



First Postpubertal Same-Sex Sex in Kinsey's General and Prison Male Same-Sex Samples: Comparative Analysis and Testing Common Assumptions in Minor–Adult Contacts

Bruce Rind¹

Received: 15 February 2017 / Revised: 16 September 2017 / Accepted: 14 March 2018
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2018

Abstract

Kinsey's prison male same-sex sample (consisting of prisoners who were gay, bisexual, or had had extensive postpubertal same-sex sex regardless of sexual attractions) was compared with Kinsey's general (i.e., non-prison) same-sex sample (previously analyzed by Rind and Welter, 2016) in terms of reactions to and characteristics of first postpubertal same-sex sex, with a focus on minor–adult contacts. Prison participants had a minor–adult contact as their first postpubertal same-sex sex twice as often as general participants, and their experience involved penetration in three-quarters of cases compared to only half the time for general participants, and it was paid for (i.e., prostitution) three times as often. Despite these differences, reactions to these events by prison and general participants were the same, with combined results of 66% positive reactions (i.e., enjoyed it “much”) versus 15% emotionally negative reactions (e.g., shock, disgust, guilt). Results added to those from a series of studies done since 2000 using male same-sex samples in showing that minor–adult same-sex sexual experiences in this population do not conform to the child sexual abuse (CSA) model of trauma and harm. Comparing prison and general participants also showed that the CSA–trauma–crime link often claimed (i.e., where minor–adult sex is said to produce trauma that leads to later criminal behavior) did not hold in the Kinsey same-sex samples, because trauma (the middle element) was mostly missing. This null result for the link alerts that trauma needs to be shown rather than assumed when considering this link. The positive reaction profile obtained was discussed in terms of cultural factors dominant in Kinsey's time.

Keywords Kinsey prison sample · Male same-sex samples · Adolescent–adult sex · Same-sex sexual experiences · First postpubertal sex · Sexual orientation

Introduction

Same-sex samples consist of participants who are same-sex attracted or bisexual, or who generally have had extensive same-sex sexual experience regardless of their sexual attractions (Rind & Welter, 2016). Since 2000 a series of studies have used male same-sex samples to examine boys' sexual experiences with significantly older males in terms of reactions and outcomes (e.g., Arreola, Neilands, Pollack, Paul, & Catania, 2008; Carballo-Díéguez, Balan, Dolezal, & Mello, 2012; Dolezal & Carballo-Díéguez, 2002; Dolezal et al., 2014; Rind, 2001; Rind & Welter, 2016; Stanley, Bartholomew, & Oram, 2004). A common theme in these studies has been to interrogate

strong assumptions made in the child sexual abuse (CSA) literature, which hold that all sexual experiences between minors and significantly older persons are, by nature, coercive, traumatic, and intensely psychologically harmful (Rind, Tromovitch, & Bauserman, 1998, 2001). Drawing upon much anecdote and previous research, the authors of these studies have argued that the CSA coercion–trauma–harm model does not fit the population of their focus. The argument has been that it is invalid to study female victims in girl–man sex, often unwanted and incestuous, in clinical-forensic samples—the basic approach that has undergirded the CSA model—and then to generalize to the male same-sex population, in which boy–man sexual contacts have been found to be willing in many cases and usually extra-familial. In these studies, the authors generally cited the Rind et al. (1998) meta-analysis as a starting point for the need to draw distinctions between clinical-forensic and general population samples, experiences of girls and those of boys, child and adolescent experiences, and unwanted and willing

✉ Bruce Rind
brind1998@gmail.com

¹ Leipzig, Germany

participation. Across the male same-sex studies, results were that boys were frequently willing participants in sexual experiences with significantly older males, their reactions were positive in a third to three-quarters of the cases, willing encounters were followed by normal adult psychological adjustment, and unwilling encounters were associated with slightly—as opposed to much—poorer later adjustment. In general, willingness and positive reactions increased with increasing maturational level of the boy (i.e., from pre- to postpubertal).

The most recent of these studies was performed by Rind and Welter (2016), who used the male same-sex sample drawn from Kinsey's "original" (i.e., general population) sample to examine reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience—henceforth, this subsample is referred to as the "general" same-sex sample. Participants having this experience as an adolescent with a man reacted positively (i.e., enjoyed the experience "much," the top scale value on the measure of enjoyment) in 70% of cases and reacted emotionally negatively (e.g., shock, disgust, guilt) in just 16% of cases. This pattern was nearly identical to that of adult men having their first same-sex sexual experience with another man (68% positive; 16% negative). The results demonstrated that postpubertal boy–man sex has a clear positive response potential, not unlike that between adult men, in sharp contradiction to the CSA model of intrinsic trauma (cf. Clancy, 2009; Jenkins, 1998).

Consistent with the other same-sex sample studies, which all examined non-clinical, non-forensic samples in following Rind et al.'s (1998) argument that such samples are required to critically test the assumed negative properties of minor–adult sex, Rind and Welter likewise restricted their analysis to Kinsey's general male same-sex sample. Notably, however, the Kinsey interviewers also collected extensive data on "delinquent" (i.e., prison) male participants, many of whom fit into their own same-sex sample (henceforth referred to as the "prison" same-sex sample). In the present study, this Kinsey prison male same-sex sample is analyzed, following the approach used by Rind and Welter (2016) regarding the general same-sex sample.

Current Study

The current study had two main goals. In the first, given that the Kinsey prison male same-sex sample is large (i.e., more than 1000 participants), just as the Kinsey general male same-sex sample was, and participants were asked the same questions, it was of interest to use the prison sample to replicate/extend the general sample regarding characteristics of first postpubertal same-sex sexual experiences. Because the new sample to be analyzed was forensic, unlike the same-sex samples cited above, a different profile in characteristics of the sex and reactions to it might be expected. On the other hand, regarding reactions, these same-sex experiences occurred in a different era, when cultural conditions relevant to same-sex sexual behavior

were quite different. Though same-sex sexual behavior in general was considerably more problematized then, conditions favored its greater occurrence and, in the case of minor–adult contacts, a more favorable response (Rind & Welter, 2016).¹ Therefore, analysis of the prison same-sex sample was undertaken on an exploratory basis, without a clear prediction of a response profile.

Given that participants in the Kinsey general and prison same-sex samples were asked the same detailed set of questions, the opportunity presented itself to pursue a second goal: to test the "CSA–trauma–crime" view often advanced in the criminological literature (e.g., Cuadra, Jaffe, Thomas, & DiLillo, 2014; English, Widom, & Brandford, 2002; Jung, Herrenkohl, Lee, Klika, & Skinner, 2015; Mersky, Topitzes, & Reynolds, 2002; Widom, 1996; Wolff & Shi, 2012). In general, this view holds that minor–adult sex (a.k.a. CSA) is traumatic by nature, which substantially disrupts development, which in turn produces a malformed personality that can lead to increased criminal behavior and thus incarceration. These researchers have postulated, for example, that the trauma from CSA creates negative emotions, which drive later antisocial behavior, with criminal behavior being an instance (Jung et al., 2015). Cuadra et al. (2014) postulated that the negative emotional pattern caused by the trauma from the CSA creates maladaptive thinking, which in turn facilitates later criminal behavior. In short, common to this perspective is the assumption of traumatic reaction as the key starting point. By examining the Kinsey prison same-sex sample, evidence for traumatic reaction in postpubertal boy–man sexual contacts as a significant characteristic can be assessed. Additionally, the general and prison same-sex samples can be compared in their patterns of reactions, where it follows from the CSA–trauma–crime view that, in the prison sample, the postpubertal boy–man response profile should be significantly more negative.

Aside from reactions, consistent with the CSA–trauma–crime view would be that proportionately more prison than general same-sex participants would have had a boy–man first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience (i.e., greater exposure to trauma, the source of later criminal behavior). Additionally, it would be expected that this experience would tend to be more "serious" on average in the prison than general sample. CSA researchers have often claimed that seriousness amplifies trauma, with greater seriousness being considered to include penetrative sex (e.g., oral, anal) as opposed to outercourse (e.g., masturbation) and characteristics such as greater age discrepancy between participant and partner, younger age and lesser maturational level of participant, more problematic status of partner (e.g., a relative, person in charge, or client who pays the participant), and partner use of force (Rind et al., 1998,

¹ For details on these points, see the discussions below later in [Introduction](#) and then in [Discussion](#), as well in Rind and Welter (2016).

2001). Such thinking appears in the criminological literature, where, for example, English et al. (2002) viewed penetrative sex as “high” sexual abuse and touching or masturbation as “medium” sexual abuse, and Widom (1996) viewed paid-for sex as increasing the risk of criminal behavior. The Kinsey data permitted examining these characteristics and relating them to reactions to test whether they have explanatory value in differentiating delinquent versus non-delinquent outcome.

It is important to note that the Kinsey data are old and not nationally representative. As Rind and Welter (2016) argued, however, the fact that the Kinsey data come from a different time is an advantage. In Kinsey’s day, male same-sex behavior was more common, especially adolescent–peer and adolescent–adult, where response tended to be less problematic than today. Some of the reasons are that males were more homosexual (i.e., males of all postpubertal ages spent more time together; females were less accessible, except in marriage), creating greater opportunity for same-sex sexual behavior, while at the same time various key problematizing factors were less pronounced or absent. For example, labeling through the use of the term “gay” was absent, which implies identity and therefore can be threatening to would-be participants, especially if heterosexually oriented (Chauncey, 1994; Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994). Additionally, the “sexual abuse” discourse that pervades culture today, which has had a significant inhibitory and problematizing effect on minor–adult sex, was undeveloped and far less pronounced back then (Rind & Welter, 2016). In other words, using the Kinsey data brings in different cultural dynamics, permitting this behavior to be understood more comprehensively, as opposed to judging its nature based solely on highly constrained current conditions (Carballo-Diéguez et al., 2012; Dolezal et al., 2014).

