

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

Bruce Rind¹  · Max Welter¹

Received: 23 August 2015 / Revised: 6 January 2016 / Accepted: 12 February 2016 / Published online: 13 May 2016
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2016

Abstract Rind and Welter (2014) examined first postpubertal coitus using the Kinsey sample, finding that reactions were just as positive, and no more negative, among minors with adults compared to minors with peers and adults with adults. In the present study, we examined first postpubertal male same-sex sexual experiences in the Kinsey same-sex sample (i.e., participants mostly with extensive postpubertal same-sex behavior), comparing reactions across the same age categories. These data were collected between 1938 and 1961 (*M* year: 1946). Minors under age 18 years with adults (*M* ages: 14.0 and 30.5, respectively) reacted positively (i.e., enjoyed the experience “much”) often (70 %) and emotionally negatively (e.g., fear, disgust, shame, regret) infrequently (16 %). These rates were the same as adults with adults (*M* ages: 21.2 and 25.9, respectively): 68 and 16 %, respectively. Minors with peers (*M* ages: 13.3 and 13.8, respectively) reacted positively significantly more often (82 %) and negatively nominally less often (9 %). Minors with adults reacted positively to intercourse (oral, anal) just as often (69 %) as to outercourse (body contact, masturbation, femoral) (72 %) and reacted emotionally negatively significantly less often (9 vs. 25 %, respectively). For younger minors (≤ 14) with adults aged 5–19 years older, reactions were just as positive (83 %) as for minors with peers within 1 year of age (84 %) and no more emotionally negative (11 vs. 7 %, respectively). Results are discussed in relation to findings regarding first coitus in the Kinsey sample and to the cultural context particular to Kinsey’s time.

Keywords Same-sex sexual experiences · First postpubertal sex · Sexual orientation

Introduction

Among males who have postpubertal same-sex sexual experiences (i.e., at any point after having entered puberty), how do they react to the first such experience? How are these reactions affected by their age and their partner’s age? On the heterosexual side, these are questions that Rind and Welter (2014) recently addressed regarding first postpubertal coitus (henceforth referred to as “first coitus”). They noted that first coitus is often viewed in our culture as a landmark event, one of “immense social and personal significance” (Hawes, Wellings, & Stephenson, 2010, p. 137), which “has a special power to shape future sexual and nonsexual adjustment” (Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994, p. 321). Parallel characterizations likely also apply to first postpubertal same-sex sexual encounters, making their investigation a valuable endeavor within sexology. In this study, we analyzed data from a large and important data set on males’ reactions to their first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of their age at the time of the experience, their partner’s age, and other relevant characteristics. In particular, following the Rind and Welter study, we focused on how reactions compared in minor–adult versus minor–peer and adult–adult pairings—by “minor” is meant a person under age 18 years.

Rind and Welter (2014) noted that lay, legal, and psychiatric opinion generally assumes that minor–adult sex is intrinsically traumatic or at least aversive, which implies that it should be experienced substantially worse than age-concordant sex, especially that between adults. They tested this implication with regard to first coitus using the Kinsey data, which permitted direct comparisons between minor–adult, minor–peer, and adult–adult participant–partner age pairings—notably, it is rare if not unique in research on reactions to minor–adult sex to have such meaningful comparison groups to put the reactions into perspective. In contradiction to widespread assumptions, they found that minor–

✉ Bruce Rind
brind1998@gmail.com

¹ Leipzig, Germany

adult first coitus was generally experienced just as positively, and no more negatively, than adult–adult first coitus. Of particular note, they found that pubescent boys aged 14 and under having first coitus with women enjoyed the experience “much” (the top scale value on this measure) at the highest rate among all groups (63 %), which was substantially higher than adult men with peer-aged women (44 %).

The present study aimed to replicate and extend Rind and Welter (2014). We also used the Kinsey data and compared reactions based on the same participant–partner age pairings. Here, we focused on reactions to first postpubertal male same-sex sexual experiences. We examined them in terms of several characteristics of the sexual events (e.g., initiative, type of sex) and explored in greater depth minors’ reactions as a function of their exact age and partner age difference.

Notably, Kinsey and his team generally did not ask interviewees detailed questions about their postpubertal same-sex sexual behavior, unless they determined that a given interviewee had much of it. Such interviewees constitute what the Kinsey researchers have referred to as the “homosexual sample” (Gebhard & Johnson, 1979; Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948). As this is the sample examined in the present study, it will be useful to briefly consider the recent literature on male minors’ reactions to minor–adult sex in other non-clinical, non-legal samples consisting of participants with postpubertal same-sex sexual experiences or attractions (henceforth referred to as “same-sex samples”).¹ This literature includes, in chronological order: Rind (2001); Dolezal and Carballo-Diéguez (2002); Stanley, Bartholomew, and Oram (2004); Arreola, Neilands, Pollack, Paul, and Catania (2008); Carballo-Diéguez, Balan, Dolezal, and Mello (2012); and Dolezal et al. (2014).

These samples varied in composition from exclusively gay/bisexual to a mix with sizable minorities of heterosexual participants. What made them “same-sex” was that, if participants did not identify as gay/bisexual, then at least they reported engaging in a fair amount of postpubertal same-sex sexual behavior. Across them, from a third to three-quarters of participants, who had same-sex sexual relations as minors with an adult, reacted positively. These reactions were related to participants’ ages and sexual development at time of experience. In general, younger prepubertal boys sometimes reacted positively, peripubertal boys reacted positively more often, and postpubertal boys reacted positively quite often. Furthermore, self-perceptions of willingness in participating and of not being a victim increased across these developmental levels. Non-negative reactions, along with a perception of having willingly participated and not being victimized, were associated with normal psychological adjustment.

The authors of these studies emphasized how different their results were from research based on female victims, which has structured and dominated professional, legal, and lay views on the nature and effects of all forms of minor–adult sex since the late 1970s (Jenkins, 1998, 2006; Lancaster, 2011; Rind, Tro-movitch, & Bauserman, 1998, 2001). In this thinking, all such relations, irrespective of circumstances, are seen as intrinsically traumatic and harmful in the long-term. The authors studying the same-sex samples, based on their empirical results, explicitly rejected this view as applied to their study population (i.e., males who engage in much postpubertal same-sex sexual behavior or are same-sex attracted), and they emphasized the importance for predictive validity regarding outcome or long-term correlates of taking into account characteristics of the sexual experience along with self-perceptions and reactions by the minor.

In two of the studies, the authors argued that, in addition to characteristics of the experience and reactions to it, culture needs to be taken into account (Carballo-Diéguez et al., 2012; Dolezal et al., 2014). In their study on male minor (age < 13)–adult sex in a Brazilian same-sex sample (*M* ages: 9 and 19, respectively), Carballo-Diéguez et al. found that positive reactions were nearly doubled (55 %), negative reactions more than halved (14 %), and perceptions of being abused halved (29 %) compared to responses in their U.S. Latino same-sex sample (*M* ages: 8.5 and 17.5, respectively), where only 32 % saw their experience as positive, while 34 % saw it as negative and 59 % considered themselves to have been abused (Dolezal & Carballo-Diéguez, 2002). In comparing the two sets of results, Carballo-Diéguez et al. argued that a culture’s sexual discourse can strongly influence perceptions, responses, and outcomes. The sexual abuse discourse dominant in modern-day North America and Europe plays relatively little role in Brazil, they noted, where instead certain cultural traditions and ideologies make room for same-sex sexual initiation by an older male as more of a normative event (Parker, 1991). They attributed the sizably different results in these two samples to cultural discursive influence on participants’ interpretation of their experiences.

