younger adolescent girls aged  $\leq 14$  with women had nominally the highest rate of positive response (91 %), a rate that was slightly higher than that of women with peer-aged partners (86 %). This outcome contradicts traditional thinking, in which the former pairing (i.e., the most “unequal” in the five participant–partner pairings analyzed) would be expected to result in far inferior reactions compared to the latter pairing (i.e., the most “equal” in the set). Also noteworthy along the same lines is that, among adolescent girls with women, the younger they were, the higher their rates of positive reactions tended to be in a nonsignificant trend. Though nonsignificant, the magnitude of this relation was identical to that concerning adolescent boys with men in the Kinsey male same-sex sample, where the relation was significant due to a larger sample size (Rind & Welter, 2016).

Adolescent girls with women frequently showed agency by initiating the contact or mutually getting involved. Their rate of agency was marginally significantly higher than that in the age-concordant groups combined (58 vs. 36 %). This active involvement is strongly at odds with the dominant and mainstream psychological views, which assume invariable victimization by an overpowering adult and do not allow for agency on the part of the adolescent. This relatively high degree of agency, however, is consistent with the cross-cultural reports reviewed earlier, including those on English boarding schools in the late nineteenth (Vicinus, 1985) through the mid-twentieth centuries (Gathorne-Hardy, 1978), the female wing of the German Wandervogel movement in the decade after World War I (de Ras, 1992), certain southern African societies more recently (Gay, 1986), and African-based Surinam in South America (Wekker, 1992). It is also consistent with the detailed anecdotes provided in the special volume of *Paidika* (1992) edited by Sax and Deckwitz, which focused mainly on adolescent girls’ erotic involvements with older females.

The agency evident in the cross-cultural studies was related to particular socioeconomic and social structural arrangements, in which various factors segregated the sexes on the one hand and made adult women a vital resource for female adolescent development and successful transition into womanhood on the other. Under these conditions, the adolescents could show an agency fueled by passion. Notably, the sexual orientation of these adolescents was fluid in general rather than specifically same-sex

directed. The agency evident in the anecdotal accounts from various Western societies was more related to individual characteristics, including needs for a relationship to resolve personal issues and an emerging or already established same-sex erotic orientation. In either case, though, the relationships were functional from the adolescents’ perspective, which helps to account for the adolescents’ generally favorable view of them.

Female adolescent agency in sexual contacts with older females is also evident in bonobos (Bagemihl, 1999; Idani, 1991). In this species, negotiating female–female social relations adequately is essential to individual female adjustment and success. At the start of adolescence, females leave their natal group and migrate to a new group, where they are faced with the task of integrating with other mature females, who initially may be hostile. They typically resolve this issue by actively seeking an adult female “mentor,” who helps them over the period of about a year to ease into and adjust to the new social group. But the basis for this “apprentice-mentor” relationship is sexual, in which the adolescent frequently is the initiator in sexual contacts. This cross-species analogue to the human form can help make sense of it owing to various parallels, including sexual segregation (e.g., the presence of an all-female society), social needs that emerge at adolescence, the usefulness of older females in solving these needs, and sexual behavior as a means to creating the bonds that facilitate this solution. Notably, there are informative parallels, as well, between human “female pederasty” and the male form, which has been extensively documented and discussed (e.g., Rind, 2013).<sup>11</sup>

The dominant view, as noted earlier, evolved largely through political discourse in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Clancy, 2009; Jenkins, 1998). Because it is highly influential, though, empirical testing of it is valuable. The essence of the dominant view is its universal (i.e., nomothetic) assumption of intrinsic abuse, aver-siveness, and harm in all minor–adult sex. These assumptions have been repeatedly disseminated as facts in the mainstream media, which has substantially helped to convince the lay public, the clinical community, and lawmakers (Jenkins, 1998, 2006). The present study, along with two previous analyses of the Kinsey data on first postpubertal sexual experiences (Rind & Welter, 2014, 2016), provides empirical results that substantially challenge the universal aspect of the dominant view’s assumptions. This research also challenges the mainstream psychological view, which, though more scientifically oriented, has a limited perspective. It generally ignores historical, cross-cultural, and cross-species data that could inform its assumption of intrinsic abuse, and it often accepts unrepresentative cases or samples (e.g., child–adult incest) as applicable to the entire population of minor–adult sexual experiences (Rind et al., 1998, 2001).

<sup>11</sup> Pederasty is defined here, and in much of the cross-cultural and historical literature, as an erotic-based relationship between an adolescent and an adult of the same-sex, regardless of whether actual sexual interactions occur.

Hines and Finkelhor (2007) criticized studies such as Okami's (1991), which sought out positive cases, arguing that one cannot draw much inference from them. The Kinsey sample cannot be criticized in this way. The Kinsey researchers sought participants irrespective of positive or negative sexual experiences and included many participants via one hundred percent sampling, which generally precludes any preselection based on nature of experience. Still, positive reactions in adolescent–adult sex to first postpubertal sexual experiences predominated in three of the four participant–partner gender combinations—girl–woman, as presented here, and boy–woman and boy–man, as presented previously. This pattern of positive response is inconsistent with intrinsic trauma. Nor does it lend any support to inherent problematicity.

