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Many individuals commonly experience sexual coercion. Considerable research has been conducted on sexual coercion, however much of this research has focused on sexual coercion within Western Cultures. The lack of research on cultures outside of Western societies calls for cross-cultural studies that examine sexual coercion in non-Western settings. The present study investigated cross-cultural differences in sexual coercion in the United States and Korea. Cultural variability dimensions such as individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, and power distance will be utilized as a framework for exploring possible influences on prevalence, perceptions, and consequences of sexual coercion. College-aged students from the United States (N=200) and Korea (N=188) were surveyed. Specifically, the following hypotheses and research questions were posed: (H1) Sexual coercion prevalence is higher among acquaintances and romantic partners compared to strangers, independent of culture; (RQ1) Does prevalence of sexual coercion (e.g., victimization and perpetration) differ by culture?; (RQ2) Are there sex differences in prevalence of sexual coercion (e.g., victimization and perpetration) across cultures?; (H2) Participants report being recipients of more psychological tactics than physical tactics, regardless of culture; (H3) Collectivism is correlated positively with the use of psychological tactics; (H4) Korean participants report being recipients of more psychological tactics than US participants; (RQ3) What is the relationship between the dimensions of cultural variability and the sexual coercion tactics used, such as (a) psychological, (b) deception, (c) mild force, and (d) severe force?; (R4) What types of cultural differences exist in receiving sexual coercion tactics, such as (a) psychological, (b) deception, (c) mild force, and (d) severe force?; (H5) Participants are less likely to perceive sexual coercion if perpetrators used psychologically coercive tactics than physically coercive tactics regardless of culture; (H6) Participants are more likely to perceive sexual coercion if perpetrators are strangers than if people are more well-known independent of culture; (H7) Collectivism is negatively related to perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration; and (H8) victimization; (H9) Masculinity is negatively related to perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration; and (H10) victimization; (H11) Power distance is negatively associated with perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration; and (H12) victimization; (H13) Recipients of sexual coercion are more likely to experience negative psychological outcomes than physical outcomes; (RQ5) What cultural differences exist in (a) anticipated outcomes and (b) actual consequences of sexual coercion?; and (RQ6) What sex differences, if any, exist in reported consequences of sexual coercion across cultures? Overall, participants from the US and Korea differed in reporting sexual
coercion experiences, victimization and perpetration, being recipients of different tactics of sexual coercion, and experiencing different sexual outcomes/consequences.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There is considerable research on sexual coercion and this research has provided details about its prevalence, perceptions, and consequences. Researchers have consistently found that over half of college females have been recipients of coercive sexual encounters (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004; Lottes & Weinberg, 1997; Struckman-Johnson, Struckman-Johnson, & Anderson, 2003). Moreover, males are also experiencing sexual coercion (Russell & Oswald, 2002; Spitzberg, 1999). We know that there are negative consequences of sexual coercion as well. Sexually coerced individuals tend to be recipients of unwanted sexual acts or sexual violence (Fisher, Daigle, Cullen, & Turner, 2003), can develop a lack of trust in others (Busby & Compton, 1997), and rarely seek help or are unaware that their experiences are categorized as one of sexual violence (Fisher et al., 2003).

While there is considerable knowledge about this concept, sexual coercion from different cultural frameworks is barely assessed. Cross-cultural research indicates that cultures differ in their attitudes, values, beliefs, and behaviors (Hofstede, 2001). These cultural differences are often explained by Hofstede’s (2001) dimensions of cultural variability (i.e., individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, uncertainty avoidance, power distance) (Hofstede, 2001). Existing communication research has found cultural differences in: self-disclosure (Yum & Hara, 2005), conflict management and communication styles (Trubisky, Ting-Toomey, & Lin, 1991), and emotional verbal and non-verbal reactions (Fernandez, Carrera, Sanchez, Paez, & Candia, 2000), thus, it is also plausible that cultural differences in sexual coercion exist as well. Given cultural differences found in other communication behaviors, an examination of sexual coercion in different cultures is needed. Thus, the purpose of the present study is to investigate cultural differences in the prevalence, perceptions, and consequences of sexual coercion in the United States and Korea.
DEFINING SEXUAL COERCION

Sexual coercion is not defined in a word or two; rather sexual coercion has been defined using many different terms and these terms, in turn, have been assessed along a continuum. According to Spitzberg (1998), sexually coercive acts can be examined on a continuum (see Figure 1) that ranges in the degree of violation of sexual consent (i.e., rape, sexual pressure, unwanted sex, deceptive sex, foregone sex) and choice (i.e., refused sex, token resistance, foregone sex). For the purpose of this study, only sexually coercive force that is “sexual pressure,” “unwanted sex,” and “deceptive sex” will be examined. Most existing research focuses on these three types of sexual coercion and these concepts are frequently discussed in definitions on sexual coercion (see Bay-Cheng & Eliseo-Arras, 2008; Koss & Oros, 1982; Lottes & Weinberg, 1997; Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988). Each concept will be defined in the following paragraph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rape Attempted</th>
<th>Sexual Contact</th>
<th>Sexual Pressure</th>
<th>Unwanted Sex</th>
<th>Deceptive Sex</th>
<th>Consensual Sex</th>
<th>Refused Sex</th>
<th>Token Resistance</th>
<th>Foregone Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIOLATED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONCONSENT</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>ACQUIESCENCE</td>
<td>CONSENT</td>
<td>NONCONSENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Sexual pressure consists of implicit and explicit messages that one should have intercourse with another even though it is not mutually desired (Spitzberg, 1998). For instance, when perpetrators say “if you love me, you will have sex with me,” this is an explicit form of sexual pressure. Also, when perpetrators say “other couples usually have sex when they go out for a month,” this is an implicit form of sexual pressure. Unwanted sex refers to engagement in sexual acts without willingness and with obvious resistance (Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988; Murnen, Perot, & Byrne, 1989). For example, if one partner is not interested in having sex but engages in it to please the other person (e.g., “I will have sex with him, so he will not be angry with me”) this could be considered an unwanted sexual experience. Deceptive sex involves manipulation by perpetrators to mislead their victims (Spitzberg, 1998). For instance, one partner could lie about his/her feelings or the
relationship and say things like “I am in love with you,” or “we will be official after having sex” to gain sexual acts from his/her partner.

Sexual coercion is often interpreted in terms of the specific tactics that are used. Specifically, it is often defined in terms of the various psychological, verbal, and physical tactics employed by perpetrators (Breitenbecher, 1999; Shackelford & Goetz, 2004). The use of physical force (e.g., pushing) is one of several sexually coercive acts. However, most researchers indicate that sexual coercion is more often identified with the use of psychological and verbal tactics, consisting of social threats (e.g., I will tell your friends that you are gay if you do not have sex with me), interpersonal threats (e.g., if you love me, why not?), and physical threats (e.g., I will hit you) (Christopher, 2001; Christopher & Kisler, 2004). Social and interpersonal threats become psychologically frightening for an individual since they endanger his/her social status and reputation (Christopher & Kisler, 2004). Psychological tactics of sexual coercion are difficult to measure since there are individual differences in perception (Christopher & Kisler, 2004). That is, both perpetrators and victims rarely perceive or label an incidence as sexually coercive when psychological coercion is used unlike instances when physical coercion is used (Byers & O’Sullivan, 1998). Often psychological coercion consists of words, such as pressure and threats, which appear simultaneously on the list of verbally coercive tactics, thus there is an overlap (Byers & O’Sullivan, 1998). Therefore, psychological and verbal coercive tactics will be considered similarly in the present study.