Current Study

The Kinsey male same-sex sample with regard to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience permitted analysis based on various age groupings (e.g., minor–adult, adult–adult) and on the factors just discussed. It contained data on reactions (i.e., degree of enjoyment, emotionally negative responses), as well as characteristics of the experience (e.g., self-perceived consent, type of sex), which could moderate these reactions. This sample also included a cultural dimension, in that the participants grew up and lived their entire lives in an era with cultural discourses about sexuality quite different from now. On the one hand, these discourses lacked the child sexual abuse (CSA) framework that dominates current thinking and presumably influences current

¹ We used the term “same-sex sample” rather than “homosexual sample” to avoid the implication in the latter term that all participants were gay, when this was not so in these samples, including Kinsey’s (see the text for details).

self-perceptions, reactions, and outcomes. On the other hand, same-sex sexual behavior was conceptualized differently at that time in ways that could impact responses (Boag, 2003; Chauncey, 1994).

Several competing perspectives predict different patterns of reactions by participants to their first postpubertal same-sex experience. The first of these is the CSA paradigm, which dominates present-day clinical, legal, and lay thinking. It evolved from sexual victimology in the late 1970s and early 1980s, has often been ideologically rather than empirically driven, and has promoted extreme conclusions (Clancy, 2009; Jenkins, 1998, 2006; Rind et al., 2001). Nevertheless, it is the dominant paradigm and highly influential, so evaluating it with the Kinsey data is appropriate and useful. The second perspective is based on the empirical results just reviewed on postpubertal first coitus and same-sex sexual experiences, results that are particularly relevant to the analysis to come. Importantly, the second perspective, as reflected in these studies, does not view abuse as a property of minor–adult sex, which distinguishes it from mainstream psychology, which does.² This mainstream view constitutes the third perspective. It is generally more empirically informed and scientifically oriented than the first perspective (CSA paradigm) but still assumes inherent problematicity in minor–adult sex. Predictions from these competing perspectives follow:

Perspective 1 (CSA paradigm): First postpubertal minor–adult same-sex sexual experiences should rarely be positive and usually be negative. Further, these age-discrepant experiences, compared to age-concordant experiences (e.g., between adults), should be much less positive and much more negative.

Perspective 2 (relevant empirical): From the Kinsey first coitus results and the postpubertal data in the same-sex samples, these experiences should often be positive and not often be negative. Further, drawing from the first coitus results, it might be expected that minors with adults would react comparably with age-concordant pairs (e.g., adults with adults).

Perspective 3 (mainstream psychology): The pattern of results should be intermediate between those predicted in Perspectives 1 and 2. Positive and negative reactions should both occur at non-trivial rates but not dominantly, and the pattern of reactions in minor–adult contacts should be significantly inferior to age-concordant contacts.

Method

Participants

The same-sex sample used here was drawn from the original (i.e., non-delinquent) Kinsey sample of $n = 6621$ males. It consisted

of $n = 1094$ participants, for whom data on age at first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience and partner's age were recorded. Most of these participants had extensive same-sex sexual experience (79.4 %), defined by Kinsey as at least 21 different male partners and/or 51 times after having entered puberty. A minority had more than incidental same-sex sexual experience (19.0 %), defined as 5–20 male partners and/or 21–50 times. A few had only incidental same-sex sexual experience (1.6 %), defined as 2–4 male partners and/or 6–20 times.

Kinsey heterosexual-homosexual scores according to the participants (i.e., Kinsey self-ratings), which could range from “00” (*exclusively heterosexual*) to “60” (*exclusively homosexual*), with 5-point increments in between, were recorded for only a quarter of the same-sex sample.³ Among these participants, 22.7 % had Kinsey self-ratings from 00 to 15 (i.e., mostly heterosexual), 19.5 % from 20 to 40 (i.e., generally bisexual), and 57.8 % from 45 to 60 (i.e., mostly homosexual). To facilitate analyses later, a proxy was sought, for which data were recorded for the entire same-sex sample. “Sexual arousal: seeing females” and “sexual arousal: seeing males” were used (with scale values: 1 = *none*, 2 = *little*, 3 = *some*, 4 = *much*).⁴ Among participants also having Kinsey self-ratings, the correlations between these ratings and the arousal variables were in the expected direction. Participants had lower Kinsey self-ratings (i.e., more heterosexually oriented) the more they were aroused seeing females, $r(280) = -.52, p < .001$, but higher Kinsey self-ratings (i.e., more homosexually oriented) the more they were aroused seeing males, $r(279) = .61, p < .001$. After dichotomizing each of these variables (i.e., no arousal versus any degree of arousal) and then cross-tabulating them, 27.1 % were sexually aroused only when seeing females, 26.0 % when seeing males or females, 33.8 % only when seeing males, and 13.1 % were not aroused seeing either. Thus, the Kinsey male same-sex sample was mixed in terms of dominant sexual attractions, but with a majority that was 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 1938 and 1961, although most interviews (81.3 %) were conducted by 1948, when Kinsey et al. (1948) published their volume on male sexual behavior. The mean age of participants at time of interview was 28.64 ($SD = 10.43$), with a range from 13 to 76—minors under age 18 comprised 7.1 % of interviewees. Participants were born on average in 1918 ($SD = 10.18$), with

³ The traditional Kinsey heterosexual-homosexual scale is that 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 data set used for the current analysis.

⁴ 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.

² For example, 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.

8.7 % born before 1900, 13 % between 1900 and 1909, 28.9 % between 1910 and 1919, 46.8 % from 1920 to 1929, and 5.2 % from 1930 to 1939. Participants' mean age of puberty was 12.72 ($SD = 1.33$), with ages ranging from 8 to 18. Most participants were White (91.7 %), followed by Black (7.6 %), and then small numbers of Hispanics, Asians, and others (0.7 %). Protestants were the largest group (68.6 %), followed by Catholics (17.6 %), Jews (11.3 %), and then others such as Muslims or Greek Orthodox (0.8 %).

Measures

The Kinsey interview schedule contains the measures used in the present study and is described by Albright (2006) in the edited work *The Kinsey Interview Kit: Code Book*. This book contains the complete set of questions and their response/coding options for the computerized data available from the Kinsey Institute. The key measures used in the present study (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. Seven basic reasons were coded: (1) fear, upset, shocked, alarmed; (2) disgust; (3) pain; (4) novelty, strangeness, surprise, curious; (5) guilty, regret, shame, embarrassed; (6) drunk; and (7) other. For present purposes, the goal was to assess whether a participant had an *emotionally* negative reaction. Such reactions are currently widely assumed by the lay public, professionals, and the law to dominate minors' responses to sex with older persons, so assessing their presence in the Kinsey same-sex sample directly tests this assumption. If a participant endorsed either Item 1, 2, or 5 (e.g., fear, disgust, or guilt), he was scored a “1” for emotionally negative reactions, otherwise a “0.”

Initiative

Another item assessed who initiated the experience. Response options were the participant, the partner, mutual, participant was forced, or participant forced partner. In the present analysis, these categories were collapsed in two ways. In one, three categories were created for initiative: (1) participant or mutual; (2) partner; (3) participant was forced—no participant

indicated that he forced his partner. In the other, two categories were created: (1) participant was forced or (2) he was not. Analyses could then assess reactions as a function of whether the participant initiated and whether he was forced.

Relationship to First Partner

A partner's relationship to a participant was assessed, which included these categories: stranger, acquaintance, friend (or companion, roommate, playmate, etc.), relative, person in charge of participant to some degree (e.g., teacher), male same-sex prostitute, client, or person whom participant was in charge of to some degree. If a partner was a male same-sex prostitute, then the participant paid the partner for sex. If a partner was a client, then the participant was paid by the partner for sex.

Technique of First Contact

Another item assessed the type of sex (i.e., technique) that occurred on the first contact, which included whether the technique used was passive, mutual, or active from the participant's perspective. Techniques were ranked according to degree of contact (i.e., invasiveness), with anal intercourse ranked highest, followed by oral sex, masturbation, femoral intercourse, and body contact (e.g., kiss, pet, hug). In the present analysis, the passive–active dimension was ignored and focus centered on whether intercourse (i.e., oral or anal) or “outercourse” (i.e., masturbation, femoral, or body contact) occurred. In CSA research, as well as in popular and legal thinking, the intercourse techniques are generally discussed as substantially more “severe” and thus traumatizing than the outercourse techniques. The present analysis tested this view.