Regarding unrepresentativeness, the Kinsey sample was nevertheless quite broad, diverse, and large, and a sizable minority of it was based on one-hundred percent sampling (i.e., all members of a club, class, etc., were petitioned until they agreed to participate, which helped to reduce bias) (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948). Additionally, the data were collected in face-to-face interviews by professional researchers from diverse disciplines (e.g., psychology, biology, anthropology), who were skilled at eliciting sensitive sexual information in non-judgmental manner and in minimizing under- and overstatement of sexual events. Moreover, re-analysis of the Kinsey data, performed after removing known biases in sampling, produced essentially the same results, indicating a lack of any significant bias (Gebhard & Johnson, 1979). Thus, even though not from a representative sample, the Kinsey data are valuable in general for examining sexual behavior. They are especially valuable for examining sexual behavior, to which universal propositions regarding its essential nature have been applied (Kinsey et al., 1948), a situation that currently and strongly describes the case of minor–adult sex (Rind et al., 1998). For present purposes, then, the Kinsey data are probative.²

Method

Subjects

Total Sample and Same-Sex Sample Sizes

The male prison sample consisted of $n = 3244$ participants, of whom $n = 1859$ (57.31%) ever had a postpubertal same-sex sexual experience. This proportion was significantly greater than in the entire non-prison male sample, where $n = 2601$ (39.28%) of the $n = 6621$ participants ever had such an experience, $\chi^2(1) = 285.41$, $p < .0001$. In terms of the same-sex samples, where participants mostly had extensive postpubertal same-sex experiences and for whom considerable data were available for analysis (e.g., participant–partner ages and reactions to the first such experience), same-sex sample sizes and proportions of total samples were: prison, $n = 1080$ (33.29%); general, $n = 1094$ (16.52%). These rates were significantly different, $\chi^2(1) = 356.35$, $p < .0001$. Given that only minor–peer, minor–adult, and adult–adult participant–partner contacts were analyzed in the present study,³ the final same-sex sample sizes were: prison, $n = 1061$; general, $n = 1084$. In summary, the same-sex samples were large and almost the same size, but in the prison total sample the proportion of participants qualifying as same-sex sample members was double.

Extensiveness of Postpubertal Same-Sex Sex

The great majority of participants in both same-sex samples had “extensive” postpubertal same-sex sexual experiences (79.4% in each), defined by Kinsey as at least 21 different male partners and/or 51 experiences after having begun puberty. In both same-sex samples, nearly all the remaining participants had “more than incidental” postpubertal same-sex sexual experiences, defined as 5–20 male partners and/or 21–50 times.

Sexual Orientation

Participants were asked to self-rate their sexual orientation with scores from 0 (exclusively heterosexual) to 60 (exclusively homosexual), with 5-point increments in between, yielding “Kinsey heterosexual–homosexual” scores, or Kinsey self-ratings. In the present study, self-ratings from 0 to 15 were labeled *heterosexual*, 20 to 40 *bisexual*, and 45 to 60 *homosexual*. The

² That is, if trauma is intrinsic to minor–adult sex, as has often been claimed in the CSA literature (Clancy, 2009), then any sample is useful for testing this universal proposition, especially one with the qualities of the Kinsey sample.

³ Excluded cases in both same-sex samples combined included $n = 14$ cases of minor participants with much younger minor partners (i.e., 5 or more years younger) and $n = 15$ cases of adult participants with much younger minor partners (i.e., 5 or more years younger).

Table 1 Sexual orientation distributions in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples

Sexual orientation measure/level	General (%)	Prison (%)
Kinsey scores		
Heterosexual (0–15)	22.7 _a	42.8 _b
Bisexual (20–40)	19.5 _a	28.9 _b
Homosexual (45–60)	57.8 _a	28.2 _b
<i>n</i>	282	432
Visual arousal to		
Neither male nor female	13.1 _a	19.5 _b
Female only	27.1 _a	31.9 _b
Male only	33.8 _a	20.7 _b
Both male and female	26.0 _a	28.0 _a
<i>n</i>	1094	1079

Kinsey scores were self-reported from 0 (exclusively heterosexual) to 60 (exclusively homosexual). In tests of independence (sexual orientation by sample), $\chi^2(2)=63.30$, $p<.001$, for Kinsey-score grouping and $\chi^2(3)=53.06$, $p<.001$, for visual arousal grouping. Row proportions with different subscripts were significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted *z*-tests

top panel of Table 1 shows the distributions in the general and prison same-sex samples. The table shows that both same-sex samples were mixed in sexual orientation, rather than being just same-sex attracted, but with prison participants heterosexual about twice as often general participants (43 vs. 23%) and homosexual only about half as often (28 vs. 58%).

In the general and prison same-sex samples, participants having provided Kinsey self-ratings were a minority (26 and 40%, respectively). Hence, proxy measures were used, to which most participants responded: sexual arousal seeing females and sexual arousal seeing males (where 1 = *none*, 2 = *little*, 3 = *some*, 4 = *much*). Correlations between Kinsey self-ratings and arousal scores for seeing females and males, respectively, were large, in the expected direction, and significant in both same-sex samples: general ($r_s = -.52$ and $.61$, $dfs = 280$ and 279 , $ps < .001$); prison ($r_s = -.43$ and $.58$, $dfs = 428$ and 428 , $ps < .001$). Dichotomizing each arousal variable (no arousal vs. any degree of arousal) and cross-tabulating them in each same-sex sample produced the distributions shown in the bottom panel of Table 1. For example, significantly more general participants were aroused only to seeing males (34%) compared to prison participants (21%). In short, using Kinsey self-ratings or visual arousal scores, each same-sex sample was quite mixed in sexual orientation, although general participants were more same-sex attracted.

Birth Year

Table 2 shows the distributions of birth years in the general and prison same-sex samples. Most participants were born in the

Table 2 Birth year distributions in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples

Birth year	General (%)	Prison (%)
<1900	6.1 _a	4.5 _a
1900–1909	13.0 _a	10.5 _a
1910–1919	28.9 _a	24.4 _b
1920–1929	46.8 _a	46.8 _a
1930–1939	5.2 _a	13.4 _b
1940+	0.0 _a	0.5 _b
<i>n</i>	1094	1080

In test of independence (birth year period by sample), $\chi^2(5)=54.24$, $p<.001$. Row proportions with different subscripts are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted *z*-tests

1910s and 1920s (a total of 76 and 71%, respectively, in these samples). General participants were born somewhat earlier on average ($M = 1917.5$, $SD = 10.2$) than prison participants ($M = 1919.9$, $SD = 10.1$), $t(2172) = -5.41$, $p < .001$. The ranges in the two samples, respectively, were the years 1867–1938 and 1860–1948.

Interview Year

General participants were interviewed somewhat earlier ($M = 1946.2$, $SD = 4.1$, range 1938–1961) than prison participants ($M = 1948.8$, $SD = 5.6$, range 1938–1962), $t(2172) = -11.84$, $p < .001$. In the general sample, the highest concentration of interviews occurred from 1943 to 1948 (65%), leading up to the publication of the Kinsey male volume (Kinsey et al., 1948), whereas in the prison sample the highest concentration was 1953–1955 (46%).

Age at Interview

Mean participant age at time of interview was the same in the general ($M = 28.6$, $SD = 10.4$) and prison ($M = 28.9$, $SD = 9.5$) same-sex samples, $t(2172) = -.52$. Age ranges in the two samples were similar: 13–76 and 12–72, respectively. Minor participants aged 12–17 made up 7.1% of the general sample and 8.0% of the prison sample. In each sample, the majority of participants were aged 18–29 (general, 57.3%; prison, 52.3%).

Puberty

General participants reached puberty slightly earlier ($M = 12.7$, $SD = 1.3$, range 8–18) than prison participants ($M = 12.9$, $SD = 1.3$, range 7–17), $t(2172) = -2.72$, $p < .01$. Combining the two samples, most participants reached puberty between ages 12 and 14 (77%).

Race

The two same-sex samples differed significantly in terms of race, $\chi^2(2) = 98.73$, $p < .001$, with general participants significantly more White (92%) than prison participants (76%) and significantly less Black (8 vs. 19%) in Bonferroni-adjusted z -tests.

Religion

The two same-sex samples differed significantly in terms of religion, $\chi^2(4) = 99.02$, $p < .001$, with more prison than general Catholics (26.2 vs. 17.7%), more general than prison Jews (11.4 vs. 2.0%), and more prison than general participants with no religion (3.7 vs. 1.6%) in Bonferroni-adjusted z -tests. Proportions of Protestants in the general and prison samples were the same (68.8 vs. 67.8%), as were proportions of other religions (e.g., Muslim, Greek Orthodox) (0.6 vs. 0.3%).

Measures

The measures used in the present study were basically the same as in the Rind and Welter (2016) study, and so they are described here more briefly. These measures come from the Kinsey interview schedule, as detailed by Albright (2006) in *The Kinsey Interview Kit: Code Book*.

Enjoyment

To the question, “Did subject enjoy first homosexual experience,” the interviewer recorded one of these options: 1 = *no*; 2 = *little*; 3 = *some*; 4 = *much*.

Emotionally Negative Reaction

Participants were asked, regardless of their degree of enjoyment, whether they had any reason for not enjoying the experience. Seven 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. If a participant endorsed either Item 1, 2, or 5 (e.g., shock, disgust, guilt), he was coded as having an emotionally negative reaction, as would be expected if the experience was traumatic.

Initiative

Three categories of source of the initiative were constructed from the Kinsey codings: (1) participant or mutual; (2) partner; and (3) participant was forced. No participant indicated that he used force.

Relationship to First Partner

The partner’s relationship with the participant was coded as: stranger, acquaintance, friend (or companion, roommate, etc.),

relative, person in charge of participant to some degree (e.g., teacher), prostitute (i.e., participant paid partner), or client (i.e., partner paid participant).

Technique of First Contact

Techniques, or types of sex engaged in, were ranked in the Kinsey coding according to degree of invasiveness, with anal intercourse ranked highest, then oral sex, masturbation, femoral intercourse, and body contact (e.g., kiss, pet, hug). In the present study, masturbation through body contact where categorized as “outercourse,” with anal and oral sex comprising intercourse. CSA researchers generally consider more invasive sex as more serious and thus traumatic, which the present study tested.