Most perpetrators use a combination of consistent pressure, threats and/or force to sexually coerce reluctant recipients (Byers & O’Sullivan, 1998; Kamath & Raghavan, 2007). Thus, any attempts or actual acts of forcing someone against their will to obtain sexual acts with various tactics (i.e., physical violence, verbal insistence, deception, or cultural expectation) could be viewed as sexual coercion (Heise, Moore, & Toubia, 1995). As indicated previously, there are various ways to define sexual coercion, but the current study defines sexual coercion as verbal or nonverbal behaviors designed to get another person to engage in unwanted sexual behavior.
**Dimensions of Cultural Variability**

Values, attitudes, and beliefs of a particular cultural entity considerably influence individuals’ perceptions and behaviors (Hofstede, 2001). This influence should also affect perceptions of human sexual behavior (Hardman & Heidelberg, 1996). That is, what is considered less sexually acceptable in one culture might be considered suitable in another culture. To illustrate, Luthar and Luthar (2002) state that if one is living in a place where sexually harassing behaviors are viewed as less serious or normative, potential perpetrators might view sexual harassment as not being harmful or negative. Thus, potential perpetrators might perceive that it is acceptable to engage in these behaviors without receiving punitive treatment consistent with other sexual crimes (e.g., rape). Moreover, individuals’ respective cultural traits would decide whether they would perceive certain types of behaviors as sexually harassing or not (Zimbroff, 2007). Since beliefs and value systems differ from culture to culture, individuals from different cultures might discern sexual coercion dissimilarly. Utilizing Hofstede’s dimensions of cultural variability (2001) as a framework, there are three dimensions that appear to be applicable to the study of cross-cultural differences in sexual coercion: individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, and power distance.

**Individualism-Collectivism**

The dimension of individualism-collectivism focuses on the role of the individual in the group. Individualism pertains to a strong sense of independence and prioritizes the individual over the group, while collectivism values harmony with others and focuses on unconditional loyalty to group members (Hofstede, 2001). Furthermore, individualism values uniqueness, competition with others, and direct communication (Hofstede, 2001). In contrast, collectivism appreciates sense of belongingness, harmony with the group, and indirect communication (Hofstede, 2001). The US is typically categorized as a highly individualistic culture, with a score of 90 on Hofstede’s individualism-collectivism scale, while South Korea is identified as a highly collectivistic culture, with a score of 18 (Hofstede, 2001).
**Masculinity-Femininity**

The dimension of masculinity-femininity explains how gender roles are viewed in different cultures (Hofstede, 2001). In highly masculine cultures, there are clearly defined expectations of gender roles. Specifically, females are expected to be nurturing and tender, while males are expected to be decisive and tough. Moreover, males are supposed to be assertive and focused on material success while females are to be modest and concerned with the quality of life. In highly feminine cultures, there is gender equality. Specifically, there are no clearly defined roles for males and females; thus, in highly feminine cultures both men and women are expected to be modest and tender (Hofstede, 2001). Masculinity-femininity as a dimension clearly indicates that males differ on this cultural dimension (i.e., highly masculine culture vs. highly feminine culture), however it is important to note that the expectations for females across cultures seem to be consistent (Hofstede, 2001). According to the Masculinity-Femininity Index (Hofstede, 2001), both the US and South Korea are identified as masculine cultures with the US identified as a more masculine country (50) than South Korea (39).

**Power Distance**

Power Distance refers to the existence and acceptance of an asymmetrical power structure within a society (Hofstede, 2001). Power distance not only refers to inequality within organizations, but also within many layers of societies (e.g., home, school, religious settings) (Hofstede, 2001). Members of a high power distance culture accept that uneven distribution of wealth, power, and prestige exists within the society. In high power distance cultures, members do not question the decisions of authority figures (Hofstede, 2001). For example, followers will not articulate disagreement with leaders for fear of consequences, such as causing conflicts or feeling shame (Antonakis & Atwater, 2002). In low power distance cultures, there are loose and decentralized hierarchies (Hofstede, 2001). The stratification of society is less distinct and people lean towards egalitarianism (Hofstede, 2001). For instance, both leaders and followers are considered equal or nearly equal, thus they tend to share blame and communicate with each other to manage conflicts (Sagie & Aycan, 2003). There is an inherent belief in low power distance cultures that every member of the society is equal (Hofstede, 2001). The US and South Korea differ on the dimension of
power distance. Specifically, the US is considered a low power distance culture (40) while South Korea is considered a high power distance culture (60) (Hofstede, 2001).

The dimensions of cultural variability developed by Hofstede are useful for understanding cross-cultural differences in perceptions and behaviors, specifically sexual behavior. According to Straus (2004a), human sexuality has complicated meaning for diverse individuals and societies. Sexual behavior of intimate partners could be interpreted and perceived very differently. There could be huge individual differences in terms of perception when negative behavior, such as sexual aggression is presented (Straus, 2004a). This could be more salient when individuals share dissimilar values and thoughts. Thus, potential cross-cultural differences in sexual aggressiveness should be understood by applying Hofstede’s cultural dimensions. Each dimension and its potential for understanding sexually coercive behaviors will be discussed to identify differences across cultures in terms of prevalence, perceptions, and consequences.

**Prevalence of Sexual Coercion**

While individuals of various age groups may experience sexual coercion, young adults (i.e., college students between 18-24 years) easily become targets of sexual coercion due to factors such as: alcohol consumption, partying, desire for independence from parents, and initiation of intimate and romantic life with their partners (Farris, Treat, & Viken, 2010). Age is a major factor associated with sexually aggressive behaviors with rates of sexual victimization being much higher among college students than the general population (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). Crown and Roberts (2007) found that as many as 30% of college students experience unwanted sexual interaction within the first academic year, and up to 50% during their entire academic career. Although sexual coercion could be experienced by a diverse cross-section of people, increasing experiences of sexual coercion among college students are much more predominant across the nation. Therefore, this study is focused on sexual coercion amongst college-goers.

Men and women have been reported to be perpetrators and victims of sexual coercion. Research shows that both men and women have engaged in some form of sexual aggression (e.g., verbal or physical) in college (White, Holland, Mazurek, & Lyndon, 1998; White & Koss, 1991). Schatzel-Murphy, Harris, Knight, and Millburn (2009) found that both
male and female college students engage in coercive behavior to maintain a sense of power and control in their relationships. In a summary of dozens of studies, Spitzberg (1999) estimated that about 25% of females and 23% of males have reported experiencing sexual coercion. Moreover, Calhoun, Bernat, Clum, and Frame (1997) reported that approximately 10% of both college males and females have experienced some type of sexual coercion. Despite research indicating that both males and females are victims of sexual coercion, considerable research suggests that males are most often perpetrators and females are most often victims (see Ben-David & Schneider, 2005; Simonson & Subich, 1999; Whatley, 2005; White & Robinson Kurpius, 2002). To illustrate, Baier, Rosenzweig, and Whipple (1991) found that nearly 15% of the college-going males and 60% of college-going females have experienced sexual coercion. Moreover, Struckman-Johnson and colleagues (2003) observed that more than half of college-going girls encounter sexual coercion victimization.