Participant–Partner Relative-Age Categories

Participants were asked their age at first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience and their partner's age.⁵ From this information, three basic participant–partner relative-age categories were constructed⁶: (1) *Minor–peer*: participant was under 18, and

⁵ In providing the partner's age, a participant could give his actual age or say “close” in age or “considerably older.” For participants choosing “considerably older,” we estimated the partner's age as the participant's age plus 10 years. It might be suspected, for example, that among younger adolescents (under age 15) having sexual experiences with adults, their memories or perceptions might often fail them on their partner's age, so that they would often choose “considerably older.” Contrary to this concern, however, more than 95 % of these participants offered an actual value for their partner's age.

⁶ Two other participant–partner relative-age groupings, not considered in the present analysis, were minor–younger minor (participant was under 18 and partner was 5 or more years younger) and adult–minor (participant was at least 18 and partner was 17 or younger and at least 5 years younger than the participant). In practice, these categories numbered relatively few cases—6 for minor–younger minor and 4 for adult–minor.

partner's age was within 4 years; (2) *Minor–adult*: participant was under 18, and partner was at least 5 years older⁷; (3) *Adult–adult*: participant and partner were both at least 18 years old.

For additional finer-graded analyses, the minor–adult and adult–adult categories were each subdivided into two subcategories: (1) *Minor (≤ 14)–adult*: participant was 14 or under, and partner was at least 5 years older⁸; (2) *Minor (15–17)–adult*: participant was 15–17, and partner was at least 5 years older; (3) *Adult–peer adult*: both participant and partner were adults (at least 18), and partner was within 4 years of participant's age⁹; (4) *Adult–older adult*: both participant and partner were adults (at least 18), and participant was at least 5 years younger than partner.

Procedure

After selecting relevant variables from *The Kinsey Interview Kit: Code Book* (Albright, 2006), we wrote the SPSS code needed to conduct the analyses relevant to the issues discussed above. We then obtained permission from the Kinsey Institute for running the study and submitted the code to the institute's programmer, who then ran it.

Statistical Analyses of Reaction Data

In the statistical analyses that follow, 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 (r s) 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 r s = .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 (2-sided) were performed using SPSS for 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, 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”).

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 tests age-discrepancy versus age-concordance following common classification approaches. Second, comparisons were made among the finer-graded groups, permitting examination of the assumption of greater trauma or negativity for younger and more immature adolescents compared to older and more mature ones involved in minor–adult same-sex sexual interactions.

Results

Three Basic Participant–Partner Relative-Age Groups

The numbers of participants in the minor–peer, minor–adult, and adult–adult groups were, respectively, 743, 189, and 152. That is, 68 % of cases of first male postpubertal same-sex sexual experience occurred between boys under 18 and peers, 17 % between boys under 18 and adults, and 14 % between adults and adults. Mean ages of participants and partners, respectively, in the minor–peer group were 13.33 ($SD = 1.50$) and 13.78 ($SD = 1.94$); in the minor–adult group were 14.02 ($SD = 1.98$) and 30.47 ($SD = 11.18$); and in the adult–adult group were 21.17 ($SD = 4.84$) and 25.91 ($SD = 8.11$).

Enjoyment

Mean enjoyment in first postpubertal same-sex sexual experiences differed significantly across the participant–partner age groups, $F(2, 610) = 7.95, p < .001$ (see Table 1). In the post hoc test, minors who had their first experience with peers enjoyed it significantly more than minors with adults or adults with adults, although the effect sizes of difference were small. Minors with adults enjoyed the experience as much as adults with adults.

“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. For readability, enjoying the first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience “much” is discussed henceforth in the text as enjoying it “a great deal” or as a “positive” reaction. Table 2 shows the proportions enjoying the experience a great deal in the three participant–partner groups. Responses differed significantly across groups, $\chi^2(2) = 13.57, p = .001$. Minors with peers enjoyed it a great deal at the highest rate (82 %), which was significantly

⁷ 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, more than 95 % of older partners were adults aged 18 or above, justifying the “minor–adult” label.

⁸ “Adult” rather than “older person” as partner was justified, because almost all older partners were adults aged 18 or above (92.2 %).

⁹ An *adult–younger adult* category was not included because of too few cases ($n = 10$), with even fewer cases answering the key measures on reactions ($n = 5$).

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

	Minor–peer	Minor–adult	Adult–adult
<i>M</i>	3.67 _a	3.39 _b	3.35 _b
<i>SD</i>	0.78	1.04	1.06
<i>n</i>	377	122	114
<i>r</i>	Minor–peer	0.13	0.15
	Minor–adult		0.02

Enjoyment measured from 1 = *no* to 4 = *much*. Means with different subscripts are significantly different in Hochberg post hoc test. Correlation effect sizes (*rs*) in bottom 2 rows are positive if row group has a higher mean than column group

Table 2 Percent indicating “much” enjoyment and emotionally negative reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience, in original Kinsey male same-sex sample by three participant–partner age groups

	Much enjoyment		Emotionally negative	
	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>
Minor–peer	82.2 _a	377	9.0 _a	343
Minor–adult	70.5 _b	122	15.7 _a	108
Adult–adult	68.4 _b	114	16.5 _a	97
Total	77.3	613	11.7	548

For much enjoyment, $\chi^2(2) = 13.57, p = .001$. For emotionally negative reactions, $\chi^2(2) = 6.23, p = .04$. Within each analysis, proportions without common subscripts are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted *z*-tests

greater than minors with adults (70 %) and adults with adults (68 %). The last two groups did not differ in their rates.

Emotionally Negative Reactions

Also displayed in Table 2 are proportions of participants in the three groups with emotionally negative reactions to their first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience. Although the groups differed significantly overall, $\chi^2(2) = 6.23, p = .04$, no significant differences emerged in the Bonferroni-adjusted post hoc test. The proportions of emotionally negative reactions were low for all groups, nominally the lowest for minors with peers (9 %). Minors with adults also had a low rate (15.7 %), slightly lower than adults with adults (16.5 %).

Outercourse Versus Intercourse

CSA researchers and popular opinion generally assume that intercourse is more “severe” than outercourse in minor–adult sex and thus more traumatic or aversive (Rind et al., 1998). From this thinking, it would be expected that, in the minor–adult group, positive reactions would be lower and negative reactions

higher among those whose experience involved intercourse. This thinking does not extend to age-concordant sexual interactions, so it would be expected that this pattern will only apply to minors with adults. Tables 3 and 4 show the results.

Contrary to these expectations, as shown in Table 3, minors with adults having intercourse enjoyed the experience a great deal at the same rate (69 %) as those having outercourse (72 %). It was in the other two groups that a reduction occurred (with same effect size), which was significant in the minor–peer group but not the adult–adult group due to a smaller sample size. In minors with peers, the outercourse versus intercourse rate dropped from 84 to 68 %, and in adults with adults, it dropped from 74 to 60 %. Furthermore, as shown in Table 4, minors with adults having intercourse had a significantly lower rate of emotionally negative reactions (9 %) than those having outercourse (25 %), which sharply contradicts conventional expectations. Rate differences in the age-concordant groups were not significant.

Relationship With Partner

Tables 5 and 6 show positive and negative reactions as a function of partners’ relationship with participants, shown separately for each participant–partner group. Notably, the tables also provide the frequencies of the different types of relationships, from which relative frequencies of types can be estimated. Thus, from Table 5 for minors with adults, the following profile of the adult partners emerges: stranger (34 %), friend (25 %), acquaintance (12 %), client (11 %), person in charge of participant to some degree (10 %), and relative (8 %). For minors with adults, no significant differences emerged as a function of relationship in positive (Table 5) or negative reactions (Table 6). In general, however, cell sizes were small given the many categories and findings should be seen as tentative.