Participant–Partner Relative-Age Categories

Participants were asked their age at first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience and their partner’s age. Using this information, four participant–partner relative-age categories were constructed: (1) Minor–peer: participant was under 18, and partner’s age was within 4 years⁴; (2) Minor (≤ 14)–adult: participant was aged 14 or under, and partner was at least 5 years older⁵; (3) Minor (15–17)–adult: participant was aged 15–17, and partner was at least 5 years older; (4) Adult–adult: participant was at least 18 years old and partner was an adult aged 18 or above or a near adult within 4 years of participant’s age.⁶

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, and the code was submitted to the institute’s programmer, who ran it.

Analysis Plan and Statistical Analyses

The analysis plan in the current study was to compare and contrast characteristics and responses in the two same-sex samples in a variety of analyses, an approach that simultaneously served to address both goals in this study. That is, the comparative analysis would directly address the CSA–trauma–crime view on the one hand and yield a detailed profile of the

⁴ For the same-sex samples combined, 96.2% of partners were also minors, with 3.8% being young adults within 4 years of age.

⁵ For the same-sex samples combined, 93.4% of partners were adults, with 6.6% being other minors who were older by 5 or more years.

⁶ For the same-sex samples combined, 95% of partners were also adults, with 5% being older minors within 4 years of age (here, participants were aged 18 or 19 and partners were mostly aged 17).

characteristics and response patterns in the prison sample on the other.

In comparing means in the different participant–partner age groups, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was followed by a Hochberg post hoc test, which is appropriate when sample sizes differ substantially (Field, 2013). In comparing proportions, chi-square analysis was based on exact tests (2-sided), which were performed using SPSS. This approach, which yields accurate estimates of p values, is useful especially when expected frequencies in one or more cells are <5 , when probabilities based on chi-square distributions become unreliable (Metha & Patel, 2011). When post hoc pairwise contrasts were performed on proportions in analyses involving multiple groups, Bonferroni-adjusted z -tests were employed. Linear trend analysis for multi-group proportions was performed using the extended Mantel–Haenszel chi-square for linear trend procedure as described by Rosner (2000). Correlations and t tests were two-tailed. For all tests, p values $\leq .05$ were considered to be statistically significant (referred to in the text simply as “significant”).

Results

Characteristics of First Postpubertal Same-Sex Sexual Experience

Age of Experience

General participants had their first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience a half year earlier on average ($M = 14.45$, $SD = 3.60$) than prison participants ($M = 15.10$, $SD = 3.99$), $t(2172) = -3.16$, $p = .002$. Participants in the two samples had the experience from ages 9 to 58 and 8 to 48, respectively. Table 3 shows the age distributions. Most participants had this experience between ages 12 and 14, with significantly more general (58%) than prison (50%) participants in this category. Significantly fewer general (20%) than prison (27%) participants fell into the next higher age category (15–17). Before they reached adulthood (i.e., age 18), 86% of general and 84% of prison participants had had their first experience, highlighting that male same-sex sexual behavior is not a property of adulthood but usually has its start in boyhood.

Year of First Experience

In a 2 (Same-sex sample: general, prison) \times 4 (Age group: minor–peer, minor (≤ 14)–adult, minor (15–17)–adult, adult–adult) between-subjects ANOVA, mean year of first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience was analyzed. There was a significant main effect for sample, $F(1, 2137) = 16.68$, $p < .001$, in which general participants had their first experience on average slightly more than 2 years earlier than prison participants (1933 vs. 1936). General participants had their first

Table 3 Age at time of first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience, in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples

Age	General (%)	Prison (%)
<12	7.9 _a	5.8 _a
12–14	58.1 _a	50.3 _b
15–17	19.7 _a	27.4 _b
18–21	10.0 _a	11.0 _a
22–29	3.7 _a	4.2 _a
30+	0.6 _a	1.3 _a
<i>n</i>	1094	1080

In test of independence (age at time of experience by sample), $\chi^2(5) = 26.36$, $p < .001$. Row proportions with different subscripts are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted z -tests

experience anywhere from 1881 to 1957, whereas the range for prison participants was 1878–1961. There was also a significant main effect for age group, $F(3, 2137) = 17.16$, $p < .001$, in which minors with peers had their experience on average slightly earlier than minors (15–17) with adults or adults with adults. The interaction was nonsignificant, $F(3, 2167) = 0.79$. Table 4 shows the means for the different levels of the two factors.

Participant–Partner Age Group

Table 5 shows the proportion of participants falling into the four participant–partner age groups in each sample. Fewer prison than general participants had their first experience as a minor with a peer (53 vs. 68%), but more of them had their first experience as a minor with an adult (32 vs. 17%). The latter proportions, nearly double in the prison sample, are relevant to the CSA–trauma–crime view, which notes higher rates of CSA (minor–adult sex) among U.S. prisoners than in the general population and assumes that this increase in CSA leads to more crime, owing to a presumed increase in trauma. This assumption is evaluated later in this article.

Technique

Table 6 shows the distributions of first-experience sexual techniques used by participants in the general and prison same-sex samples, shown separately for each of the four age groups. For minors (≤ 14) with adults, prison participants had oral sex as their first experience nearly twice as often as general participants (61 vs. 34%), whereas they had intercourse less than half as often (26 vs. 59%). These results could be cited to claim that prisoners more often had “serious” early experiences, leading to their crimes (although such a claim is complicated by the finding that prison minors with peers and prison adults with adults, compared to their counterparts, also used more invasive techniques). This issue is evaluated below. For minors (15–17) with adults, on the other hand, the two samples did not differ for any technique.

Table 4 Mean year (and minimum, maximum years) of first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience in Kinsey male same-sex samples, shown separately by sample and participant–partner age group

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Min.	Max.
Same-sex sample					
General	1933.3 _a	14.1	1084	1881	1957
Prison	1935.6 _b	11.3	1061	1878	1961
Age group					
Minor/peer	1932.7 _a	10.0	1302	1881	1961
Minor (≤ 14)/adult	1933.0 _{ab}	10.2	303	1884	1955
Minor (15–17)/adult	1935.3 _{bc}	10.5	221	1901	1955
Adult/adult	1936.8 _c	9.9	319	1878	1958

Cases not fitting into the four age groups were omitted from analysis (10 and 19 cases, respectively, in general and prison samples). The sample by age group interaction was not significant. Within each factor, means without a common subscript are significantly different (Hochberg post hoc test used for age group)

Table 5 Distributions in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples of first same-sex sexual experience as a function of participant–partner age groups

Age group	General (%)	Prison (%)
Minor/peer	68.5 _a	52.7 _b
Minor (≤ 14)/adult	10.6 _a	17.7 _b
Minor (15–17)/adult	6.8 _a	13.8 _b
Adult/adult	14.0 _a	15.7 _a
<i>n</i>	1084	1061

In test of independence (age group by sample), $\chi^2(3)=68.17$, $p<.001$. Row proportions with different subscripts are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted z -tests

Partner's Relationship with Participant

Table 7 shows, for each age group and for general versus prison participants, the distributions of type of relationship between partner and participant. Few differences occurred between the two same-sex samples within the different age groups, but one

notable tendency in minors with adults and adults with adults was that prison participants significantly more often were paid by their partner compared to general participants. For younger boys with men (i.e., minor [≤ 14]-adult), prison sample boys were paid for sex more than three times as often as general sample boys (34 vs. 10%), while for older boys with men [i.e., minor (15–17)-adult], being paid occurred nearly three times as often, with the prison versus general proportions being 58 versus 22%. These sizable between-sample differences could be cited as consistent with greater “seriousness” in the prison sample, accounting in part for its members’ criminal behavior (cf. Widom, 1996). This issue is evaluated below. There were no differences in proportions for sex with a relative or person in charge, which were both uncommon for younger boys with men and rare for older boys with men.

Initiative

Table 8, for each age group and sample, shows the distribution of initiative, in which the participant could have initiated or mutually agreed to the contact, the partner could have initiated, or the participant could have been forced by the partner. There were no significant differences between the samples in any age group. That force was not more common in minor–adult contacts among prison than general participants is not what would be expected from the CSA–trauma–crime view.

The samples, with their same patterns of initiative, were combined and the relationship between age group and initiative was assessed, which was significant, as shown in Table 9. Minors with adults rarely initiated the contacts (only in 7% of cases), adults with adults initiated more often (28%), and minors with peers initiated most often (46%). Notably, partner use of force was rare and occurred no more often in the case of younger boys (≤ 14) with men (5%) than boys with peers (4%) or men with men (1%). Partner use of force in the case of older boys (15–17) with men (9%) was significantly more frequent than men with men, but still uncommon. Use of force in the case of minors with adults is widely assumed but was uncommon in the Kinsey same-sex samples.