Sexual coercion is more likely to occur within interpersonal relationships. Perpetrators of sexual violence tend to be identified as someone close to victims (i.e., acquaintances, romantic partners) and not strangers to them (Byers, 1996; Chan, Straus, Brownridge, Tiwari, & Leung, 2008; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003; Testa & Livingston, 1999; Waldner-Haugrud & Magruder, 1995). According to Koss, Dinero, and Seibel (1988), more than 50% of their participants reported sexual assault being experienced with a person they knew well. Most recipients of sexual coercion report their perpetrators were current dating partners or someone they used to be in a relationship with (Sampson, 2002; Shackelford & Goetz, 2004; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003; Ward, Chapman, Cohn, White, & Williams, 1991). Moreover, sexually coerced individuals reported far more of their romantic partners as perpetrators than someone they just knew or were not familiar with (Impett & Peplau, 2002; Koss et al., 1988; Lloyd & Emery, 2000). In their national-level study, Tjaden and Thoennes (2000) found that 31% of their college sample reported being sexually harassed and/or assaulted by their significant others. Similar numbers for sexual violence victimization by intimate partners was reported (i.e., approximately 1/3 of victims reported the incidence) by Smith, White, and Holland (2003).

A limited number of cross-cultural studies examining the prevalence of unwanted sexual behavior have been conducted (e.g., Hines, 2007; Lottes & Weinberg, 1997). A cross-national study on the prevalence of sexual assault among college students indicates that
27.5% of the participants surveyed in Canada, Korea, New Zealand, the UK, and the US reported being victims of sexual assaults and identified the perpetrators as someone they have known for some period of time (Heise, Pitanguy, & Germain, 1994; Heise, Raikes, Watts, & Zwi, 1994). Another international comparative study assessing intimate partner violence among college students from 31 universities across 16 nations found that approximately 30% of the participants have been assaulted and harassed by their dating partners independent of gender and culture (Straus, 2004b). Based on what research indicates about prevalence of sexual coercion, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H1**: Sexual coercion prevalence is higher among acquaintances and romantic partners compared to strangers, independent of culture.

Although there is some research assessing cross-cultural differences in prevalence of sexual coercion in terms of the type of relationship with the perpetrator, less is known about cultural differences in the reported frequency of perpetration and victimization. That is, the majority of existing research is based on statistics from the United States. When one considers cultural differences, it might be the case that cultures vary in prevalence (or reporting frequency) of sexual coercion. Subsequently, differences might be found in collectivistic cultures like Korea. To illustrate, Triandis (1994) indicates that collectivists object to confrontation, conflict, as well as broaching sensitive topics. Moreover, when collectivists are dissatisfied with another’s deeds, they tend to remain silent (Marin & Marin, 1991). Ting-Toomey et al. (1991) contend that collectivists do not highlight others’ negative behaviors in order to help them “save face.” Consequently, these collectivistic tendencies appear to influence sexual behaviors as well.

Since collectivistic cultures are framed with tight social bonds, Patel (2003) suggests that recipients of sexual violence are less likely to report their experiences officially (i.e., to a law enforcement organization, center for sexual violence). Wasti and Cortina (2002) found that collectivistic concerns for harmonious relationships with others were positively correlated with the recipients’ reliance on exclusive in-group supportive coping methods when sexually harassed. That is, collectivists tended to seek more in-group (i.e., friends, family members) support when they needed people to talk about their problems and concerns with instead of seeking help from outside (e.g., counseling personnel, law enforcement officers). In most cases, collectivists conceal mistakes of others, try to satisfy in-group
interests, and detest making a big deal out of it. Such characteristics influence recipients to not report their partners’ sexually harassing behaviors (Patel, 2003). Although it is difficult for many people to admit being victimized by someone they know, it would be even more difficult for people from reserved cultures. Yoshihama, Parekh, and Boyington (1991) found that compared to their individualistic White participants, collectivistic Asian participants were reluctant to discuss their private sexual relationships in public due to their cultural traditions.

These results are reflective of the nature of collectivistic cultures. In an effort not to lose relationships with others and to maintain harmony, it is possible that collectivistic individuals are more likely to experience unwanted sexual acts. Moreover, most research on victimization and perpetration collected using US samples showed that more males are perpetrators and females are victims, but there is a lack of existing cross-cultural research that allows for these findings to be generalized. Therefore, the following research questions are posed:

RQ1: Does prevalence of sexual coercion (e.g., victimization and perpetration) differ by culture?

RQ2: Are there sex differences in prevalence of sexual coercion (e.g., victimization and perpetration) across cultures?

**TACTICS OF SEXUAL COERCION**

Individuals adopt a variety of tactics to coerce others sexually. As indicated previously, sexual coercion is often distinguished in terms of psychological (including verbal) and physical tactics (Shackelford & Goetz, 2004). Physical tactics involve actual hitting, pushing, choking, and/or physically restrain victims; while psychological tactics involve pressure, verbal persistence, deception, and/or threats to the relationships with others or their own (Christopher & Frandsen, 1990; Craig, 1990; Kamath & Raghavan, 2007; Shackelford & Goetz, 2004; Spitzberg, 1998; Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999). Although physical tactics are used, perpetrators often adopt psychological coercion to pressure victims to engage in sexual acts. Craig, Kalichman, and Follingstad (1989) found that 42% of the perpetrators in their study had engaged in verbalized sexual coercion. Moreover, Gidycz, Warkentin, and Orchowski (2007) indicated that 84% of perpetrators reported using
psychologically aggressive behaviors (e.g., threatening victims or saying something to pressure victims to have sex) on targets in the past. Also, in a follow-up study, Gidycz et al. (2007) revealed that people indicated engaging in less physically aggressive behaviors (10%) and more psychologically aggressive behaviors (74%). Overall, verbal and psychological coercion are used more predominantly than actual physical force (Gavey, 1992; Koss & Oros 1982; Livingston, Buddie, Testa, & VanZile-Tamsen, 2004; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003; Testa & Dermen, 1999).

Both men and women appear to prefer engagement in psychological (and verbal) coercive tactics. Hines and Saudino (2003) indicated that around 30% of male and 13% of female college students reported using more psychological tactics than physical tactics when engaging in sexual coercion. Poitras and Lavoie (1995) found that 12% of men and 6% of women used verbal coercion or psychological pressure against their intimate courtship partners, while less than 1% of men and no women used authority, 2% of men and no women used substances (i.e., alcohol and/or drugs), and nearly 4% of men and less than 1% of women reported using threats to physically harm others. Among all other types of tactics, verbal persistence is the most frequently used tactic.

There are various reasons why psychological and verbal tactics are used more than physical tactics. Research shows that perpetrators and victims regard psychological/verbal tactics as more effective than aggressive physical tactics (Livingston et al., 2004; Shackelford & Goetz, 2004; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003). According to Byers and Eno (1992), perpetrators of sexual coercion are more likely to adopt specific types of coercive tactics depending on their relationship with potential victims. Specifically, they found that those in dating relationships are more likely to use psychological and verbal tactics (Byers & Eno, 1992). By adopting more subtle forms of coercion instead of explicit physical force, perpetrators might avoid relational issues (e.g., potential breakups which lead problems with mutual friends or close family members) as well as legal issues (e.g., being arrested or accused for committing physical violence) that are associated with sexual violence (Goetz & Shackelford, 2009). Perpetrators also intentionally and unintentionally use threats that imply relational termination to get their way sexually (Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988; Shackelford & Goetz, 2004). Moreover, victims often comply based on these relational termination threats.
because they wish to maintain the relationships and fear losing their significant others (Byers & O’Sullivan, 1998). Given what research indicates, the following hypothesis is posed:

H2: Participants report being recipients of more psychological tactics than physical tactics, regardless of culture.