Initiative

Table 7 displays the frequency distributions of type of initiative for the 3 participant–partner groups. In a test of independence, the distributions differed significantly from one another, $\chi^2(4) = 23.28, p < .001$. Minors involved with adults initiated the contacts infrequently (9 %), which was significantly less than minors with peers (45 %) or adults with adults (30 %). Analysis of rates of participants being forced, however, revealed no differences across the three groups, $\chi^2(2) = 2.98, p = .23$. Being forced was rare in all groups, although nominally higher in minors with adults (7.5 %) than minors with peers (3.5 %) or adults with adults (1.5 %).

Following some of the other studies of same-sex samples reviewed earlier (e.g., Stanley et al., 2004), we constructed a definition of “abuse” as having an emotionally negative reaction or being forced (not shown in the table). Notably, this is a liberal definition of abuse, because feeling guilty, for example,

Table 3 Percent enjoying “much” their first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of outercourse versus intercourse, in original Kinsey male same-sex sample by three participant–partner age groups

		Outercourse	Intercourse	Total	$\chi^2(1)$	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>
Minor–peer	%	84.5	68.0	82.1	7.88	.01	0.15
	<i>n</i>	296	50	346			
Minor–adult	%	72.3	68.7	70.2	0.18	.67	0.04
	<i>n</i>	47	67	114			
Adult–adult	%	74.5	60.4	68.0	2.35	.13	0.15
	<i>n</i>	55	48	103			

n = number of cases having given type of sex; % = percent of these cases enjoying “much.” Outercourse consisted of non-penetrative contact (body contact, masturbation, femoral intercourse); intercourse was oral or anal sex. The effect size (*r*) is positive if outercourse proportion is higher than intercourse proportion

Table 4 Percent of emotionally negative reactions in first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of outercourse versus intercourse, in original Kinsey male same-sex sample by three participant–partner age groups

		Outercourse	Intercourse	Total	$\chi^2(1)$	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>
Minor–peer	%	9.1	14.3	9.8	1.11	.29	0.06
	<i>n</i>	275	42	317			
Minor–adult	%	25.0	8.8	15.8	4.91	.03	−0.22
	<i>n</i>	44	57	101			
Adult–adult	%	20.4	13.2	17.2	0.79	.37	−0.10
	<i>n</i>	49	38	87			

n = number of cases having given type of sex; % = percent of these cases emotionally negative. Outercourse consisted of non-penetrative contact (body contact, masturbation, femoral intercourse); intercourse was oral or anal sex. The effect size (*r*) is positive if intercourse proportion is higher than outercourse proportion

as Stanley et al. pointed out, may not reflect abuse per se but instead assimilation of socially negative attitudes. Nevertheless, even with this liberal definition, only 18.9 % of minors with adults fit it, not significantly different from adults with adults (17.5 %). The omnibus test was significant, $\chi^2(2) = 8.12$, $p = .017$, in which minors with peers had the lowest rate (9.9 %).¹⁰

Sexual Orientation

It was of interest to examine how participants reacted to their first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience in relation to their sexual orientation. This analysis was done in two stages. First, Kinsey self-ratings were used to divide the participants into mostly heterosexual (scores 0–15), bisexual (scores 20–40), and homosexual (scores 45–60) categories. Proportions of positive (i.e., enjoying “much”) and emotionally negative reactions were then compared separately for minors with peers, minors with adults, and adults with adults. Table 8 shows the results.

The adult–adult results were tentative due to too few heterosexual participants. Positive reactions did not differ by sexual

orientation in the minor–peer group in the omnibus test; however, there was a linear increase in positive reactions from heterosexual to bisexual to homosexual, $\chi^2(1) = 3.94$, $p = .047$. Positive reactions did not vary significantly in the minor–adult group, in which the rate of positive reactions by heterosexual participants was only trivially different from the rate for homosexual participants. Emotionally negative reactions were uniformly low and did not differ as a function of sexual orientation in the minor–peer group. In the minor–adult group, these reactions also did not differ, but notably heterosexual and bisexual participants reported no negative reactions.

Given that only a quarter of the sample had Kinsey self-ratings, a second analysis including all or most participants was performed on reactions. It was based on the variables sexual arousal when seeing females and when seeing males. Here, participants with any degree of sexual arousal when seeing males (i.e., aroused only when seeing males or when seeing either males or females) were compared to participants with no sexual arousal when seeing males (i.e., only aroused when seeing females or not aroused when seeing either females or males). Table 9 shows that rates of positive reactions were not significantly higher when participants were sexually aroused when seeing males compared to when they were not. In the minor–adult group, these rates were, respectively, 72.9 versus 61.5 %, highlighting that, among those not aroused at time of interview by seeing males, a majority of them still enjoyed a great deal their first postpubescent same-sex

¹⁰ Percents in all categories would be higher if the data for being forced were complete, but only marginally higher because rates of force were low.

Table 5 Percent enjoying “much” their first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of relationship with partner, in original Kinsey male same-sex sample by three participant–partner age groups

		Stranger	Acquaintance	Friend, companion	Relative	Person in charge	Prostitute	Client	Total	χ^2	<i>p</i>
Minor–peer	%	100.0 _{ab}	0.0 _b	86.8 _a	72.4 _{ab}			0.0	82.6	18.35	.00
	<i>n</i>	3	2	114	29			1	149		
Minor–adult	%	67.9	90.0	71.4	71.4	62.5		66.7	71.1	2.26	.83
	<i>n</i>	28	10	21	7	8		9	83		
Adult–adult	%	70.6	54.5	70.7	100.0		0.0	100.0	67.1	6.19	.27
	<i>n</i>	17	11	41	1		2	1	73		

n = number of cases having a particular type of relationship; % = percent of these cases that were enjoyed much. *dfs* = 4, 5, and 5, respectively. *p* values are based on exact tests. For minor–peer group, proportions without a common subscript are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted *z*-tests. “Person in charge” included teachers, etc., of participant; “prostitute” meant partner was a prostitute for participant; “client” meant participant was a prostitute for the partner

Table 6 Percent with emotionally negative reactions in their first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of relationship with partner, in original Kinsey male same-sex sample by three participant–partner age groups

		Stranger	Acquaintance	Friend, companion	Relative	Person in charge	Prostitute	Client	Total	χ^2	<i>p</i>
Minor–peer	%	0.0	0.0	10.3	12.5				10.4	.58	1.00
	<i>n</i>	3	1	107	24				135		
Minor–adult	%	19.2	9.1	12.5	28.6	14.3		0.0	15.1	2.81	.76
	<i>n</i>	26	11	16	7	7		6	73		
Adult–adult	%	7.7	30.0	14.7	0.0		50.0	0.0	16.4	4.18	.50
	<i>n</i>	13	10	34	1		2	1	61		

n = number of cases having a particular type of relationship; % = percent of these cases that were enjoyed much. *p* values are based on exact tests. “Person in charge” included teachers, etc., of participant; “prostitute” meant partner was a prostitute for participant; “client” meant participant was a prostitute for the partner

sexual experience as a minor with an adult. In the table, rates of emotionally negative reactions also did not differ significantly. In the minor–adult group, negative reactions were nominally lower among participants not aroused by males (6 %) compared to those who were (18 %). These findings are consistent with the analyses based on the Kinsey self-ratings shown above.

Extent of Postpubertal Same-Sex Sexual Experience

In a related analysis, it was of interest to determine whether participants with more extensive postpubertal same-sex sexual experience enjoyed their initial experience at a higher rate. Table 10 shows that they did not. In the minor–adult group, participants with “more than incidental” and “extensive” experience enjoyed it a great deal at the same rate (70 %).