Table 6 Distributions, in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples, of sexual technique used in first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience, shown separately by participant–partner age group

Technique	Minor/peer		Minor (≤ 14)/adult		Minor (15–17)/adult		Adult/adult	
	General (%)	Prison (%)	General (%)	Prison (%)	General (%)	Prison (%)	General (%)	Prison (%)
Outercourse	87.9 _a	66.5 _b	58.9 _a	25.8 _b	28.8 _a	20.0 _a	53.4 _a	15.0 _b
Oral sex	8.5 _a	16.8 _b	33.7 _a	61.3 _b	59.3 _a	63.8 _a	37.4 _a	65.7 _b
Anal intercourse	3.7 _a	16.8 _b	7.4 _a	12.9 _a	11.9 _a	16.2 _a	9.2 _a	19.3 _b
<i>n</i>	544	465	95	163	59	130	131	140

In tests of independence (technique by same-sex sample): minor/peer, $\chi^2(2)=73.14$, $p<.001$; minor (≤ 14)/adult, $\chi^2(2)=28.06$, $p<.001$; minor (15–17)/adult, $\chi^2(2)=2.02$, $p=.36$; adult/adult, $\chi^2(2)=45.02$, $p<.001$. Within each age group, general versus prison proportions for a given technique with different subscripts are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted z -tests

Table 7 Distributions, in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples, of participant–partner relationships in participants' first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience, shown separately by participant–partner age group

Relationship	Minor/peer		Minor (≤ 14)/adult		Minor (15–17)/adult		Adult/adult	
	General (%)	Prison (%)	General (%)	Prison (%)	General (%)	Prison (%)	General (%)	Prison (%)
Stranger	1.2	2.3	24.3	19.4	36.0	24.7	21.7	23.3
Acquaintance	2.0	1.7	15.7 _a	4.8 _b	8.0	2.2	12	4.1
Friend, companion	71.2	78.5	22.9	21.8	24.0 _a	6.5 _b	55.4 _a	26.0 _b
Relative	24.0	16.4	12.9	12.1	4.0	2.2	4.3	0
Person in charge	0.0	0.6	14.3	8.1	6.0	4.3	1.1	2.7
Prostitute	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	3.3	2.7
Client	1.6	0.6	10.0 _a	33.9 _b	22.0 _a	58.1 _b	2.2 _a	41.1 _b
<i>n</i>	250	177	70	124	50	93	92	73

“Prostitute” means participant paid partner; “client” means participant was paid by partner. In tests of independence (relationship by same-sex sample): minor/peer, $\chi^2(5)=6.76$, $p>.10$; minor (≤ 14)/adult, $\chi^2(5)=18.37$, $p<.01$; minor (15–17)/adult, $\chi^2(6)=23.02$, $p<.001$; adult/adult, $\chi^2(6)=46.91$, $p<.001$. Within each age group, general versus prison proportions for a given relationship with different subscripts are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted z -tests

Table 8 Distributions, in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples, of initiative in first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience, shown separately by participant–partner age group

Initiative	Minor/peer		Minor (≤ 14)/adult		Minor (15–17)/adult		Adult/adult	
	General (%)	Prison (%)	General (%)	Prison (%)	General (%)	Prison (%)	General (%)	Prison (%)
Participant initiated or mutual	45.1	47.7	10.3	4.1	8.3	7.5	29.9	24.4
Partner initiated	51.3	45.5	79.3	93.9	87.5	80.0	68.7	75.6
Partner forced participant	3.5	5.8	10.3	2.0	4.2	12.5	1.5	0.0
<i>n</i>	113	86	29	49	24	40	67	41

In tests of independence (initiative by same-sex sample): minor/peer, $\chi^2(2)=0.86$, $p>.10$; minor (≤ 14)/adult, $\chi^2(2)=4.00$, $p>.10$; minor (15–17)/adult, $\chi^2(2)=1.23$, $p>.10$; adult/adult, $\chi^2(2)=1.06$, $p>.10$. No initiative level in general versus prison samples was significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted z -tests

Table 9 For Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples combined, distributions of initiative in first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of participant–partner age group

Age group	Initiative (%)			<i>n</i>
	Participant or mutual	Partner	Partner used force	
Minor/peer	46.2 _a	49.2 _a	4.5 _{ab}	199
Minor (≤ 14)/adult	6.4 _b	88.5 _b	5.1 _{ab}	78
Minor (15–17)/adult	7.8 _b	82.8 _{bc}	9.4 _b	64
Adult/adult	27.8 _c	71.3 _c	0.9 _a	108

For test of independence (age group by initiative), $\chi^2(6)=67.60$, $p<.001$. Column proportions (i.e., going downward) without a common subscript are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted z -tests

Table 10 Mean enjoyment of first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of participant–partner age group, in Kinsey combined male same-sex samples (general and prison)

Age Group	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>
Minor/peer	3.70 _a	0.74	750
Minor (≤ 14)/adult	3.42 _b	0.99	213
Minor (15–17)/adult	3.23 _b	1.08	137
Adult/adult	3.35 _b	1.07	210

Enjoyment measured from 1 = *no* to 4 = *much*. Means with different subscripts are significantly different in Hochberg post hoc test

Table 11 Positive reactions (enjoyed “much”) to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of participant–partner age group, in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples

Age group	General		Prison		Total	
	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>
Minor/peer	82.23 _a	377	84.18 _a	373	83.20 _a	750
Minor (≤ 14)/adult	75.95 _{ab}	79	66.42 _b	134	69.95 _b	213
Minor (15–17)/adult	60.47 _b	43	60.64 _b	94	60.58 _b	137
Adult/adult	68.42 _b	114	67.71 _b	96	68.10 _b	210

Tests of independence (reaction by age group): general, $\chi^2(3)=17.38$, $p=.001$; prison, $\chi^2(3)=35.37$, $p<.001$; total, $\chi^2(3)=50.96$, $p<.001$. Column proportions without a common subscript are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted *z*-tests

Reactions

Enjoyment

In a 2 (Sample) \times 4 (Age group) between-subjects ANOVA of enjoyment scores, a main effect emerged for age group, $F(3, 1302)=17.00$, $p<.001$, but not for sample, $F(1, 1302)=.06$; the age group \times sample interaction was not significant, $F(3, 1302)=.45$. Table 10 shows mean enjoyment for the four age groups collapsed across sample. Minors with peers enjoyed their first postpubertal same-sex experience the most, while the other three age groups enjoyed it to the same degree. Importantly, minors with adults did enjoy the experience on average, with means between “some” and “much” on the enjoyment measure. The findings that boys’ experiences with men were often enjoyed and were just as positive as men’s experiences with other men are inconsistent with the view of inherent trauma or problemat�icity regarding the former.

Positive Reactions

Enjoying the experience “much,” the top scale value on the measure of enjoyment, was taken here as a conservative indicator of a positive reaction. Table 11 shows the distributions of positive reactions for the general and prison same-sex samples. Not shown in the table are the between-sample contrasts within each age group—these were all nonsignificant, justifying focusing on the combined-sample proportions (last column).⁷ There, minors with peers had the highest proportion of positive reactions, followed by the other three age groups, which did not differ significantly from one another.

The positive response proportion for younger boys (≤ 14) with men was just as high as men with men (70 vs. 68%), sharply contradicting expectations of characteristic trauma in minor–adult contacts as well as much worse response

compared to relations between mutually mature partners. The statistical equivalence between prison and general participants is contradictory to the CSA–trauma–crime view, where few positive reactions along with even fewer such reactions among prison participants in minor–adult contacts would have been expected.

Emotionally Negative Reactions

If a sexual experience is traumatic, emotionally negative reactions with responses such as shock, disgust, and guilt are expectable. Table 12 shows the results of analysis, in which, for each age group and both samples, proportions of emotionally negative reactions are shown. In contrasts not shown in the table, the general and prison samples differed significantly only in the minor–peer age group, in which general participants had a somewhat higher proportion of emotionally negative reactions than prison participants (9 vs. 4%).⁸ Given these low rates along with the equivalence in the other three age groups, focusing on the combined proportions (last column) is indicated. There, minors with peers had fewer emotionally negative reactions compared to younger boys with men or men with men. But younger boys (≤ 14) with men, older boys (15–17) with men, and men with men did not differ in their proportions.

In all cases, emotionally negative reactions occurred in a small minority of participants (e.g., fewer than 1 in 5 cases for younger boys [≤ 14] with men). These results do not indicate trauma as characteristic in minor–adult sex in these same-sex samples. Moreover, the equivalence in proportions in minor–adult contacts in the prison versus general samples lends no support to the CSA–trauma–crime view, where frequent trauma for prison participants would have been expected, along with higher proportions of trauma compared to general participants.

⁷ Contrasts in the 4 age groups were, in order: $\chi^2(1)=.51$, 2.15, .00, and .01 ($ps>.10$).

⁸ Contrasts in the 4 age groups were, in order: $\chi^2(1)=7.43$, .04, .10, and 1.25 ($p<.01$ and then $ps>.10$).

Table 12 Emotionally negative reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of participant–partner age group, in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples

Age group	General		Prison		Total	
	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>
Minor/peer	9.04 _a	343	3.88 _a	335	6.49 _a	678
Minor (≤ 14)/adult	18.67 _a	75	17.54 _b	114	17.99 _b	189
Minor (15–17)/adult	9.09 _a	33	11.11 _{ab}	72	10.48 _{ab}	105
Adult/adult	16.49 _a	97	10.39 _{ab}	77	13.79 _b	174

Tests of independence (reaction by age group): general, $\chi^2(3)=8.26$, $p<.05$; prison, $\chi^2(3)=22.84$, $p<.001$; total, $\chi^2(3)=25.79$, $p<.001$. Column proportions without a common subscript are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted z -tests

Table 13 Reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of partner–participant age difference in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples: For participants aged 14 or younger at time of experience

Reactions	Same-sex sample		Age difference in years (partner age minus participant age)						Omnibus $\chi^2(5)$	Linear $\chi^2(1)$	<i>r</i>
			≤ -2	-1 to 1	$2-4$	$5-9$	$10-19$	$20+$			
Positive (enjoyed much)	General	%	76.2 _{ab}	83.6 _b	79.4 _{ab}	82.4 _{ab}	84.6 _{ab}	52.6 _a	11.42*	3.20	–.14**
		<i>n</i>	21	207	63	34	26	19			
	Prison	%	82.1 _{ab}	86.5 _b	82.5 _{ab}	77.4 _{ab}	62.8 _a	63.3 _a	22.92**	19.71**	–.21**
		<i>n</i>	28	192	63	31	43	60			
	Total	%	79.6 _{ab}	85.0 _b	81.0 _b	80.0 _{ab}	71.0 _{ab}	60.8 _a	27.90**	22.43**	–.18**
		<i>n</i>	49	399	126	65	69	79			
Emotionally negative	General	%	5.9 _{ab}	7.4 _b	10.3 _b	15.6 _{ab}	4.2 _b	42.1 _a	24.66**	11.89**	.21**
		<i>n</i>	17	188	58	32	24	19			
	Prison	%	0.0 _{ab}	4.0 _b	5.2 _{ab}	17.2 _{ab}	8.8 _{ab}	23.5 _a	26.24**	21.93**	.24**
		<i>n</i>	24	174	58	29	34	51			
	Total	%	2.4 _{ab}	5.8 _a	7.8 _{ab}	16.4 _{ac}	6.9 _{ab}	28.6 _c	43.21**	30.58**	.21**
		<i>n</i>	41	362	116	61	58	70			

n=number of cases in a given age difference; %=percent of these cases with a given reaction. Omnibus and linear trend chi-squares (the latter based on Rosner, 2000) across rows are shown. Correlations (*r*) of given reaction versus age difference are shown. Across rows, proportions without common subscripts are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted z -tests

* $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$

Reactions in Relation to Specific Age Characteristics

In the following analyses, age characteristics are taken into more detailed account in terms of how they relate to reactions. These analyses focus just on minor participants with peer and adult partners. First, minors' reactions as a function of age difference are examined, conducted separately for minors 14 and under and minors 15–17 at time of experience, following the approach used by Rind and Welter (2016). In the present study, six categories of age difference were used, in which the partner was: (1) younger by 2 or more years; (2) within a year of age; (3) 2–4 years older; (4) 5–9 years older; (5) 10–19 years older; or (6) 20 or more years older. Second, minors' reactions as a function of the minors' exact age at time of experience were examined, analyzed separately for minors with peers and minors with adults. In all analyses, general and prison samples were considered separately.