Tactics used by perpetrators might be reflective of different communication styles. The way individuals choose to communicate with others depends heavily on their cultural norms (Merkin, 2006). Although there is no research assessing differences in sexual coercion tactics across cultures, research investigating cross-cultural differences in communication styles is helpful for suggesting potential differences in tactical use. According to Trubisky et al. (1991), individuals from different cultures use unique communication styles. For that reason, cultural differences in communication styles could potentially influence perpetrators’ use of sexually coercive tactics. In the following paragraphs, cultural differences in communication styles as they relate to sexual coercion will be discussed.

Attributes of individualism-collectivism have been found to affect human communication behaviors (Gudykunst et al., 1996; Triandis, 1995). Individualism and collectivism directly affects the style of communication in each culture because cultural beliefs and norms influence and guide individuals’ behavior in a certain context (Gudykunst et al., 1996). Context refers to the background or the frame where individuals are surrounded and raised in, such as culture (Hall, 1989). According to Hall (1989), cultures can be differentiated in terms of the use of two types of messages. Low-context messages refer to messages that are clear in description, unambiguous, and highly specified (Gudykunst et al., 1996). In contrast, high-context messages are related to a high level of ambiguity and dependency on non-verbal communication (Gudykunst et al., 1996). In individualistic cultures, low-context messages (i.e., direct) are typically preferred and used; thus, the use of precise and functional language is crucial (Hall, 1989). In contrast, collectivistic cultures use high-context messages (i.e., indirect) that are not specifically stated; that is, messages are less likely to be verbalized and might be conveyed nonverbally. Thus, individuals in collectivistic cultures are expected to be intuitive and sensitive towards their surroundings and observant while engaging in communication with others (Hall, 1989). Cultural differences in conflict management are frequently linked to the individualism-collectivism dimension (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002) as well as communication styles (Trubisky et al., 1991).
Research has found that collectivistic cultures communicate indirectly, thus people choose avoidance as a form of conflict management (Merkin, 2006). In contrast, individualistic cultures communicate directly, thus choosing confrontation as a style for handling conflicts (Merkin, 2006).

Individualism and collectivism, high- and low-context messages, and conflict management styles might have considerable influence on the types of sexual coercion tactics. To illustrate, Hernandez and Mendoza (2009), in their examination of sexual coercion among Mexicans, found that most male perpetrators used indirect tactics to coerce female victims to engage in sexual acts. They suggest that this tactical style choice is consistent with Mexican culture which is collectivistic and tends to prefer the use of high-context messages. In comparing tactics used to manage contradictory situations, Merkin (2009a) found that Korean participants, compared to their American participants, mainly used indirect communication and avoidance tactics. This should also extend itself to the engagement in sexual coercion tactics as well. Therefore, the following hypotheses are posed:

H₃: Collectivism is correlated positively with the use of psychological tactics.
H₄: Korean participants report being recipients of more psychological tactics than US participants.

Similar to individualism and collectivism, power difference within a culture has been frequently linked to different communication behaviors as well. In cultures where there is a strong power distance (i.e., a high power distance culture), use of indirect communication is preferred to manage conflicts (Merkin, 2006). Specifically, using direct and explicit styles of communication in controversial situations (e.g., accusing a husband or a company boss of sexual harassment) threatens the face of self and others. Therefore, individuals in high power distance cultures might avoid speaking out against those who are in higher positions than them. To illustrate, Hernandez and Mendoza (2009) assert that sexual coercion tactical choices in Mexico (i.e., a high power distance, high masculine culture) might be derived from a difference in power structure and privilege. The study found that participants reported receiving more subtle indirect tactics (Hernandez & Mendoza, 2009) which is consistent with research indicating that high power distance cultures prefer to use indirect strategies of communication when resolving conflict. Specifically, Fu and Yukl (2000) found that American managers considered the use of direct rational persuasion as a highly effective
tactic, while Chinese regarded the use of same tactic as undesirable and less effective. This difference in preference and choice of using specific types of tactical communication were influenced from societal customs in terms of which types of tactical influences were effective and used more often by far within a society with different power. Moreover, the way in which males and females have been socialized in society might influence the use of specific strategies. For instance, since traditional sexual scripts are adhered to in Mexico leads males to expect sexual access to females, men are more likely to use culturally acceptable strategic communication (i.e., indirect and subtle forms of coercion) to gain sexual acts (Hernandez & Mendoza, 2009). Power differences and expected cultural scripts within a society might influence acceptance of sexual behaviors, and this also might explain preferences and the choice of tactics. Based on the cultural differences in communication styles and its relation to tactical use of sexual coercion, the following research questions are asked:

RQ3: What is the relationship between the dimensions of cultural variability and the sexual coercion tactics used, such as (a) psychological, (b) deception, (c) mild force, and (d) severe force?
RQ4: What types of cultural differences exist in sexual coercion tactics experienced, such as (a) psychological, (b) deception, (c) mild force, and (d) severe force?

PERCEPTIONS OF SEXUAL COERCION

Sexual coercion is a subjective phenomenon. Countless behaviors could be interpreted as sexual coercion depending on the individual. The main factor that decides whether what happened is sexual coercion or not is the perception of the victim (Lengnick-Hall, 1995). Research indicates that perceptions of severity vary based on the type of coercion used as well as the relationship between victims and perpetrators. Psychological/verbal coercion is perceived differently than physical coercion. To illustrate, recipients of sexual coercion perceive psychological coercion as less violent than coercion via physical force because it is thought that psychologically coerced recipients have the ability to resist sexual pressure and stop the perpetrators at any time if they wish compared to physically coerced recipients (Katz, Carino, & Hilton, 2002). Miller (2009) found that psychological force, especially verbal coercion, is viewed as less aggressive and more resistible than physical force. Moreover, Wilkinson (2008) indicated that when sexually
coercive situations are framed with less severe forms of coercion (i.e., persuasion or deception), and are committed within close interpersonal relationships (e.g., friendships, romantic relationships), participants rated the coercive acts as not solely the responsibility of the perpetrators and indicated that the perpetrators did not deserve to be punished. Research on intimate partner violence argues that most victims rate the event as less violent than they should or refrain from labeling their experience as “violence” when the assaults were experienced by someone they were familiar with (see Chan et al., 2008; Durant & Carey, 2000; Forbes & Adams-Curtis, 2001; Kalof & Wade, 1995; Metts, Cupach, & Imahori, 1992; Reilly, Lott, Caldwell, & DeLuca, 1992; Smith et al., 2003; Waldner-Haugrud & Magruder, 1995; White et al., 1998). Therefore, depending on the types of tactics and the nature of the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim, perceptions of coercive situations will differ by individuals. Based on these points, the following hypotheses are posed:

H5: Participants are less likely to perceive sexual coercion if perpetrators use psychologically coercive tactics (e.g., verbal persistence) than physically coercive tactics (e.g., hitting), regardless of culture.

H6: Participants are more likely to perceive sexual coercion if perpetrators are strangers than if people are more well-known (e.g., acquaintances or romantic partners), independent of culture.