Finally, an important question concerns the relevance of the findings in the present study on adolescent girls' reactions to sexual experiences with women, based on data many decades old, for understanding the nature of such relations today. In Kinsey's time and before, social, gender, and age-based relations were different and the sexual abuse discourse that pervades present-day thinking and discussions was largely absent (Rind & Welter, 2016). Because reactions to adolescent–adult sex are affected by cultural context, it would not be safe to surmise that the pattern of reactions found in the Kinsey sample would transfer to today—although that is an empirical question. Today, social arrangements and contexts that support intergenerational relations (non-sexual as well as sexual) are sparse compared to the past, and such relations are likely to come under strain if they involve sexual behavior, owing to the prevailing sexual abuse mindset. Under such conditions, adolescent–adult sex is likelier to yield less positive and more negative reactions. What is most important from a scientific view, however, is not what current patterns may be (or should be), but what they can be. The dominant and mainstream psychological views center on negative reactions and outcomes as inherent and inevitable, and this thinking is substantially challenged by the Kinsey data.

### Compliance with Ethical Standards

**Conflict of interest** There were no conflicts of interest, and the research is secondary research on Kinsey data, so informed consent is not an issue.

### References

- Albright, T. (Ed.). (2006). *The Kinsey interview kit: Code book* (2nd ed.). Bloomington, IN: The Kinsey Institute.
- Bagemihl, B. (1999). *Biological exuberance: Animal homosexuality and natural diversity*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Carballo-Díéguez, A., Balan, I., Dolezal, C., & Mello, M. B. (2012). Recalled sexual experiences in childhood with older partners: A study of Brazilian men who have sex with men and male-to-female transgender persons. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 41, 363–376.
- Clancy, S. (2009). *The trauma myth: The truth about the sexual abuse of children—And its aftermath*. New York: Basic Books.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analyses for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- de Ras, M. (1992). The domain of the Wandervogel girls: Pedagogical eros and the utopia of a holy island. *Paidika*, 2(4), 76–82.
- Dolezal, C., Carballo-Díéguez, A., Balán, I., Pando, M. A., Mabruga, M., Marone, R., ... Avila, M. M. (2014). Childhood sexual experiences with an older partner among men who have sex with men in Buenos Aires, Argentina. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 38, 271–279.
- Field, A. P. (2013). *Discovering statistics using SPSS: And sex and drugs and rock 'n' roll* (4th ed.). London: Sage.
- Gathorne-Hardy, J. (1978). *The old school tie: The phenomenon of the English public school*. New York: Viking Press.
- Gay, J. (1986). "Mummies and babies" and friends and lovers in Lesotho. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 11, 97–116.
- Gebhard, P. H., & Johnson, A. B. (1979). *The Kinsey data: Marginal tabulations of the 1938–1963 interviews conducted by the Institute for Sex Research*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.
- Hines, D. A., & Finkelhor, D. (2007). Statutory sex crime relationships between juveniles and adults: A review of social scientific research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12, 300–314.
- Idani, G. (1991). Social relationships between immigrant and resident bonobo (*Pan paniscus*) females at Wamba. *Folia Primatologica*, 57, 83–95.
- Jenkins, P. (1998). *Moral panic: Changing concepts of the child-molester in modern America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Jenkins, P. (2006). *The decade of nightmares: The end of the sixties and the making of eighties America*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Kinsey, A., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E., & Gebhard, P. H. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.
- Laumann, E. O., Gagnon, J. H., Michael, R. T., & Michaels, S. (1994). *The social organization of sexuality: Sexual practices in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Metha, C. R., & Patel, N. R. (2011). *IBM SPSS exact tests*. Armonk, NY: IBM Corporation.
- Okami, P. (1991). Self-reports of "positive" childhood and adolescent sexual contacts with older persons: An exploratory study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 20, 437–457.
- Paidika*. (1992). On an old bicycle: Erotic and sexual relationships between women and minors. In M. Sax & S. Deckwitz (Eds.), *Special women's issue* (Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 1–100). Amsterdam: Author.
- Rind, B. (2013). Pederasty: An integration of empirical, historical, sociological, cross-cultural, cross-species, and evolutionary perspectives. In T. K. Hubbard & B. Verstraete (Eds.), *Censoring sex research: The debate over male intergenerational relations* (pp. 1–90). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Rind, B., Tromovitch, P., & Bauserman, R. (1998). A meta-analytic examination of assumed properties of child sexual abuse using college samples. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 22–53.
- Rind, B., Tromovitch, P., et al. (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.
- Rind, B., & Welter, M. (2014). Enjoyment and emotionally negative reactions in minor–adult versus minor–peer and adult–adult first post-pubescent coitus: A secondary analysis of the Kinsey data. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 43, 285–297.
- Rind, B., & Welter, M. (2016). Reactions to first postpubertal male same-sex sexual experience in the Kinsey sample: A comparison of minors with peers, minors with adults, and adults with adults. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 45, 1771–1786.
- Sax, M., & Deckwitz, S. (1992). When you change the gender, reality changes too. *Paidika*, 2(4), 2–14.
- Vicinus, M. (1985). *Independent women: Work and community for single women 1850–1920*. London: Virago Press.
- Wekker, G. (1992). Girl, it's boobies you're getting, no? *Paidika*, 2(4), 43–48.

Archives of Sexual Behavior is a copyright of Springer, 2017. All Rights Reserved.