Age Difference: Minors ≤ 14 at Time of Experience

Table 13 shows proportions of positive and emotionally negative reactions for the general and prison samples as a function of six categories of age difference. Three statistics were computed for each reaction-sample combination: an omnibus chi-square (i.e., test of independence between reaction and age difference); a linear trend chi-square (i.e., assessing whether, with advancing age-difference categories, proportions trended linearly); and a Pearson correlation (i.e., the ungrouped correlation between age difference and reaction).

In the upper panel of the table, increasing age difference was modestly correlated with less positive response in both samples (last column). The sample correlations did not differ significantly, $z=1.12$, $p>.10$. Proportions of positive reactions differed in both samples (and combined) in the omnibus tests. In Bonferroni-adjusted z -tests, positive reaction proportions in

Table 14 Reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of partner–participant age difference in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples combined: For participants aged 15–17 at time of experience

Reactions	Same-sex sample		Age difference in years (partner age minus participant age)						Omnibus $\chi^2(5)$	Linear $\chi^2(1)$	r
			≤ -2	-1 to 1	$2-4$	$5-9$	$10-19$	$20+$			
Positive (enjoyed much)	General	%	100.0	82.8	66.7	75.0	61.1	46.2	13.23*	11.09**	– .26**
		n	9	64	18	12	18	13			
	Prison	%	83.3 _{ab}	81.1 _b	77.8 _{ab}	75.0 _{ab}	64.3 _{ab}	42.9 _a	16.93**	13.86**	– .28**
		n	12	66	18	24	42	28			
	Total	%	90.5 _a	82.3 _a	72.2 _{ab}	75.0 _{ab}	63.3 _{ab}	43.9 _b	29.16**	25.75**	– .27**
		n	21	130	36	36	60	41			
Emotionally negative	General	%	0.0	12.1	18.8	10.0	0.0	22.2	4.97	0.12	.05
		n	9	58	16	10	14	9			
	Prison	%	0.0	3.4	6.7	5.0	9.4	20.0	7.62	6.45*	.20*
		n	12	58	15	20	32	20			
	Total	%	0.0	7.8	12.9	6.7	6.5	20.7	8.42	3.16	.12*
		n	21	116	31	30	46	29			

n =number of cases in a given age difference; %=percent of these cases with a given reaction. Omnibus and linear trend chi-squares (the latter based on Rosner, 2000) across rows are shown. Correlations (r) of given reaction versus age difference are shown. Across rows, proportions are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted z -tests when they have subscripts that have no common letters

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

the base category (i.e., age-mates within 1 year of age) were significantly greater than in the highest age-difference categories (i.e., 20 or more years in both samples, and 10–19 years in the prison sample). A decreasing linear trend for positive reaction proportions across increasing age-difference categories occurred in the prison and combined samples. Comparing proportions between samples for each age-difference category yielded no significant differences,⁹ indicating that the combined values in the totals-row could be used as estimates for the entire sample. Notably, although positive reaction proportions did modestly decrease with increasing age difference, positive reactions were still in the majority throughout.

The lower panel of the table shows results for emotionally negative reactions. Increasing age difference was correlated with more emotionally negative reactions in both samples to the same degree, $z = -.47$, $p > .10$ (last column). As can be seen in the table, this relationship was mostly accounted for by the category of greatest age difference (i.e., 20 or more years), where proportions were significantly higher than in the base category. There were no between-sample differences in proportions in the various age-difference categories,¹⁰ indicating that the totals-row could be used for estimates of the entire sample. Notably, proportions of emotionally negative reactions were small, whether the minors' contacts were with peers or

adults, except in the case of much older adults. But even here still only a minority reacted emotionally negatively.

Age Difference: Minors 15–17 at Time of Experience

Table 14 shows results for minors 15–17 at the time. In the top panel, in the correlational analyses (last column), increasing age difference was associated with decreasing positive reactions, equally so in both samples, $z = .12$, $p > .10$. There were no between-sample differences in the different categories of age difference.¹¹ Interpreting the totals-row, positive reaction proportions were significantly higher in the base versus greatest age-difference categories, and proportions trended significantly lower with categories of increasing age difference. Reactions were positive in clear majorities with partners up to 19 years older.

In the bottom panel, in the correlational analyses, increasing age difference was not correlated with more emotionally negative reactions in the general sample but was in the prison sample, although these correlations did not differ from each other significantly, $z = -1.27$, $p > .10$. There were no between-sample differences in any age-difference category,¹² so the totals-row can be used for estimates. Here, proportions of emotionally negative reactions were small for all age-difference

⁹ Contrasts in the 6 age-difference categories, were, in order: $\chi^2(1) = .26, .65, .21, .25, 3.75$, and $.69$ ($ps > .10$, except 5th category, where $p = .06$).

¹⁰ Contrasts in the 6 age-difference categories, were, in order: $\chi^2(1) = 1.45, 1.94, 1.08, .03, .48, 2.34$ ($ps > .10$).

¹¹ Contrasts in the 6 age-difference categories, were, in order: $\chi^2(1) = 1.66, .02, .55, .00, .06, .04$ ($ps > .10$).

¹² Contrasts in the 6 age-difference categories, were, in order: $\chi^2(1) = .00, 3.01, 1.01, .27, 1.40$, and $.02$ ($ps > .10$).

Table 15 Rates of positive reactions (enjoyed “much”) by minors to their first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of age at experience, in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples, shown separately for minor–peer and minor–adult experiences

Age pairing/ same-sex sample		Age at first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience							Omnibus $\chi^2(6)$	Linear $\chi^2(1)$	r
		≤11	12	13	14	15	16	17			
Minor–peer											
General	%	85.3	75.6	90.2	80.9	80.0	82.1	82.4	6.54	.00	.00
	n	34	82	82	89	45	28	17			
Prison	%	88.5	84.7	76.2	92.9	84.0	79.3	80.0	9.87	.03	− .01
	n	26	85	84	84	50	29	15			
Total	%	86.7	80.2	83.1	86.7	82.1	80.7	81.3	3.51	.00	− .01
	n	60	167	166	173	95	57	32			
Minor–adult											
General	%	100.0	61.1	80.0	71.4	68.4	50.0	56.3	10.30	4.75*	− .20*
	n	13	18	20	28	19	8	16			
Prison	%	69.2	78.8	68.9	53.5	61.0	60.7	60.0	6.29	2.48	− .11
	n	13	33	45	43	41	28	25			
Total	%	84.6	72.5	72.3	60.6	63.3	58.3	58.5	9.25	7.02**	− .14**
	n	26	51	65	71	60	36	41			

n = number of cases for a given age; % = percent of these cases with a positive reaction. Omnibus and linear trend chi-squares (the latter based on Rosner, 2000) across rows are shown. Correlations (*r*) of given reaction versus exact age are shown

p* < .05; *p* < .01

categories, except the highest one, where the proportion was doubled or tripled (but still did not differ significantly from the other categories). Notably, though proportions of emotionally negative reactions were slightly over 20% in the largest age-difference category in both same-sex samples, these proportions were less than half the size of the positive reaction proportions in this same category (in the top panel of the table).

Exact Age of First Experience for Minor Participants: Positive Reactions

Table 15 shows positive reaction proportions as a function of the exact age at which the minors had the experience. These proportions are shown separately for minors with peers and minors with adults, as well as by sample. For minors with peers (upper panel of the table), no significant correlations or linear trends emerged. That is, younger adolescent minors (e.g., age 11) with peers reacted just as positively as older adolescents (e.g., age 17) with peers. Between-sample comparisons showed two significant contrasts—at age 13, where general participants reacted more positively, and at age 14, where prison participants reacted more positively.¹³

For minors with adults (lower panel of the table), younger ages at time of experience were correlated with a *greater*

degree of positive reactions in the general and total samples (last column). The correlations in the general and prison samples were not significantly different, $z = -.87$, $p > .10$, and no between-sample significant differences occurred in the different exact-age categories.¹⁴ Focusing on the totals-row, there was a significant linear decreasing trend across the exact-age categories, in which boys aged 11 and under reacted positively in 85% of cases, a proportion that decreased linearly to 58% for boys aged 17. This trend is contrary to expectations under the CSA view, in which younger ages would be expected to react worse because of less maturity.

Exact Age of First Experience for Minor Participants: Emotionally Negative Reactions

Table 16 shows proportions of emotionally negative reactions as a function of exact age of experience. In the upper panel concerning minors with peers, no significant differences among the age categories, linear trends, or correlations emerged. Between-sample differences occurred in two age categories: at ages 12 and 15, where general participants reacted more emotionally negatively than prison participants.¹⁵ In the lower panel

¹³ Contrasts in the 7 exact-age categories, were, in order: $\chi^2(1) = .13$, 2.18, 5.84, 5.36, .26, .07, .03 ($ps > .10$, except 3rd and 4th categories, where $ps = .02$).

¹⁴ Contrasts in the 7 exact-age categories, were, in order: $\chi^2(1) = 4.73$, 1.83, .85, 2.28, .31, .29, .06 ($ps > .10$, except 1st category, where $p = .096$).