Socially acceptable behaviors differ by cultures and their norms, thus each culture will perceive sexual behaviors differently. For instance, what could be viewed as harassing behaviors to North American culture could be interpreted as flattering to South American culture (e.g., complementing the physical figure of a stranger on the street) (Merkin, 2009b; Pryor & Whalen, 1997). Hardman and Heidelberg (1996) asserted that general greetings which involve physical contact (i.e., kissing on the cheek, hugging while touching backs) might be perceived as promiscuous and viewed as unacceptable in many East Asian cultures compared to European cultures. Although sexual violence is viewed as problematic, in some African (i.e., Ghana, Nigeria) and Latin American countries sexual assault and harassment are accepted parts of their culture (Gordon, 1991; Hardman & Heidelberg, 1996).

Research on international sexual violence asserts that each culture responds differently in terms of sexual notions and these findings indicate that social behavior and cultural norms are associated (Straus, 2004b). According to research, individualistic and
collectivistic cultures differ in their perceptions of sexual aggression. Applying Hofstede’s
dimension of individualism-collectivism, Straus (2004b) found that people across nations
judge the severity of sexual violence according to their social norms. The study results
showed that minor sexual assaults (e.g., verbal harassment, unwanted sexual looks or
gestures, whistling or kissing sounds) were not harshly taken or not taken as violence at all
for collectivistic cultures though it was the opposite case for individualistic cultures (Straus,
2004b). Luthar and Luthar (2002) also found cultural differences in perception of sexually
harassing behaviors in their scenario study. In their sample, North Americans, Germans, and
Australians (i.e., individualistic cultures) interpreted some sexual behaviors as unpleasant
and obscene while Brazilians (i.e., a collectivistic culture) saw the same behaviors as
seductive and even intimate (Luthar & Luthar, 2002). Kennedy and Gorzalka (2002) found
that Asians, who are generally perceived as collectivistic, are more tolerant of rape myths and
sexually coercive behaviors than non-Asians from their examination of ethnic differences in
sexual aggression. Not only do individualists judge sexual harassment more negatively than
collectivists, individualists and collectivists differ in their attribution of responsibility. To
illustrate, Sigal and colleagues (2005) found that individualists tend to attribute less
responsibility to victims and more to perpetrators than collectivists. In light of this research,
the following hypotheses are posed:

H7: Collectivism is negatively related to perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration.
H8: Collectivism is negatively related to perceptions of sexual coercion victimization.

The dimension of masculinity-femininity can also explain potential differences in
perception of sexual coercion. As indicated previously, cultural variability on the
masculinity-femininity dimension reveals that some cultures have specific expectations for
each gender (i.e., gender roles) which can influence the ways that men and women are
socialized to perceive sexual behaviors. Masculinity includes beliefs about male dominance
and control of female sexuality while femininity is about compliance and female passivity
(Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004). In masculine cultures, men are socialized to be sexually
dominant and women to be sexually submissive (Timmerman & Bajema, 1999; Wasti,
Bergman, Glomb, & Drasgow, 2000). Cultural gender-role scripts emphasizing male power
and female obedience coupled with control of female sexuality is a primary contributor to
male sexual coercion (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004). This extends to how perceptions will
differ from one culture to another.

In masculine cultures, people commonly interpret men’s sexual coercion behaviors as their demonstration of power and control, and this makes the practice of sexual coercion justifiable and acceptable by members of that society (Oswald & Russell, 2006). Cultural scripts regarding sexual behaviors often highlight that males are supposed to be pursuers of sexuality while women should be gatekeepers of sex (Collins, 1998; Lamanna & Riedmann, 2006; Lefkowitz, & Gillen, 2006). Expected gender roles and traditional sex scripts might frame male perpetrators to misperceive sexual behaviors of female victims. Victims in highly masculine cultures perceive perpetrators’ attempts to gaining sexual acts as an expected part of their customs and, therefore are less likely to find problems or accuse perpetrators of sexual violence (Wasti et al., 2000). Based on what research indicates in terms of masculinity-femininity, the following hypotheses are posed:

\[ H_9: \text{Masculinity is negatively related to perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration.} \]

\[ H_{10}: \text{Masculinity is negatively related to perceptions of sexual coercion victimization.} \]

Another dimension of cultural variability that is relevant in explaining potential cultural differences in perceptions of sexual coercion is power distance. Power distance refers to the degree of acceptance of varied social structure and privilege by its members. In high power distance cultures, the more powerful tend to dominate the less powerful, and the less powerful avoid conflict since they are afraid of going against the more powerful (Wasti & Cortina, 2002). When there is high power distance within a culture, the power of higher authority figures is absolute and unquestionable. In a low power distance culture, there is a lateral relationship between the leaders and followers are interdependent and members of the society espouse perceptions of fairness (Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen, & Lowe, 2009).

Perceptions of sexual coercion can be affected by the amount of power distance in a society (White, Donat, & Bondurant, 2001; White & Kowalski, 1998). To illustrate, Fiedler and Blanco (2006) assert that individuals from high power distance cultures (e.g., Japan, Mexico) are likely to define sexual harassment based on the interpretation of the more powerful and follow what the powerful members of society say without doubt or questions; whereas individuals from low power distance cultures (e.g., the US) are more likely to develop their own norms. Thus, different interpretations based on cultural norms influence perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment (Fiedler & Blanco, 2006).
The less powerful victims respond to sexually coercive acts with obscure to moderate reactions (i.e., pushing the perpetrator weakly, indirectly rejecting by saying that they are “not ready”) (Wasti et al. 2000). Research suggests that victims’ weak refusal and mild resistance to coercive acts as well as perpetrators’ practice of power on victims are socially adequate and even desirable (Impett & Peplau, 2002, 2003; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003). Consistent with the traditional sexual scripts within a culture with different power structure, victims will be more likely to agree to unwilling sex and perpetrators will regard feeble responses as token resistance (i.e., “no means yes”) (Byers & Wilson, 1985; Foubert & Perry, 2007; Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988; O’Byrne, Rapley, & Hansen, 2006; Skaine, 1996; Wright, Norton, & Matussek, 2010). Based on the concept of power distance and its relation to perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration and victimization, the following hypotheses are posed:

H11: Power distance is negatively associated with perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration.

H12: Power distance is negatively correlated with perceptions of sexual coercion victimization.

**CONSEQUENCES/OUTCOMES OF SEXUAL COERCION**

There are potentially harmful and negative consequences of sexual coercion; these consequences can be physical, psychological, and relational (Brown, Testa, & Messman-Moore, 2009; Crocker & Kalemba, 1999; de Visser, Rissel, Richters, & Smith, 2007). Physical harms range from injury from threats, unwanted pregnancy, and sexually transmitted diseases (see Arata & Burkhart, 1996; Byers & Eastman, 1979; Byers & O’Sullivan, 1998; Erulkar, 2004; Kamath & Raghavan, 2007). Psychological damages range from nervousness, fear, depression, low self-esteem, low self-efficacy, shame, feelings of hostility, self-blame, to post-traumatic stress-disorder (PTSD) (see Abbey, BeShears, Clinton-Sherrod, & McAuslan, 2004; Craig, 1990; Frieze, 2005; Heise, Ellsberg, & Gottemoeller, 1999; Katz et al., 2002).