Five Finer-Graded Participant–Partner Relative-Age Groups

Following the approach used by Rind and Welter (2014), it was next of interest to examine the reactions of younger ver-

sus older adolescents to their first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience with an adult. The numbers of participants in the minor–peer, minor (≤ 14)–adult, minor (15–17)–adult, adult–peer adult, and adult–older adult groups, respectively, were 743, 115, 74, 78, and 64. With respect to the entire same-sex sample ($n = 1094$), 68 % of first postpubertal same-sex sexual experiences occurred between boys under 18 and peer-aged males, 11 % between boys under 15 and men, 7 % between boys 15–17 and men, 7 % between men and peer-aged men, and 6 % between men and older men. Mean ages of participants and partners, respectively, were 13.33 ($SD = 1.50$) and 13.78 ($SD = 1.94$) in the minor–peer group; 12.70 ($SD = 1.24$) and 29.55 ($SD = 12.01$) in the minor (≤ 14)–adult group; 16.07 ($SD = 0.85$) and 31.91 ($SD = 9.65$) in the minor (15–17)–adult group; 20.69 ($SD = 2.97$) and 21.06 ($SD = 3.61$) in the adult–peer adult group; and 19.84 ($SD = 2.15$) and 32.44 ($SD = 7.90$) in the adult–older adult group.

Enjoyment

Mean enjoyment differed significantly among these groups, $F(4, 603) = 5.56, p < .001$ (see Table 11). In the post hoc test,

Table 7 Initiative in first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience, in original Kinsey male same-sex sample by three participant–partner age groups

	Initiative (%)			<i>n</i>
	Participant or mutual	Partner	Partner used force	
Minor–peer	45.1 _a	51.3 _a	3.5 _a	113
Minor–adult	9.4 _b	83.0 _b	7.5 _a	53
Adult–adult	29.9 _a	68.7 _{ab}	1.5 _a	67
Total	32.6	63.5	3.9	233

For test of independence (age grouping by initiative), $\chi^2(4) = 23.28, p < .001$. For partner use of force across 3 age groups, $\chi^2(2) = 2.98, p = .23$. For each category of initiative, proportions (going down a given column) without a common subscript are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted *z*-tests

Table 8 Positive (enjoyed “much”) and emotionally negative reactions as a function of sexual orientation based on Kinsey self-rating scores, in original Kinsey male same-sex sample by three participant–partner age groups

		Sexual orientation			Total	$\chi^2(2)$	p
		Heterosexual	Bisexual	Homosexual			
Positive							
Minor–peer	%	75.0	84.4	89.1	85.0	4.06	.12
	n	36	32	92	160		
Minor–adult	%	62.5	66.7	67.9	66.0	0.13	.92
	n	16	9	28	53		
Adult–adult	%	66.7	80.0	69.6	72.2	0.43	.86
	n	3	10	23	36		
Negative							
Minor–peer	%	3.6	6.9	4.7	4.9	0.37	1.00
	n	28	29	86	143		
Minor–adult	%	0.0	0.0	16.0	9.3	3.18	.29
	n	10	8	25	43		
Adult–adult	%	50.0	0.0	20.0	16.7	3.36	.19
	n	2	8	20	30		

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 specified reaction. *p* values are based on exact tests

minors with peers had a significantly higher mean enjoyment compared to minors 15–17 with adults and adults with older adults, but not compared to minors 14 and under with adults or adults with peer-aged adults. Notably, mean enjoyment was virtually identical in the latter two groups.

“Much” Enjoyment

Table 12 shows comparisons of these five groups with regard to rates of enjoying the experience a great deal. Rates differed significantly across groups, $\chi^2(4) = 19.57, p = .001$. Minors with peers had nominally the highest rate (82 %), but this was not significantly greater than minors 14 and under with adults (76 %) or adults with peer-aged adults (73 %). The other two groups, minors 15–17 with adults (60 %) and adults with older

adults (62 %), had significantly lower rates than minors with peers.

Emotionally Negative Reactions

Table 12 also shows comparisons among the five groups in terms of rates of emotionally negative reactions. Rates differed to a marginally significant degree, $\chi^2(4) = 9.20, p = .056$, but no groups differed pairwise in Bonferroni-adjusted contrasts. The rate of emotionally negative reactions for minors 14 and under with adults was nearly 19 %. For perspective, this rate was slightly lower than adults with older adults (20 %) and was only nominally higher than adults with peer-aged adults (13 %), with a small effect size, $r = .07$. Additionally, positive reactions occurred 4 times as often as negative reactions for minors 14 and under with adults.

Table 9 Positive (enjoyed “much”) and emotionally negative reactions as a function of sexual arousal seeing males, in original Kinsey male same-sex sample by three participant–partner age groups

		Sexual arousal seeing males		Total	$\chi^2(2)$	p	r
		No	Yes				
Positive							
Minor–peer	%	75.8	83.5	82.2	2.09	.15	0.07
	n	62	315	377			
Minor–adult	%	61.5	72.9	70.5	1.27	.26	0.10
	n	26	96	122			
Adult–adult	%	68.8	68.4	68.4	0.00	.98	0.00
	n	16	98	114			
Negative							
Minor–peer	%	7.5	9.3	9.0	0.17	.68	−0.02
	n	53	290	343			
Minor–adult	%	5.6	17.8	15.7	1.69	.19	−0.13
	n	18	90	108			
Adult–adult	%	0.0	18.8	16.5	2.71	.10	−0.17
	n	12	85	97			

n = number of participants in condition; % = proportion of them enjoying “much” or reacting emotionally negatively to their first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience. Sexually aroused “yes” includes *only aroused when seeing males* and *aroused when seeing either males or females*. For positive reactions, the effect size (*r*) is positive if “yes” proportion is higher than “no” proportion; for negative reactions it is positive if “yes” proportion is lower than “no” proportion

Table 10 Percent enjoying “much” their first male postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of extent of postpubertal same-sex sexual behavior, in original Kinsey male same-sex sample by three participant–partner age groups

		Extent of postpubertal same-sex sexual behavior				χ^2	<i>p</i>
		Incidental	More than incidental	Extensive	Total		
Minor–peer	%	71.4	76.7	82.9	82.2	1.31	.52
	<i>n</i>	7	30	340	377		
Minor–adult	%		70.0	70.5	70.5	0.00	.97
	<i>n</i>	0	10	112	122		
Adult–adult	%	80.0	73.3	67.0	68.4	0.56	.75
	<i>n</i>	5	15	94	114		

n = number of cases having a particular extent of postpubertal same-sex sexual behavior; % = percent of these cases enjoying “much” the experience. *Incidental* = 2–4 males and/or 6–20 times; *more than incidental* = 5–20 males and/or 21–50 times; *extensive* = 21+ males and/or 51+ times. *dfs* = 2, 1, and 2, respectively

Minors’ Reactions as a Function of Partner Age Difference

To further explore minors’ reactions, we included all participants whose first experience was as a minor (i.e., minors with peers and minors with adults). Initial analyses showed that enjoying the experience a great deal decreased with greater partner age difference, $r(502) = -.18$, $p < .001$, and that rates of emotionally negative reactions increased with greater age difference, $r(452) = .16$, $p < .001$. To explore these associations in greater detail, we created seven categories of partner age difference, where partners

were: (1) younger by 2 or more years; (2) within 1 year; (3) older by 2–4 years; (4) older by 5–9 years; (5) older by 10–14 years; (6) older by 15–19 years; or (7) older by 20 or more years. The second of these categories is most clearly “age-equal” and can serve as the base category, against which to compare other categories that are age-discrepant to varying degrees. “Minors with adults” was broken into four categories under the assumption that younger adults (e.g., in their 20s or early 30s) might elicit a very different response than older adults (e.g., in their later 40s or 50s). Continuing with the finer-graded analyses just presented, we analyzed reactions separately for younger (≤ 14) and older (15–17) minors

Table 11 Mean enjoyment of first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience, in original Kinsey male same-sex sample by five finer-graded participant–partner age groups