¹⁵ Contrasts in the 7 exact-age categories, were, in order: $\chi^2(1) = .68$, 6.54, .01, 1.65, 4.27, 2.08, and .02 ($ps > .10$, except 2nd and 5th categories 2–4, where $p < .05$).

Table 16 Rates of emotionally negative reactions by minors to their first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of age at experience, in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples, shown separately for minor–peer and minor–adult experiences

Age pairing/ same-sex sample		Age at first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience							Omnibus $\chi^2(6)$	Linear $\chi^2(1)$	r
		≤ 11	12	13	14	15	16	17			
Minor–peer											
General	%	3.2	14.1	3.8	8.6	14.3	8.0	13.3	7.82	.60	.04
	n	31	71	78	81	42	25	15			
Prison	%	8.3	2.6	4.2	3.8	2.2	0.0	15.4	7.60	.02	.00
	n	24	77	71	80	45	25	13			
Total	%	5.5	8.1	4.0	6.2	8.0	4.0	14.3	5.91	.43	.02
	n	55	148	149	161	87	50	28			
Minor–adult											
General	%	21.4	26.7	15.0	15.4	6.7	16.7	8.3	3.13	1.73	– .13
	n	14	15	20	26	15	6	12			
Prison	%	16.7	6.7	17.9	27.3	14.7	9.5	5.9	7.41	.16	– .03
	n	12	30	39	33	34	21	17			
Total	%	19.2	13.3	16.9	22.0	12.2	11.1	6.9	4.93	1.43	– .07
	n	26	45	59	59	49	27	29			

n=number of cases for a given age; %=percent of these cases with an emotionally negative reaction. Omnibus and linear-trend chi-squares (the latter based on Rosner, 2000) across rows are shown. Correlations (*r*) of given reaction versus exact age are shown

p* < .05; *p* < .01

concerning minors with adults, no significant results occurred and all between-sample contrasts were nonsignificant.¹⁶ That is, lesser maturity in contacts with adults was not more problematic in terms of emotionally negative reactions.

Maturity and Reactions

Given the similar patterns of reactions as a function of exact age between the general and prison samples, results were collapsed across samples and ages were regrouped according to commonsense categories of maturity (preteens = 12 and under; early teens = 13–14; mid-teens = 15–17). Table 17 shows positive and emotionally negative reactions, separately for minors with peers and minors with adults, in relation to maturity level. Minors with peers showed no omnibus differences or linear trends in reactions as a function of maturity level. For minors with adults, a clear linear trend emerged in positive reaction proportions, in which preteens were largest (77%), followed by early teens (66%) and then mid-teens (61%). No differences occurred in proportions of emotionally negative reactions. In short, this analysis lends no support to the view that greater maturity (physically, emotionally, cognitively) is essential among postpubertal boys for better or less problematic reactions to same-sex sexual experiences, whether with peers or adults.

¹⁶ Contrasts in the 7 exact-age categories, were, in order: $\chi^2(1) = .09, 3.46, .08, 1.20, .63, .24$, and $.07$ (*ps* > .10).

Reactions in Relation to Other Characteristics

In keeping with the last analysis and for the same reason (i.e., the comparability of reaction patterns in the general and prison samples), the remaining analyses are performed using the combined same-sex samples. These analyses concern event and personal characteristics (i.e., sexual technique used; relationship with partner; sexual orientation).

Sexual Technique

Examining reactions in relation to technique is useful for assessing claims about seriousness, with its assumed greater trauma, often made in reference to minor–adult sex. Table 18 shows proportions of positive and emotionally negative reactions for each age group as a function of three levels of technique with increasing invasiveness, considered to be increasingly serious in the CSA view: outercourse, oral intercourse, and anal intercourse.¹⁷

As can be seen in the table, younger boys (≤ 14) with men reacted positively often and equally so regardless of technique. By contrast, men with men reacted less positively with greater levels of invasiveness in a significant linear trend. Younger boys with men reacted emotionally negatively *less* often with increasing levels of invasiveness in a significant linear trend:

¹⁷ Note that Rind and Welter (2016) only compared outercourse and intercourse; here the latter was divided into oral and anal.

Table 17 Reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples combined as a function of participant–partner age pairing and participant age/maturational level at time of the experience

Reactions	Age pairing		Age/maturational level at time of experience			Omnibus: $\chi^2(2)$	Linear: $\chi^2(1)$
			Preteens	Early teens	Mid-teens		
Positive (enjoyed “much”)	Minor–peer	%	81.9	85.0	81.5	1.38	0.01
		<i>n</i>	227	339	184		
	Minor–adult	%	76.6	66.2	60.6	5.68*	5.80**
		<i>n</i>	77	136	137		
Emotionally negative	Minor–peer	%	7.4	5.2	7.9	1.70	0.00
		<i>n</i>	203	310	165		
	Minor–adult	%	15.5	19.5	10.5	3.49	1.45
		<i>n</i>	71	118	105		

n=number of cases for a given age pairing; %=percent of these cases with a given reaction. Preteens=age 12 or younger at time of experience; early teens=ages 13–14; mid-teens=ages 15–17. For each age pairing across its three maturational levels, an omnibus chi-square (assessing independence) and a linear trend chi-square (based on Rosner, 2000) were computed

* $p < .10$; ** $p < .05$

Table 18 Reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of sexual technique, analyzed separately for each participant–partner age group, in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples combined

Reaction	Age group		Sexual technique			Omnibus $\chi^2(2)$	Linear $\chi^2(1)$
			Outercourse	Oral	Anal		
Positive (enjoyed much)	Minor/peer	%	84.4	84.5	74.1	5.45	3.70
		<i>n</i>	518	97	81		
	Minor (≤ 14)/adult	%	68.1	70.0	70.8	0.95	.17
		<i>n</i>	69	110	24		
	Minor (15–17)/adult	%	66.7	55.0	78.3	4.46	.45
		<i>n</i>	27	80	23		
	Adult/adult	%	76.5	66.3	55.2	4.57	4.07*
		<i>n</i>	68	98	29		
Emotionally negative	Minor/peer	%	6.8 _{ab}	12.0 _b	1.5 _a	6.73*	.31
		<i>n</i>	472	92	68		
	Minor (≤ 14)/adult	%	27.7 _a	15.8 _{ab}	0.0 _b	8.70*	7.71**
		<i>n</i>	65	95	20		
	Minor (15–17)/adult	%	20.8	8.6	0.0	5.41*	4.16*
		<i>n</i>	24	58	19		
	Adult/adult	%	18.3	15.2	0.0	4.71	3.01
		<i>n</i>	60	79	23		

Within each age group, *n*=number of cases having given type of sex, and %=percent of these cases with the given reaction (i.e., positive or negative). Outercourse consisted of non-penetrative contact (body contact, masturbation, femoral intercourse). Omnibus and linear trend chi-squares (the latter based on Rosner, 2000) across rows are shown. Significant differences in row proportions are indicated by subscripts; here, proportions without a common subscript are significantly different in Bonferroni-adjusted *z*-tests

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

outercourse (28%), oral intercourse (16%), and anal intercourse (0%). For older boys (15–17) with men, positive reactions did not differ in relation to technique, but clearly the extent of positive reactions to anal intercourse was high and not inferior to the less “serious” techniques. As with younger boys with men, the proportion of emotionally negative reactions for older boys with men significantly linearly decreased with increasing

level of invasiveness. Overall, these results are essentially the opposite of what would be expected under the CSA view.

Partner’s Relationship with Participant

Table 19 shows reactions for each age group in relation to the partner’s relationship with the participant. No significant

differences emerged, although results should be seen as tentative for various relationship-types, given small numbers of cases. Results for one category—client (i.e., participant was paid for the sex)—are robust for the minor–adult age groups, given the larger number of cases. Reactions were frequently positive in these two groups (68 and 64% for younger and older boys, respectively, with men), but infrequently emotionally negative (12 and 4% in the two groups, respectively). This pattern of reactions was comparable to that in the category of friend as a partner [for younger (≤ 14) and older (15–17) boys with men, respectively: positive = 74 and 68%; negative = 13 and 10%]. This comparability, along with the overall positive reaction profile, indicates that paid-for sex was not troubling to boy participants on average (i.e., not characteristically traumatic) and not exceptional compared to relationship structures seen as not problematic (e.g., friendships). This finding is contrary to the view expressed in the criminological literature (e.g., Widom, 1996), which stems mainly from the female experience in paid-for sex.

Sexual Orientation

Positive and emotionally negative reactions as a function of sexual orientation were examined in two steps. First was using Kinsey self-ratings, in which participants were divided into three groups: heterosexual, bisexual, and homosexual. Table 20 shows the results, in which, for each type of reaction and age group, the distribution of reactions across the three levels of sexual orientation was assessed (i.e., via an omnibus and linear trend χ^2). In the top panel, positive reaction proportions neither significantly differed nor trended linearly in relation to sexual orientation for any age group. Further, the correlations between Kinsey self-ratings and positive reactions were all nonsignificant and small. In the bottom panel regarding emotionally negative reactions, no significant trends or correlations emerged; only in the case of adults with adults was there a significant difference among the proportions. Regarding the minor–adult age groups, heterosexual participants reacted positively in the majority of cases and rarely reacted emotionally negatively. Their pattern of reactions was statistically equal to that of homosexual participants having minor–adult contacts.

In a second step, sexual arousal on seeing males was analyzed. Participants were divided into two groups: those having no such arousal and those having at least some arousal. Table 21 shows, for each reaction by age group, the proportion of participants having a given reaction as a function of level of arousal. Only in the case of positive reactions did differences occur, specifically for minors with peers and minors (≤ 14) with adults, in which participants with arousal had significantly higher proportions. In the last column are correlations between arousal level and reactions, and these values serve also as measures of effect size (where $r_s = .10, .30$, and $.50$, respectively, are small, medium, and large). All effect sizes

were small. Regarding minors with adults, participants with no arousal on seeing males still reacted positively in the majority of cases and infrequently reacted emotionally negatively.