There are relational consequences as well, which are often subsumed under psychological consequences. Individuals who experience sexual coercion are less likely to trust others and are prone to having less satisfying relationships (Busby & Compton, 1997).
When the violators are close relational partners, recipients may face problems in their upcoming or future romantic relationships along with other consequences, such as: general distrust in romance, lowered relationship satisfaction, sexual dysfunction, and decreased sexual appetites or satisfaction (Koss et al., 1988; Murmen et al., 1989; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003). Research on sexual violence indicates that victimization from intimate partners is highly correlated with PTSD (Temple, Weston, Rodriguez, & Marshall, 2007; Ullman, Filipas, Townsend, & Starzynski, 2006), chronic depression, and nervousness (Riggs, Kilpatrick, & Resnick, 1992). Moreover, other interpersonal relationships of sexually coerced individuals tend to be disrupted. For example, relationships with their own family members become limited when recipients of sexual violence are not able to get needed support (Abbey et al., 2004; Kamath & Raghavan, 2007; Katz et al., 2002). Although victims suffer from both physical and psychological outcomes/consequences of sexual coercion, psychological damages tend to affect victims more in the long run compared to the physical ones (see Abbey et al., 2004; McBride, Reece, & Sanders, 2008). To illustrate, Katz et al. (2002) found that most victims were able to recover from physical harms but psychological damages ruined their future relationships with others. Based on this existing research, the following is hypothesized:

H13: Recipients of sexual coercion are more likely to experience negative psychological outcomes than physical outcomes.

Outcomes and consequences of sexual coercion might differ across cultures. As indicated previously, victims often experience problems with their other interpersonal relationships (e.g., friends, family members), especially when seeking support after experiencing sexual violence (Campbell, Dworkin, & Cabral, 2009). That is, victims often feel vulnerable in terms of how their networks will react since cultural messages about sexuality (e.g., sexuality of women is bad) tend to blame victims when it comes to sexual violence (i.e., “she asked for it,” “such event will only happen to promiscuous women”) (Faulkner, 2003; Lamanna & Riedmann, 2006). Rather than finding help, victims may experience embarrassment, disbelief, and even rejection that might lead them to develop negative self-appraisals or chronic distress. Viewing victims negatively might result from cultural codes and how each culture views sexual behaviors. Victims are more likely to
blame themselves, especially those from a culture where rape myths are accepted and biases of promiscuous women are prevalent (Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004; Rozee & Koss, 2001).

Research indicates that some cultural dimensions, especially individualism-collectivism affect how individuals in each culture make attributions based on their cultural customs and beliefs (Wang, 1993). Fundamental attribution error, also known as attribution effect or bias, attributes internal factors (i.e., dispositional, thoughts, feelings) for successful events and external factors (i.e., situational, environment) for failing situations (Gilbert & Malone, 1995). Individualists tend to make fundamental attribution errors more than collectivists, meaning that individualists are more likely to view human behaviors and related situations as the result of dispositional factors (O’Sullivan, 2009; Wang, 1993). Collectivists, in contrast, are more likely to engage in the attribution of negative events to external factors (Dolan-Henderson, 2003; Kim & Park, 2010; Wang, 1993). In terms of sexual coercion, collectivists might experience less psychological consequences than individualists because of the attribution bias.

Individualistic and collectivistic cultures also differ in the role that the in-group plays in an individual’s life. As indicated previously, within collectivistic cultures, individuals belong to few ingroups and these groups have considerable influence on their behavior as well as their well-being (Hofstede, 2001). Since group membership is important to collectivists, rejection and ostracism by their group members (e.g., family, friends) could result in more psychological problems for victims of sexual aggression. Victims of sexual violence might be viewed as dishonorable and group members might be upset about the potential harm to the group’s reputation (Hartling & Luchetta, 1999; Pogrebin & Poole, 1990; Rodriguez Mosquera, Manstead, & Fischer, 2002). In contrast to the attribution bias, this suggests that collectivists would experience more psychological consequences from sexual coercion.

Masculinity-femininity as a dimension of cultural variability could also explain potential difference in outcomes/consequences for victims of sexual coercion. Since expectations about gender roles are very clear in masculine cultures, individuals in such cultures might shun victims or hold general disbelief in victimization. Research consistently has found that gender is often the factor attributed to sexual violence victimization (Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1989; Himelein 1995, McMullin, Wirth, & White, 2007; Muehlenhard
& Linton, 1987; Spence, Helmreich, & Holahan, 1979). Most research on sexual violence argues that typical female victim images and traditional sexual scripts condone and support sexual violence against victims, and this could be the main cause of psychological sufferings (e.g., self-blame, shame) for victims (Burt, 1980; Byers, 1996; Humphrey & White, 2000; Koss & Dinero, 1989; Myers, Templer & Brown, 1984; Sarkar & Sarkar, 2005; Twenge, 1997). Although victims suffer consequences across cultures, a more sexually reserved culture might frame female sexuality negatively (e.g., as indecent), thus resulting in a lack of support for victims. Female victims in such cultures might be fearful of societal accusations and, therefore, might be more likely to develop internal problems (e.g., distrust in men, have relational problems) and engage in anti-social behaviors (e.g., avoid engaging in new relationships with others). Thus, cultural differences in viewing sexual behaviors might influence the experience of certain types of consequences/outcomes more than the other. There is a lack of research examining the relationship between ethnic/cultural differences and consequences of sexual coercion, and therefore more research should be conducted across cultures to understand the potential outcomes/consequences of sexual coercion (see Arata, 1999; Campbell, Wasco, Ahrrens, Sefl, & Barnes, 2001; Filipas & Ullman, 2006; McFarlane et al., 2005; Ullman & Brecklin, 2002; Ullman et al., 2006). Thus, the following research question is posed:

RQs: What cultural differences exist in (a) anticipated outcomes and (b) actual consequences of sexual coercion?

Sexual coercion also has been found to be associated with negative outcomes and consequences for both men and women. Although most of the consequence research tends to focus on female victimization, men suffer from sexual coercion as well. Specifically, men have been found to exhibit alcohol problems as a result of being victimized sexually (Sorenson & Siegal, 1992). Moreover, Struckman-Johnson (1988) found that sexually coerced men also tend to suffer negative emotional consequences (e.g., distrust in others, depression, shame). Gutek and Done (2001) found that unwanted sexual attention and sexually coercive experiences negatively influence the psychological well-being of recipients, irrespective of sex. Unfortunately, there is no existing research examining sex differences in reporting of sexual coercion outcomes/consequences across cultures. Thus, the following research question is asked:
RQ6: What sex differences, if any, exist in reported consequences of sexual coercion across cultures?
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

PARTICIPANTS

Initially, there were a total of 563 participants. Of the 563 respondents, there were 375 from the US and 188 from Korea. For the US sample, only the first 200 participants were selected to allow for comparable analysis with the Korean sample. To ensure that the unselected participants were not significantly different from the 200 selected participants, a series of t-tests were conducted. The statistical results indicated that there was no significant difference between the two groups, except for their orientation in power distance, $t(360)=2.12$, $p=.04$, $\eta^2=.01$. The effect size indicated that there is only a slight difference between these two groups.

For the US sample, participants were from a large public university in Southern California. The average age was 20.22 ($SD=2.78$), ranging from 18 to 48 years old. With few exceptions, the sample accurately represents college-aged students within the 18 to 24 year range. In the sample, there were 56 males and 144 females. The ethnic makeup of the US participants consisted of 10 African Americans/Blacks, 18 Asian Americans, 40 Mexican Americans/Latino(a)s/Hispanics, 7 Pacific Islanders, 96 European Americans/Whites, and 29 participants who indicated ‘other’ (e.g., African American/White, Asian/European American, Middle Easterners, etc.). The class standings of the US participants were mainly freshmen ($n=85$) and juniors ($n=50$), with the remaining participants being sophomores ($n=25$) and seniors ($n=26$); several US participants failed to indicate their class standings ($n=3$). The current relational statuses of the US participants were indicated as: Single ($n=114$), In a relationship ($n=78$), Engaged ($n=3$), and Married ($n=5$).