	Minor–peer	Minor (≤ 14)–adult	Minor (15–17)–adult	Adult–peer adult	Adult–older adult
<i>M</i>	3.67 _a	3.48 _{ab}	3.23 _b	3.49 _{ab}	3.16 _b
<i>SD</i>	0.78	1.01	1.09	0.94	1.20
<i>n</i>	377	79	43	59	50
<i>r</i>	Minor–peer	0.08	0.15	0.07	0.18
	Minor (≤ 14)–adult		0.13	−0.01	0.17
	Minor (15–17)–adult			−0.14	0.04
	Adult–peer adult				0.18

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 4 rows are positive if row group has a higher mean than column group

Table 12 Positive and negative reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience, in original Kinsey male same-sex sample by five finer-graded participant–partner age groups

	Positive (enjoyed “much”)		Emotionally negative	
	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>
Minor–peer	82.2 _a	377	9.0 _a	343
Minor (≤ 14)–adult	75.9 _{ab}	79	18.7 _a	75
Minor (15–17)–adult	60.5 _b	43	9.1 _a	33
Adult–peer adult	72.9 _{ab}	59	13.2 _a	53
Adult–older adult	62.0 _b	50	20.5 _a	39
Total	77.3	608	11.6	543

For enjoyed “much,” $\chi^2(4) = 19.57, p = .001$. For emotionally negative reactions, $\chi^2(4) = 9.20, p = .056$. Within each analysis, proportions without a common subscript are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted *z*-tests

at time of experience. Table 13 shows the results for both positive and negative reactions.

“Much” Enjoyment

For adolescents 14 and under at time of experience, positive reactions decreased with greater age difference, $r(368) = -.14, p = .009$. Rates of positive reactions across the seven categories of age difference differed marginally significantly, $\chi^2(6) = 11.44, p = .076$. Notably, the source of the correlation and difference was the most age-discrepant category (partner ≥ 20 years older), where rates of positive reactions fell to slightly more than 50 %. When partners were adults anywhere from 5 to 19 years older, however, rates of positive response made up a sizable majority ($M = 83.3$ %) and were just as high as the base category (minors with age-equal peers, 83.6 %).

For adolescents 15 to 17 at time of experience, rates of positive reactions decreased with greater partner age difference, $r(132) = -.26, p = .002$, and rates also differed across the 7 categories of age discrepancy, $\chi^2(6) = 16.11, p = .013$. Positive reactions clearly predominated when partners were up to 9 years older, but fell to about 50 % on average with partners 10 or more years older.

Compared to the base category of minors with age-equal peers, minors with younger adults aged 5–19 years older had lower rates of positive response (83 vs. 67 %).

Emotionally Negative Reactions

For adolescents 14 and under at time of experience, emotionally negative reactions increased with greater age difference, $r(336) = .21, p < .001$, and rates differed significantly across the 7 categories of age discrepancy, $\chi^2(6) = 25.19, p < .001$. As with positive reactions, the source of the correlation and difference was the most age-discrepant category (partner ≥ 20 years older), in which the rate of negative reactions was 42 %. Notably, the rate of negative reactions was low with adult partners 5–19 years older (10.7 %), which was only nominally higher than the rate of such reactions with age-equal peers (7.4 %).

For adolescents 15–17 at time of experience, emotionally negative reactions were uncorrelated with partner age difference, $r(114) = .05, p = .61$, and rates did not differ across the 7 categories of age discrepancy, $\chi^2(6) = 4.97, p = .55$. Nevertheless, interesting is that rates of emotionally negative reactions were

Table 13 Minors' reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of age difference with partner, in original Kinsey male same-sex sample shown separately for participants 14 and under and 15–17 at the time of the experience

Type of reaction	Age at first experience		Age difference in years (partner age minus participant age)							Total
			≤−2	−1 to 1	2–4	5–9	10–14	15–19	≥20	
Enjoyed much	≤14	%	76.2 _{ab}	83.6 _b	79.4 _{ab}	82.4 _{ab}	83.3 _{ab}	85.7 _{ab}	52.6 _a	80.8
		n	21	207	63	34	12	14	19	370
	15–17	%	100.0 _a	82.8 _a	66.7 _a	75.0 _a	53.3 _a	100.0 _a	46.2 _a	74.6
		n	9	64	18	12	15	3	13	134
Emotionally negative	≤14	%	5.9 _{ab}	7.4 _b	10.3 _b	15.6 _{ab}	9.1 _{ab}	0.0 _{ab}	42.1 _a	10.4
		n	17	188	58	32	11	13	19	338
	15–17	%	0.0 _a	12.1 _a	18.8 _a	10.0 _a	0.0 _a	0.0 _a	22.2 _a	11.2
		n	9	58	16	10	11	3	9	116

n = number of cases in a given age difference; % = percent of these cases with a given reaction. For enjoyed much: for ≤ 14, $\chi^2(6) = 11.44$, $p = .073$ (exact test); for 15–17, $\chi^2(6) = 16.11$, $p = .012$ (exact test). For emotionally negative: for ≤ 14, $\chi^2(6) = 25.19$, $p = .001$ (exact test); for 15–17, $\chi^2(6) = 4.97$, $p = .54$ (exact test). Across rows, proportions without a common subscript are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted *z*-tests

Table 14 Minors' reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of age at experience, in original Kinsey male same-sex sample, shown separately for minor–peer and minor–adult groups

Type of reaction		Age at first male postpubertal same-sex sexual experience							Total
		≤11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
Enjoyed much									
Minor–peer	%	85.3	75.6	90.2	80.9	80.0	82.1	82.4	82.2
	<i>n</i>	34	82	82	89	45	28	17	377
Minor–adult	%	100.0	61.1	80.0	71.4	68.4	50.0	56.3	70.5
	<i>n</i>	13	18	20	28	19	8	16	122
Emotionally negative									
Minor–peer	%	3.2	14.1	3.8	8.6	14.3	8.0	13.3	9.0
	<i>n</i>	31	71	78	81	42	25	15	343
Minor–adult	%	21.4	26.7	15.0	15.4	6.7	16.7	8.3	15.7
	<i>n</i>	14	15	20	26	15	6	12	108

n = number of cases in a given age; % = percent of these cases with a given reaction. For enjoyed much: for minor–peer, $\chi^2(6) = 6.54$, $p = .36$; for minor–adult, $\chi^2(6) = 10.30$, $p = .11$. For emotionally negative: for minor–peer, $\chi^2(6) = 7.82$, $p = .25$; for minor–adult, $\chi^2(6) = 3.13$, $p = .79$

only 4 % with adult partners 5–19 years older, whereas they were 12 % with age-equal peers.

Minors' Reactions as a Function of Their Exact Age

Finally, it was of interest to determine how minors at different ages reacted. Conventional views would assume that older adolescents, being more physically, sexually, and cognitively mature, would react better than younger adolescents. Drawing from the CSA paradigm and popular thinking, it would be further expected that minors with peers would react better than minors with adults. For this analysis, we considered seven age categories, with the first being age 11 and under (to accumulate enough cases), followed by ages 12–17, each as its own category, and we considered reactions separately for

minors with peers and minors with adults. Table 14 shows the results for positive and negative reactions.

"Much" Enjoyment

For minors with peers, age at first experience was uncorrelated with positive reactions, $r(375) = -.00$, $p = .96$, and no differences in rates emerged across the different age categories, $\chi^2(6) = 6.54$, $p = .36$.

For minors with adults, on the other hand, age at first experience was correlated with positive reactions, $r(120) = -.21$, $p = .02$. Reactions were more positive the *younger* the minor was, contrary to conventional expectations. No significant differences emerged in the omnibus chi-square analysis, $\chi^2(6) = 10.30$, $p = .11$, but post hoc inspection revealed that reactions were

predominantly positive at ages 15 and under, whereas they were positive in only about half the cases at ages 16 and 17 (the contrast between the two, 74 versus 54 %, respectively, was significant, $z = 1.96$, $p = .05$). Notable is that 100 % of minors aged 11 and under reacted positively to contacts with adults.