Discussion

Since 2000, a growing number of studies have used male same-sex samples to interrogate the dominant CSA model of intrinsic abuse, trauma, and harm, given that much anecdote and prior research indicates that this model misfits minor–adult sexual experiences on average in the male same-sex population. Adding to this research trend, the present study focused on an important, large-scale male same-sex sample drawn from Kinsey’s prison interviewees. Moreover, use of this sample enabled direct comparisons with Kinsey’s general (i.e., non-prison) male same-sex sample, previously analyzed by Rind and Welter (2016), permitting examination of the CSA–trauma–crime link often claimed in criminology.

CSA–Trauma–Crime

It has widely been held that minor–adult sex is traumatic and has often been claimed that criminal behavior is one of its many possible negative outcomes. The argument has been that traumatic response sets up a negative emotional pattern, which then leads to antisocial thinking and/or behavior, which in turn increases criminal behavior risk and thus incarceration. In support of this argument, researchers have pointed to the higher incidence of minor–adult sex in the history of prisoners compared to non-prisoners. These researchers, however, have assumed, but *not* demonstrated, an increase in trauma associated with this higher incidence.

The Kinsey data from the prison and general male same-sex samples regarding first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience were useful for testing this thinking, because they provided comparative information on rates of minor–adult sex, characteristics of this experience, and reactions to it. Indeed, prison participants had a first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a minor with an adult at nearly twice the rate as general participants. Moreover, their experiences were more often “serious” in that, overall, they had more penetrative sex and prostitution-based sex, characteristics viewed by CSA researchers to be aggravating. From these findings, one might conclude that the CSA–trauma–crime link received support. Critical, however, is to assess whether prison participants had a higher rate of traumatic response in relation to their experience.

The reaction data contradicted the CSA–trauma–crime link, because trauma related to the experience (i.e., the middle element in this link) was mostly missing in the prison same-sex sample, it was no more frequent there than in the general same-sex sample, and it was not related to characteristics viewed in the CSA field as “serious.” Rather than being traumatic, the

Table 19 Reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience as a function of relationship with partner, analyzed separately for each participant-partner age group, in Kinsey general and prison male same-sex samples combined

Reaction	Age group	Stranger	Acquaintance	Friend, com- panion	Relative	Person in charge	Prostitute	Client	χ^2	df
Positive (enjoyed much)	Minor/peer	% 100.0	60.0	85.7	81.4			50.0	6.03	4
		<i>n</i> 7	5	231	43			2		
	Minor (≤ 14)/adult	% 61.1	100.0	73.5	71.4	60.0		67.5	6.36	5
		<i>n</i> 36	10	34	14	10		40		
	Minor (15–17)/adult	% 65.6	80.0	66.7	50.0	50.0	100.0	63.9	2.04	6
		<i>n</i> 32	5	12	4	6	1	36		
Emotionally negative	Adult/adult	% 61.3	53.8	71.2	100.0	0.0	33.3	60.0	5.51	6
		<i>n</i> 31	13	52	1	1	3	20		
	Minor/peer	% 0.0	0.0	7.6	7.9			0.0	.99	4
		<i>n</i> 7	4	211	38			1		
	Minor (≤ 14)/adult	% 25.0	16.7	13.3	28.6	12.5		11.8	3.68	5
		<i>n</i> 32	12	30	14	8		34		
	Minor (15–17)/adult	% 17.9	0.0	10.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	3.8	7.55	6
		<i>n</i> 28	5	10	2	5	1	26		
	Adult/adult	% 13.6	33.3	14.3	0.0	100.0	33.3	0.0	11.48*	6
		<i>n</i> 22	12	42	1	1	3	13		

n=number of cases having a given relationship; %=percent of these cases with given reaction. Rates of reactions did not differ significantly across relationship-types. "Person in charge" included teachers, etc., of participant; "prostitute" means participant paid partner; "client" means participant was paid by partner

* $p < .10$

Table 20 Positive and emotionally negative reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience in combined Kinsey male same-sex samples as a function of sexual orientation based on Kinsey self-ratings, separately by age group

Reactions	Age pairing		Sexual orientation			Omnibus: $\chi^2(2)$	Linear: $\chi^2(1)$	<i>r</i>
			Heterosexual	Bisexual	Homosexual			
Positive (enjoyed “much”)	Minor–peer	%	82.4	80.0	89.9	5.37	3.60	.09
		<i>n</i>	119	90	158			
	Minor (≤ 14)–adult	%	65.6	58.3	75.6	2.21	1.21	.07
		<i>n</i>	32	24	41			
	Minor (15–17)–adult	%	56.3	52.4	70.0	1.48	1.04	.11
		<i>n</i>	32	21	20			
	Adult–adult	%	71.4	86.4	70.0	2.11	0.00	– .02
		<i>n</i>	28	22	30			
Emotionally negative	Minor–peer	%	3.9	8.6	3.4	3.42	0.05	– .01
		<i>n</i>	102	81	148			
	Minor (≤ 14)–adult	%	8.0	23.8	18.0	2.19	1.19	.17
		<i>n</i>	25	21	39			
	Minor (15–17)–adult	%	5.0	11.8	11.8	0.69	1.00	.12
		<i>n</i>	20	17	17			
	Adult–adult	%	8.3	0.0	23.1	6.08*	3.51	.19
		<i>n</i>	24	19	26			

n = number of cases for a given age pairing; % = percent of these cases with a given reaction. Heterosexual = Kinsey scores 0–15; bisexual = Kinsey scores 20–40; homosexual = Kinsey scores 45–60. For each age group across its sexual orientation levels, an omnibus chi-square (assessing independence) and a linear trend chi-square (based on Rosner, 2000) were computed. Correlations between Kinsey self-ratings and reactions are in last column

**p* < .05

Table 21 Positive and emotionally negative reactions to first postpubertal same-sex sexual experience in combined Kinsey male same-sex samples as a function of sexual orientation based on visual arousal to males, separately by age group

Reactions	Age pairing		Sexual arousal seeing males		$\chi^2(1)$	<i>r</i>
			No	Yes		
Positive (enjoyed “much”)	Minor–peer	%	77.8	85.0	5.05*	.08*
		<i>n</i>	185	565		
	Minor (≤ 14)–adult	%	60.0	74.8	4.75*	.15*
		<i>n</i>	65	147		
	Minor (15–17)–adult	%	54.1	65.8	1.94	.12
		<i>n</i>	61	76		
	Adult–adult	%	66.7	68.8	0.10	.02
		<i>n</i>	72	138		
Emotionally negative	Minor–peer	%	5.8	6.7	0.17	– .02
		<i>n</i>	156	522		
	Minor (≤ 14)–adult	%	17.6	18.2	0.01	– .01
		<i>n</i>	51	137		
	Minor (15–17)–adult	%	14.6	7.8	1.24	.11
		<i>n</i>	41	64		
	Adult–adult	%	10.7	15.3	0.67	– .06
		<i>n</i>	56	118		

n = number of cases for a given age pairing; % = percent of these cases with a given reaction. Sexually aroused “yes” includes *only aroused when seeing males* and *aroused when seeing either males or females*. For positive reactions, the correlation (*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

**p* < .05

experience for prison participants was mostly positive. In this sample, younger boys (≤ 14) with men reacted positively in 66% of cases and emotionally negatively in only 18%. Similarly, older boys (15–17) with men reacted positively in 61% of cases and emotionally negative in 11%. These reaction profiles were essentially the same as in the case of adult men having their first experience with other men (68% positive; 10% emotionally negative). Additionally, reactions were mostly positive and infrequently emotionally negative under conditions of greater “seriousness” (e.g., penetration, prostitution) on the one hand, and not inferior to the reaction profiles under conditions of lesser “seriousness” (e.g., outercourse, friendship) on the other. Moreover, prison participants were rarely forced in their minor–adult contacts and were forced no more often than general participants—use of force is an empirically well-established seriousness factor (Rind et al., 1998).

Again, “positive” reactions were defined as those in which participants indicated that they enjoyed the experience “much,” whereas emotionally negative reactions were those that elicited reactions such as shock, disgust, or guilt—the types of response expectable to a psychologically traumatic event. Thus, if the events had, in fact, been essentially traumatic, the data based on these measures should have shown it, and more so for prison participants. Given that the data did not, the conclusion is that the CSA–trauma–crime view does not apply to the Kinsey male prison sample.

It has been well documented that minor–adult sex in our society is correlated with other factors (e.g., poor family and peer environment) (Rind et al., 1998). These latter factors tend to promote counternormative behavior (e.g., minor–adult sex), and also tend to lead to poorer later adjustment (e.g., criminal behavior), such that the correlation between minor–adult sex and later problem behavior may be spurious (Rind et al., 2001). Therefore, based on the findings in the current study regarding first postpubertal minor–adult same-sex sexual experiences, the criminal behavior in the Kinsey prison sample may be more parsimoniously attributed to background factors other than postpubertal minor–adult same-sex sex. Moreover, the current results alert that the trauma postulated in the CSA–trauma–crime link needs verification in empirical research rather than just being assumed, and they indicate that greater attention to confounding variables as the explanatory drivers is also needed.¹⁸

¹⁸ The genetic-evolutionary perspective, recently gaining within criminology, also offers important alternative explanations for the CSA–crime link (e.g., Barnes, Boutwell, Beaver, Gibson, & Wright, 2014; Barnes, Boutwell, & Beaver, 2016; Ferguson, 2010; Fox, 2017). This view emphasizes that mainstream psychological and criminological research has focused too heavily on social-environmental causes of antisocial (and other) behavior, at the expense of genetic-evolutionary considerations. Numerous recent meta-analyses, however, have demonstrated a greater contribution of genetic (i.e., heritable) sources to antisocial behavior than shared- or unique-environmental sources.