For the Korean sample, participants were from a large private university based in Seoul, South Korea. The average age for the participants was 20.46 ($SD=2.25$), ranging from 18 to 30; again, most participants were within the 18 to 24 year old range. There were 64 males and 124 females. In terms of ethnicity, all of the participants self identified as Korean (100%). The participants included: freshmen ($n=61$), sophomores ($n=57$), juniors ($n=35$),
seniors \((n=20)\), some undergraduates who were in their 5th year \((n=5)\), and some graduate students \((n=7)\); there were several participants who failed to indicate their class standings \((n=3)\). The participants indicated their relational statuses as being: Single \((n=116)\), In a relationship \((n=62)\), Engaged \((n=1)\), and Married \((n=9)\).

**PROCEDURES**

In the US, participants were recruited from communication classes via a research website for the School of Communication (https://sites.google.com/site/commsdsuresearch/). Participating students received some form of extra credit at the discretion of their instructors. In Korea, participants were recruited via a survey announcement provided in different majors in the College of English (영어학과) including English Literature (영문학과) and English Interpretation and Translation (영어통번역학과). Since this study was presented as an American study, no extra credit was offered for participation in Korea. This ensured that students could participate in the survey without feeling pressure or obligation as the study was not conducted by one of their own professors or graduate instructors at their university.

The current study required participants to indicate their own experiences in sexual coercion (i.e., victimization or perpetration) and the type of relationship with either victims or perpetrators. Participants answered questions indicating the frequency of sexually coercive acts, the tactical behaviors of perpetrators, perceptions of sexually coercive situations after reading vignettes, and anticipated and actual consequences/outcomes of sexual coercion.

An online survey housed on the Qualtrics website was available and distributed to both the US and Korean samples. The data collection took place during the Spring semester of 2012. Participants was asked to voluntarily participate in the online survey and informed that they may withdraw at any time without being penalized. The informed consent notified and assured that any information shared or provided would be treated as confidential. Upon acknowledgement and agreement to the statement of informed consent, instructions about the completion of the survey were given.

**TRANSLATION**

When conducting cross-cultural research, adopting questions that have equivalent meaning to all participants is critical (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009). Researchers have
emphasized the importance of translation methods in cross-cultural studies. A survey
instrument should have semantic (i.e., sentence structure), conceptual (i.e., different wording
but the same concept), and normative (i.e., addressing different social norms correctly)
equivalence across languages and cultures (Behling & Law, 2000; Forsyth, Kudela, Levin,
Lawrence, & Willis, 2006; Harkness, Pennell, & Schoua-Glusberg, 2004). Furthermore, both
bilingual and monolingual researchers should work together to assess the translated
questionnaires and translate them back to compare the accuracy of the two versions of the
questionnaires (Beaton, Bombardier, Guillemin, & Ferraz, 2000; Harkness, 2003; Willgerodt,
Kataoka-Yahiro, Kim, & Ceria, 2005). A back translation method was employed for this
particular study. Specifically, one person translated the original English survey into Korean,
and then another person translated the proposed Korean survey into English. Lastly, the
back-translated English survey was compared with the original survey to assess the accuracy
and the validity of the translation and ensure cultural sensitivity.

**Measures**

Various existing measurement scales and demographic items were used for this study.
These included: Value Survey Modules (VSM; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2008), Sexual
Coercion in Intimate Relationship Scale (SCIRS; Goetz & Shackelford, 2010), sexual
coercion scenarios, a revised Sexual Coercion Scale (SCS; Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999),
Cognitive and Behavioral Outcomes of Sexual Behavior Scale (CBOSBS; McBride, Reece,
& Sanders, 2010), and a series of demographic items.

**Demographics**

Participants were asked to complete a series of demographic items at the beginning of
the survey. These items include: sex (male or female), age, relational status (single, in a
relationship, etc.) class standing in college (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, etc.),
etnicity (African American, Asian American, European American, Hispanic, etc.),
nationality, and native language of the participants.

**Dimensions of Cultural Variability**

Value Survey Modules (VSM, 2008) by Hofstede and Hofstede was used to measure
the cultural dimensions of individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, and power
distance. Hofstede and Hofstede (2008) provided English and Korean versions of these measures on Hofstede’s website (www.geerthofstede.nl/research--vsm/vsm-08.aspx), thus no back transition was necessary for these items. There were a total of 12 likert-type items, asking about general life value and personal relationships with others that could be shaped by culture.

Four items were used to measure individualism and collectivism on a scale from 1 (of very little or no importance) to 5 (of utmost importance). Sample items include: How important would it be to you to: “have sufficient time for your personal or home life,” and “have a job respected by your family and friends.” Prior use of the individualism-collectivism index has yielded a reliability coefficient of .77 (Hofstede, Hofstede, Minkov, & Vinken, 2008).

Another four items were used to measure masculinity and femininity on a scale from 1 (of very little or no importance) to 5 (of utmost importance). Sample items include: How important would it be to you to: “get recognition for good performance,” and “have chances for promotion.” Prior use of the masculinity-femininity index scale has yielded a reliability coefficient of .76 (Hofstede et al., 2008).

In addition, four items were used to measure power distance. All items were assessed on a 5-point likert scale, but with three different types of value labels. Two questions were measured on a scale from 1 (of very little or no importance) to 5 (of utmost importance). A sample item includes: “How important would it be to you to be consulted by your boss in decisions involving your work.” One question was measured on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). This item asked: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: “one can be a good manager without having a precise answer to every question that a subordinate may raise about his or her work.” The final question was measured on a scale from 1 (never) to 5 (always). This question asked “how often, in your experience, are subordinates afraid to contradict their boss (or students, their teacher)?” Prior use of the power distance index indicates that it is reliable ($\alpha=.84$) (Hofstede et al., 2008).

The 12-items were submitted to a principal components factor analysis. The Kasier-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) was highly satisfactory at .82 for the US sample, and .92 for the Korean sample. Four components for the US sample and two components for the Korean sample were produced with eigenvalues greater than one, accounting for 33.80% and 71.70% of the
common variance, respectively. The results indicate that the measures did not factor analyze as expected. Given that these scales have been found to be reliable and valid in the past, the measurement instruments were kept consistent with previous expectations. The scale reliabilities for the United States and Korea were respectively as follows: individualism-collectivism, ($\alpha=.59$ and $\alpha=.95$); masculinity-femininity, ($\alpha=.70$ and $\alpha=.94$); and power distance, ($\alpha=.36$ and $\alpha=.70$).

### Prevalence of Sexual Coercion

The Sexual Coercion in Intimate Relationship Scale (SCIRS; Goetz & Shackelford, 2010) assessed the frequency and severity of sexually coercive acts. The SCIRS examines sexually coercive behaviors that are communicative (i.e., hinting, lying), behavioral (i.e., hitting, pushing), and psychological (i.e., pressure, withholding of resources) in nature. The SCIRS also assesses the range of the use of tactics and its subtleness as well (Goetz & Shackelford, 2010). Consequently, the SCIRS is more appropriate for understanding the nature of sexual coercion across cultures and for measuring the prevalence of sexual coercion.