Emotionally Negative Reactions

For minors with peers, age at first experience was uncorrelated with emotionally negative reactions, $r(341) = .04$, $p = .43$, and no differences emerged across the different age categories, $\chi^2(6) = 7.82$, $p = .25$.

For minors with adults, age at first experience was also uncorrelated with emotionally negative reactions, $r(106) = -.12$, $p = .20$, and no significant differences emerged in the omnibus chi-square analysis, $\chi^2(6) = 3.13$, $p = .79$. But in post hoc inspection, reactions were nominally more negative under age 13 (24 %) compared to ages 13 and above (13 %)—the contrast was not significant, $z = 1.45$, $p = .15$.

Discussion

Results of the present study replicate Rind and Welter (2014). That study employed the full non-delinquent Kinsey sample and found that, in response to first postpubertal coitus, minors with adults compared to adults with adults reacted just as positively and no more negatively. The present study, focusing on the male same-sex sample taken from the non-delinquent Kinsey sample, found the same relationship regarding reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience: boys with men compared to men with men reacted just as positively and no more negatively. Notably, in both studies, reactions of pubescent boys (aged ≤ 14) to sexual contacts with adults were especially positive and not inferior to reactions of adults with peer-aged adults.

These results sharply contradict the CSA paradigm (i.e., Perspective 1). In this perspective, repeatedly presented and promoted in sexual victimological writings, the mainstream media, and legal proceedings, minor–adult sex is seen as traumatic *by nature* (Clancy, 2009; Jenkins, 1998, 2006; Rind et al., 1998, 2001), which implies that few individuals having this experience should perceive it as positive, most should respond emotionally negatively, and reactions should be distinctly worse compared to age-concordant pairings in any sample. The sizable contradiction from the Kinsey sample, however, provides yet another key empirical demonstration challenging the scientific validity of this paradigm. This demonstration is important because the CSA paradigm is monopolistic outside scientific circles.

The present findings were consistent with previous empirical research relevant to adolescent boys sexually involved with adults of the gender generally matching the boys' sexual orientation (i.e., Perspective 2) (Rind, 2004). The present study adds significantly to the research focusing on same-sex sexual experiences in

same-sex samples by providing the largest number of cases to date specifically involving postpubertal boys' reactions to minor–adult same-sex sexual contacts. It also adds significantly by presenting comparative data (i.e., reactions to age-concordant relations).

Present results were inconsistent with mainstream psychology (i.e., Perspective 3), which assumes that minor–adult sex is abusive per se and must therefore produce problematic responses. No evidence for problematicity appeared in the data, but arguably at least some evidence should have, if such relations are inherently troublesome for the individual, rather than just being a social problem.

It could be argued that positive reactions or a lack of negative reactions do not preclude the possibility that such experiences are nevertheless traumatic and harm-producing (e.g., Hines & Finkelhor, 2007). Notably, when discussing harm, it is important to distinguish between primary and secondary forms (Baumann, 1983; Rind & Yuill, 2012). Primary harm is trauma or long-term impairment caused directly by the sexual experience. Secondary harm comes from other sources such as reactions by others, social disapproval, or legal interventions, which can be nocebogenic or iatrogenic.¹¹ Against the argument concerning primary harm, however, are the empirical data in the same-sex studies reviewed earlier, which consistently showed a tight relation between reactions and later adjustment—only negative reactions were associated with later psychological problems. Constantine (1981), in reviewing non-clinical and clinical research, first reported this pattern, which Rind et al. (1998) later confirmed in their meta-analysis.

Notably, if primary harm in reference to minor–adult sex with high rates of positive reactions and low rates of negative reactions is supposed, then what is to be assumed regarding adult–adult sex with the same pattern of reactions? In the latter case, few researchers would suppose primary harm, so it seems unparsimonious to assume it in the former. Arguably, a more fruitful possibility to consider is secondary harm, to which we return later.

The same-sex sample examined here was based on having had extensive postpubertal same-sex sex. It was mixed in terms of sexual orientation, but with a predominance of same-sex-attracted individuals—as was the case in the other studies based on same-sex samples reviewed earlier. In terms of the minor–adult group, the chief focus here, 53 % were mainly same-sex attracted, 15 % mainly bisexual, and 32 % mainly heterosexual (based on Kinsey self-ratings), and 39 % were only aroused by seeing males, 21 % by both males and females, and 23 % only by females (based on arousal scores). Thus, the present findings are useful not just only for understanding how gay men may react to their first postpubertal minor–adult same-

¹¹ Nocebo (*Lat.*, “I will harm”) is the opposite of placebo (*Lat.*, “I will please”). Here, harm comes from negative expectations produced by social beliefs or suggestion rather than from the experience per se. Iatrogenic psychological harm comes from negative expectations induced by an intervention (e.g., psychotherapeutic).

sex sexual experience, but also how heterosexual men may react, who go on to have extensive postpubertal same-sex sex.

Moderator Variables

The present study evaluated reactions to minor–adult same-sex sex in relation to a series of moderator variables, as the other recent studies based on non-clinical same-sex samples have done. This approach proceeds from the understanding in this area of research that men in same-sex samples frequently report positive experiences in addition to negative ones (in contrast to samples of female victims), and so it is valuable to investigate moderators. First, we review some of the key results. Then we discuss culture as a special moderator.

It might be expected that minors' reactions would incrementally worsen with increasing partner age difference, especially when partners were at least 5 years older, the most used age-difference cutoff in this field for defining CSA or minor–adult sex. Such expectations did not hold. For example, the vast majority of younger minors (≤ 14) with adults reacted positively (83.3 %), with only a few reacting negatively (10.7 %), when their adult partners were 5–19 years older, rates that were highly consistent with minors' reactions to contacts with peers within a year of their age (83.6 and 7.4 %, respectively). For minors (≤ 14) with adults, partners 5–19 years older would have been mostly in their 20s or early 30s, when men are generally at the peak of their physical vigor and attractiveness, factors that might be expected to appeal to same-sex attracted youths. It was only with greater age differences (≥ 20 years) where the pattern of reactions worsened. These empirical results challenge the standard 5-year-age-difference marker as meaningful, at least in regard to postpubertal boys in same-sex samples.

Another important moderator was intercourse versus outercourse, where the former is commonly believed to be more disturbing in minor–adult sex (Rind et al., 1998). Contrary to this belief, in the minor–adult relations, rates of positive reactions were just as high in intercourse as outercourse and rates of negative reactions were significantly lower for intercourse. It may be that, in this population, penetrative sex generally follows greater levels of receptivity on the part of the youth (e.g., mediated by greater friendliness or interest), such that it is more intimate than “severe” (as framed in sexual victimology), reducing negative reactions.

Still another important moderator was sexual orientation. Among minors with adults, this was not related to positive or negative reactions. Positive reactions occurred in the majority of cases involving participants mostly heterosexual at time of interview, and emotionally negative reactions were uncommon among them. These findings imply that, among male heterosexuals with extensive postpubertal same-sex sexual experience, sexual contacts with men as postpubertal boys may frequently be positive and generally not disturbing.

Culture as a Moderator

The finding that heterosexually oriented youths had predominantly positive and few negative reactions to their first postpubertal sexual experience with a man needs further examination. It could be that these participants went on to have extensive postpubertal same-sex encounters because the first was positive, motivating repetition. More generally, positive response may have been occasioned by the erotic nature of postpubertal boys in combination with the culture of the time, as explained next (Boag, 2003; Chauncey, 1994; Dennis, 2007; Gebhard, Gagnon, Pomeroy, & Christenson, 1965; Greenberg, 1988; Kinsey et al., 1948; Tindall, 1978).