Replication/Extension of Rind and Welter (2016)

The present study was also undertaken to examine another male same-sex sample in terms of reactions to minor–adult sexual experiences, thus adding to a recent but growing literature. More immediately, it was of interest to compare the experiences of members from this sample (i.e., Kinsey prisoners) with those of Kinsey general participants. The comparison showed that reaction patterns were essentially the same in the two same-sex samples, permitting combining the results for a stronger overall estimate of reaction patterns in Kinsey’s day. The general same-sex sample contained $n = 122$ cases of adolescent minor–adult same-sex sexual experiences, for which there were reaction data. As Rind and Welter (2016) noted, this was the largest number of such cases reported in the literature up to that time. In the prison same-sex sample analyzed here, there were $n = 228$ additional such cases, nearly double the general number. Combining them in the present study resulted in $n = 350$ cases of adolescent boys with men, for which there were reaction data—by far the largest in the literature. This huge number of cases, coming from an important sample, highlights the value of the current results for attempting to understand this phenomenon.

Combined results were that 70% of younger adolescent boys (≤ 14) with men reacted positively and 18% reacted emotionally negatively. The same basic pattern obtained among older adolescent boys (15–17) with men (61 and 10%, respectively) and men with men (68 and 14%, respectively). The predominance of positive reactions and infrequency of emotionally negative reactions in the minor–adult contacts sharply misfits the CSA model, which assumes intrinsic trauma (Clancy, 2009; Jenkins, 1998). The comparability between the adolescent minor–adult and adult–adult sexual experience suggests that the former type of relationship is not essentially outside the bounds of normal experience, contrary to how it is usually portrayed today (Jenkins, 2006).

Also worthy of note are the other analyses of reactions based on combining the two same-sex samples. First, immaturity was clearly not a disadvantage in terms of reactions, contrary to widespread assumptions that emphasize full maturity (e.g., physical, emotional, cognitive) as a prerequisite for non-problematic response whenever an age discrepancy is present. In a linear trend, preteen adolescent boys enjoyed “much” their age-discrepant experiences the most often, followed by early teen boys and then by mid-teen boys (77, 66, and 61%, respectively). Proportions of emotionally negative reactions were small and the same across these three groups. These results,

Footnote 18 (continued)

In this view, child maltreatment, including CSA, may emerge from genetic factors (which bias exposure to social-environmental experiences such as child maltreatment), and as such may be only correlated with rather than causative of later antisocial behavior.

at odds with conventional thinking today, are nevertheless consistent with the findings and observations made by Kinsey et al. (1948) and Gebhard, Gagnon, Pomeroy, and Christenson (1965). Both sets of Kinsey researchers discussed the sizable potential in early postpubertal boys to be highly responsive to erotic activity, a potential much stronger than in postpubertal girls and one equaling if not exceeding that in adult males. As per these authors, this potential is not limited to heterosexual outlet, but extends to same-sex sexual experiences with peers or older males under certain conditions, the kinds often in place in Kinsey's day (Rind & Welter, 2016). The mostly positive pattern found here is also consistent with results from non-clinical studies focusing on sexual relations between adolescent boys and men (e.g., Money & Weinrich, 1983; Rind, 2001; Sandfort, 1984; Tindall, 1978). Notably, all these studies provided detailed case summaries that helped to clarify narratively why the relations were often reacted to positively.

In the combined-samples analysis, also noteworthy is that more invasive (a.k.a. "serious") sexual techniques in minor–adult contacts were not experienced more traumatically, as would be expected under the CSA view. On the contrary, they were experienced increasingly *less* emotionally negatively in linear fashion the more invasive the technique—there were *no* cases of emotionally negative response in the most invasive technique (i.e., anal intercourse). In the two minor–adult groups combined, this last technique was experienced positively in three-quarters of cases. Invasiveness of technique is frequently cited in the CSA literature as an important aggravating factor, but generally based on moral grounds (Rind et al., 1998). The present study adds important empirical findings, which dispute the conventional view. It could be that more invasive techniques were employed when the minor was more interested or his relationship with the partner was friendlier, thereby reducing or avoiding circumstances that elicit negative reactions. Future research would be needed to verify this conjecture.

In the minor–adult contacts, no significant differences in reactions as a function of sexual orientation based on Kinsey self-ratings occurred. When sexual arousal on seeing another male was used as the measure, participants with such arousal involved in minor (≤ 14)–adult contacts did have more positive reactions than those without this arousal. Nevertheless, most of the latter group still also reacted positively. No other differences on this measure emerged. Overall then, notable is that heterosexual males, as indicated by these measures, mostly reacted positively and infrequently reacted emotionally negatively to minor–adult same-sex sexual experiences.

Cultural Perspective

The positive reaction profile obtained in the case of minor–adult contacts, particularly those involving heterosexual participants, needs discussion. To the modern eye, under

the influence of four decades of media exposure to the sexual abuse narrative (Jenkins, 1998, 2006), quite an opposite pattern of reactions would have been expected. Rind and Welter (2016) attempted to reconcile the actual findings in the Kinsey data with present-day assumptions by taking culture into account, following the lead of Carballo-Diéguez et al. (2012) and Dolezal et al. (2014), who showed, using same-sex samples from South and North America, the importance of culture in explaining reactions to minor–adult same-sex sexual experiences.

Briefly, before the 1960s, and especially before World War II, when Kinsey's participants had their minor–adult same-sex sexual experiences, the following cultural differences acted to facilitate postpubertal male same-sex sexual behavior, particularly between adolescents and between adolescents and adults (Kinsey et al., 1948). First, unmarried postpubertal males were more homosocial (i.e., they socialized more with other males and less with females, where access was more restricted), which increased opportunities for same-sex sex (Dennis, 2007). Second, these homosocial interactions were less restricted by age, as they are today, such that opportunities for minor–adult sex were increased (Boag, 2003; Chauncey, 1994). Third, this greater opportunity for same-sex contacts and lesser opportunity for heterosexual contacts interacted with adolescent males' natural erotic potential (Gebhard et al., 1965) to produce greater levels of minor–adult same-sex contacts, just as these factors have done cross-culturally (Ford & Beach, 1951; Greenberg, 1988). Fourth, such contacts also tended not to be short-circuited by powerful inhibitory cultural currents, which obtain today. One of these was the lack of the use of the term "gay," which only came into popular use after World War II, and when it did, had a suppressing effect on same-sex experimentation because it tended to threaten male (especially heterosexual) sexual identity (Chauncey, 1994; Laumann et al., 1994). Another was the absence of any significant "sexual abuse" discourse, which similarly has had a dampening effect on the occurrence of minor–adult contacts and has tended to color them more negatively when they do occur. In short, in Kinsey's day, male adolescent eroticism could more readily find release in minor–adult contacts, which were less subject to problematic response owing to key cultural-discursive differences.

Conclusions

The current study adds to the growing literature based on male same-sex samples, which has interrogated strongly held assumptions in the CSA field such as that trauma is basic to minor–adult sex in all its forms. The current results reinforce the conclusion that the CSA view is untenable, particularly as applied to minor–adult sex in the male same-sex population. The postpubertal minor–adult sexual experiences examined here were mostly positive, infrequently emotionally negative,

and thus sizably at odds with the CSA view. Even though the current study focused on a prison same-sex sample, reaction patterns were the same as Kinsey's corresponding general (i.e., non-prison) same-sex sample. This comparability may be due to different cultural conditions in Kinsey's day. In short, results from this male prison same-sex sample, added to results from the series of male non-clinical, non-forensic same-sex samples analyzed since 2000, indicate that male minor–adult same-sex sexual interactions in this population have a sizable nonnegative potential. Because the highly positive reaction profiles obtained here concerned postpubertal sexual experiences of males defined as gay or bisexual, or heterosexual with extensive postpubertal same-sex sexual experience, they should not be generalized to other kinds of cases (e.g., heterosexual males with a one-time minor–adult same-sex contact; prepubertal contacts) without further study.

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 was not an issue.

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.
- Barnes, J. C., Boutwell, B. B., & Beaver, K. M. (2016). Contemporary biosocial criminology: A systematic review of the literature, 2000–2012. In A. R. Piquero (Ed.), *The handbook of criminological theory* (pp. 75–99). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Barnes, J. C., Boutwell, B. B., Beaver, K. M., Gibson, C. L., & Wright, J. P. (2014). On the consequences of ignoring genetic influences in criminological research. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42, 471–482.
- 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.
- Cuadra, L. E., Jaffe, A. E., Thomas, R., & DiLillo, D. (2014). Child maltreatment and adult criminal behavior: Does criminal thinking explain the association? *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 38, 1399–1408.
- 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., Mabraga, 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 and Neglect*, 38, 271–279.
- English, D. J., Widom, C. S., & Brandford, C. (2002). *Childhood victimization and delinquency, adult criminality, and violent criminal behavior: A replication and extension, final report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Ferguson, C. J. (2010). Genetic contributions to antisocial personality and behavior: A meta-analytic review (1996–2006) from an evolutionary perspective. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 150, 160–180.
- Field, A. P. (2013). *Discovering statistics using SPSS: And sex and drugs and rock 'n' role* (4th ed.). London: Sage.
- Ford, C., & Beach, F. (1951). *Patterns of sexual behavior*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Fox, B. (2017). It's nature and nurture: Integrating biology and genetics into the social learning theory of criminal behavior. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 49, 22–31.
- 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, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 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.
- Jung, H., Herrenkohl, T. I., Lee, J. O., Klika, B., & Skinner, M. L. (2015). Effects of physical and emotional child abuse and its chronicity on crime into adulthood. *Violence and Victims*, 30, 1004–1018.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. 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.
- Mersky, J. P., Topitzes, J., & Reynolds, A. J. (2002). Unsafe at any age: Linking childhood and adolescent maltreatment to delinquency and crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 49, 295–318.
- Metha, C. R., & Patel, N. R. (2011). *IBM SPSS exact tests*. New York: IBM Corporation.
- Money, J., & Weinrich, J. D. (1983). Juvenile, pedophile, heterophile: Hermeneutics of science, medicine and law in two outcome studies. *International Journal of Medicine and Law*, 2, 39–54.
- 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., 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., 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. (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.
- Rosner, B. (2000). *Fundamentals of biostatistics* (5th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Duxbury.

- 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.
- Widom, C. S. (1996). Child sexual abuse and its criminal consequences. *Society*, 33, 47–53.
- Wolff, N., & Shi, J. (2012). Childhood and adult trauma experiences of incarcerated persons and their relationship to adult behavioral health problems and treatment. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 9, 1908–1926.