Gebhard et al. (1965) studied male sex offenders from the delinquent Kinsey sample. One group involved 91 offences against male minors aged 12–15. According to official court records, the boys were *encouraging* in 70 % of the contacts. Gebhard et al. attributed this high rate of receptivity to sexual interests well activated in boys of that age. They argued that such boys are still flexible in terms of sexual outlet and that, given their sexual energies, if they can be persuaded, they exhibit “an intensity of response matching or frequently surpassing that of an adult” (p. 209). This opinion is consistent with Kinsey et al.'s (1948) findings that: (1) boys of this age can be especially sexually active—boys up to age 15 who matured early constituted the most sexually active group in the sample (p. 303); (2) 28 % of boys from onset of adolescence through age 15 had achieved orgasm via a same-sex contact—by age 17 the rate rose to 34 % (pp. 623–625); and (3) the active incidence rate for postpubertal same-sex encounters was highest among younger adolescents up to age 15 (p. 94). In short, in Kinsey's day, sexual interest, sexual activity, and same-sex encounters were familiar to many an adolescent boy.

Various cultural factors likely contributed to this pattern of same-sex encounters and response to it. In the half century prior to World War II, when Kinsey's participants generally were born and grew up, same-sex social interactions played a much greater role in male adolescents' social life compared to today, were more intimate and intense, and were often with significantly older males, not just peers (Dennis, 2007). Temporary all-male societies, consisting of men and adolescent boys, were common in many regions of the U.S. owing to developing industries (e.g., lumber, mining), which depended on transient unattached male workers (Boag, 2003; Chauncey, 1994). Male same-sex sexual behavior was organized differently, structured not as the heterosexual–homosexual binarism that is hegemonic today but more along gender lines (Chauncey, 1994), comporting to the pattern commonly found cross-culturally (Ford & Beach, 1951; Greenberg, 1988; Williams, 1999). In this pattern, masculine males sought sex with non-masculine partners, which could include women, transgendered men, and male youths. Additionally, though reproved by religion and criminalized by the

law (as non-marital heterosexual sex was), male same-sex sex during this era did not threaten a male's identity as it tended to do in the post-war period, so long as he took the masculine role—allowances were made for youths taking the female role (Chauncey, 1994). This pattern is also consistent with that found cross-culturally (Greenberg, 1988; Williams, 1999). These factors combined to produce opportunity for, and a social climate conducive to, male adolescent–adult same-sex sexual relations in various settings (Boag, 2003), generally with non-problematic reactions by the adolescents involved (Chauncey, 1994; Sandfort, 1984; Tindall, 1978). This context, in combination with adolescent boys' general readiness for sex (Gebhard et al., 1965; Kinsey et al., 1948), arguably contributed to the pattern of reactions found among heterosexually oriented youths in the Kinsey same-sex sample.

Concluding Remarks

How do these data from the past help scientific understanding of same-sex sexual behavior between postpubertal boys and men in the present? Since Kinsey's time, other relevant major cultural changes have occurred aside from those just listed. Social attitudes have dramatically shifted, in which same-sex sexual relations between men have increasingly become tolerated, culturally sanctioned, and even esteemed. Such relations between adolescent and adult males, however, have increasingly become more criminalized, pathologized, and scandalized, understood ubiquitously via the CSA discourse of trauma and ruination. These relations are also targeted by the authorities with a vigor and persistence not present in Kinsey's day regarding same-sex relations in general (Jenkins, 2006; Lancaster, 2011). Such an atmosphere is bound to differentially impact reactions to adult–adult versus minor–adult relations, with the latter subject to secondary harm (e.g., via nocebo reactions, iatrogenic effects).¹² The Kinsey data, then, may not predict current or future patterns of reactions, but they do provide a window into how minor–adult relations can be experienced under different cultural conditions, with secondary sources of harm much less pronounced. Only through such perspective can the primary nature of these relations be validly understood.

¹² Rind and Yuill (2012, p. 808 and p. 819) discussed secondary harm, including nocebo reactions and iatrogenic effects, in some detail. This discussion followed presentation of substantial evidence from other cultures and primate species that negative response by immature males to sexual contacts with older males is not inherent. Absent aggravating factors (e.g., force), cultural ideologies that encourage social perceptions of disgust and opprobrium, and a dominant discourse that speaks of abuse, violation, and damage, these relations generally proceed unproblematically. The presence of such ideologies and discourse, even in the absence of aggravating factors, can be nocebogenic, evidenced in the past involving other highly disapproved sexual behaviors (e.g., masturbation, adult same-sex sex, vaginal orgasm). Their presence today regarding all forms of minor–adult sex is an important potential source for secondary harm.

References

- Albright, T. (Ed.). (2006). *The Kinsey interview kit: Code book* (2nd ed.). Bloomington, IN: The Kinsey Institute.
- Arreola, S., Neilands, T., Pollack, L., Paul, J., & Catania, J. (2008). Childhood sexual experiences and adult health sequelae among gay and bisexual men: Defining childhood sexual abuse. *Journal of Sex Research*, 45, 246–252.
- Baurmann, M. C. (1983). *Sexualität, Gewalt und psychische Folgen* [Sexuality, force and psychic consequences]. Wiesbaden: Bundeskriminalamt.
- Boag, P. (2003). *Same-sex affairs: Constructing and controlling homosexuality in the Pacific Northwest*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Carballo-Diéguez, 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.
- Chauncey, G. (1994). *Gay New York: Gender, urban culture, and the making of the gay male world, 1890–1940*. New York: Basic Books.
- 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.
- Constantine, L. L. (1981). The effects of early sexual experiences: A review and synthesis of research. In L. L. Constantine & F. M. Martinson (Eds.), *Children and sex* (pp. 217–244). Boston: Little, Brown.
- Dennis, J. P. (2007). *We boys together: Teenagers in love before girl-craziness*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Dolezal, C., & Carballo-Diéguez, A. (2002). Childhood sexual experiences and the perception of abuse among Latino men who have sex with men. *Journal of Sex Research*, 39, 165–173.
- Dolezal, C., Carballo-Diéguez, 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' role* (4th ed.). London: Sage.
- Ford, C. S., & Beach, F. A. (1951). *Patterns of sexual behavior*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Gebhard, P. H., Gagnon, J. H., Pomeroy, W. B., & Christenson, C. V. (1965). *Sex offenders: An analysis of types*. New York: Harper & Row.
- 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.
- Greenberg, D. (1988). *The construction of homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hawes, Z. C., Wellings, K., & Stephenson, J. (2010). First heterosexual intercourse in the United Kingdom: A review of the literature. *Journal of Sex Research*, 47, 137–152.
- 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.
- 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. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.
- Lancaster, R. N. (2011). *Sex panic and the punitive state*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 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*. IBM Corporation.

- Parker, R. (1991). *Bodies, pleasures and passions: Sexual culture in contemporary Brazil*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Rind, B. (2001). Gay and bisexual adolescent boys' sexual experiences with men: An empirical examination of psychological correlates in a nonclinical sample. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 30, 345–368.
- Rind, B. (2004). An empirical examination of sexual relations between adolescents and adults: They differ from those between children and adults and should be treated separately. *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality*, 16, 55–62.
- 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., & 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.
- Rind, B., & Welter, M. (2014). Enjoyment and emotionally negative reactions in minor-adult versus minor-peer and adult-adult first postpubescent coitus: A secondary analysis of the Kinsey data. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 43, 285–297.
- Rind, B., & Yuill, R. (2012). Hebeophilia as mental disorder? A historical, cross-cultural, sociological, cross-species, non-clinical empirical, and evolutionary review. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 38, 797–829.
- Sandfort, T. G. M. (1984). Sex in pedophilic relationships: An empirical investigation among a nonrepresentative group of boys. *Journal of Sex Research*, 20, 123–142.
- Stanley, J. L., Bartholomew, K., & Oram, D. (2004). Gay and bisexual men's age-discrepant childhood sexual experiences. *Journal of Sex Research*, 41, 381–389.
- Tindall, R. H. (1978). The male adolescent involved with a pederast becomes an adult. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 3, 373–382.
- Williams, C. A. (1999). *Roman homosexuality: Ideologies of masculinity in classical antiquity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Archives of Sexual Behavior is a copyright of Springer, 2016. All Rights Reserved.