The SCIRS consists of 34 items rated on a 6-point scale from 0 (act did not occur) to 5 (act occurred 11 or more times) to assess the frequency of sexual coercion experienced by respondents (Goetz & Shackelford, 2010). For the present study, the wording of the items was slightly modified. For instance, gender-specific words were substituted with gender-neutral words (i.e., woman to person, he or him to he/she or him/her). Items include: “my partner persisted in asking me to have sex with him/her, even though he/she knew that I did not want to,” “my partner hinted that if I loved him/her I would have sex with him/her,” and “my partner threatened to have sex with another person if I did not have sex with him/her.” Previous research that adopted the scale found it to be highly reliable, ($\alpha=.96$) (Shackelford & Goetz, 2004).

A principal components analysis (PCA) was conducted on the 34 items for both the US and the Korean samples. Due to a lack of response variability in the Korean responses, a PCA analysis was unable to be conducted. For the US sample, the resulting KMO was .90 and showed seven eigenvalues greater than one, accounting for 48% of the common variance. The original SCIRS scale is a 3-factor scale that assesses: resource
manipulation/violence, commitment manipulation, and defection threat. However, given that the intention of the present study is only to use this measurement to assess the frequency of the sexual coercion experience, this scale was treated as a uni-dimensional construct. The overall uni-dimensional scale was very reliable ($\alpha=.90$).

**Tactics of Sexual Coercion**

A revised version of the Sexual Coercion Scale (SCS; Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999) was used to measure different types of tactics that can be adopted by perpetrators to gain sexual acts. The scale is a slightly modified version of the sexual coercion measure used in Spitzberg and Rhea’s study (1999) examining obsessive relational intrusion and sexual coercion victimization. The revised scale consists of a total of 40 items, measured on a 4-point likert-type scale that ranges from 0 (never) to 3 (very often) and asks participants to report their experiences of coercive actions that others used to gain sexual acts from them (Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999). The SCS is a four-dimension scale assessing: psychological coercion, severe force, mild force, and deception tactics (Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999). The first dimension is labeled ‘psychological coercion,’ and sample items include: “used verbal persuasion,” and “used psychological or verbal pressure.” The second dimension is labeled ‘deception,’ and sample items include: “falsely professed their love,” and “lied to you.” The third dimension is labeled ‘mild force,’ and sample items include: “threatened to hurt you,” and “got on top of you so you couldn’t move.” The fourth dimension is labeled ‘severe force,’ and sample items include: “beat you,” and “injured you physically.” Prior use of this scale indicated that the subscales are reliable (psychological coercion, $\alpha=.93$; deception, $\alpha=.90$; mild force, $\alpha=.90$; and severe force, $\alpha=.87$) (Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999).

A principal components analysis (PCA) was conducted on the tactics of sexual coercion. A PCA could not be conducted on the Korean sample since there was a lack of variability in the responses. The KMO for the US sample was .91 and showed six eigenvalues greater than one, accounting for 49.40% of the common variance. The items did not factor analyze as expected, but the subscales (i.e., psychological coercion, deception, mild force, and severe force) were kept consistent with existing research. In the present study, the psychological coercion subscale was found to be highly reliable for the US sample ($\alpha=.94$) and somewhat reliable for the Korean sample ($\alpha=.73$). The deception subscale was
very reliable for the US sample ($\alpha=.91$) while the Korean sample showed slightly low reliability ($\alpha=.65$). The mild force subscale was shown to be very reliable for the US sample ($\alpha=.93$), however, the Korean sample could not be examined in terms of its reliability since none of the respondents reported the use of mild force as a sexual coercive tactic. Lastly, the severe force subscale was extremely reliable for the US sample ($\alpha=.95$), and again the Korean sample could not be tested for its reliability since all participants indicated that they had never experienced severe force.

### Perceptions of Sexual Coercion

In addition to measuring prevalence, scenarios were presented to assess perceptions of sexual coercion. The scenario method is one of the most common and reliable ways to measure perceptions of participants when conducting social science research (Gutek & Done, 2001). Most participants are capable of identifying themselves fairly well with the characters in a given scenario (Gutek & Done, 2001). Baker, Terpstra, and Cutler (1990) assert that using vignettes that are compatible with realistic situations should be considered a highly appropriate research method for measuring perceptions of various phenomena. Moreover, according to Bouffard, Wright, Muftic, and Bouffard (2008), hypothetical scenarios work well for college samples because of their likelihood of identifying themselves with characters in the scenario.

In the present study, participants were given three scenarios between two people and asked to indicate how likely at different points in the interaction behaviors could be perceived as sexual coercion on a likert scale from 1 to 5 (i.e., 1=it definitely IS NOT sexual coercion, 3=it may or may not be sexual coercion, 5=it definitely IS sexual coercion). The scenarios were developed to reflect different relational types as well as sexual coercion tactics (e.g., psychological coercion, severe force, and mild force). Scenario A describes two individuals who know each other from a class and occasionally hang out together. In this case, the two individuals were identified as acquaintances. In addition to the relational type, the scenario includes tactics that were, according to previous research (Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999), consistent with coercion that is psychological in nature (e.g., used verbal persuasion, touching body without consent). Scenario B involves two individuals who are romantic partners (e.g., boyfriend/girlfriend) and have been in a relationship with each other for six
months. Tactics used in this scenario were reflective of psychological coercion (e.g., making a victim feel guilty). Scenario C demonstrates two individuals who meet each other for the first time at a school party; the two people are strangers. In this situation, the perpetrator used sexual coercion tactics that reflect mild force (e.g., trapping the victim in the car) as well as severe force (e.g., slapping the victim).

Outcomes/Consequences of Sexual Coercion

The Cognitive and Behavioral Outcomes of Sexual Behavior Scale (CBOSBS) was used to measure anticipated outcomes (i.e. worry) and actual outcomes of sexual acts (i.e., consequence) resulting from individuals’ sexual behaviors (McBride et al., 2010). The original CBOSBS scale is divided into two scales, anticipated outcomes (20 items) and actual outcomes (16 items) which each measure the following six factors: financial/occupational, legal, physical, psychological, spiritual, and social. For the purpose of this study, only the two factors (i.e., physical, psychological) were used. To measure anticipated outcomes, a total of 11 items on a 4-point likert-type scale ranging from 0 (never) to 3 (always) were used. These items measure the cognitive dimension of sexual behavior outcomes by asking about potential worries from sexual behavior. Sample items include: I am worried that the things I have done sexually…: “might have placed me or one of my sex partners at risk for HIV/AIDS,” and “might be leading to problems with my family members.”

To measure actual outcomes of sexual acts (i.e., consequences), 11 items assessed on a dichotomous scale (no=1, yes=2) were used. Sample items include: As a result of the thing you have done sexually…: “I caused pain, injury, or other physical problems for myself,” and “I was embarrassed or ashamed of myself.” Prior use of this scale yielded reliability coefficients of .89 for the 20 anticipated outcomes (i.e., cognitive items) and a slightly lower reliability coefficient of .75 for the actual outcomes of sexual acts (i.e., behavioral items) (McBride et al., 2010).

A principal components analysis (PCA) was conducted on the anticipated outcomes of the sexual acts. The KMO for the US sample was .91 and showed three eigenvalues greater than one, accounting for 51.91% of the common variance. The KMO could not be reported from the Korean sample due to the lack of variability across the responses. Overall, the anticipated outcomes scale was found to be reliable for the US sample (α=.94) as well as
for the Korean sample ($\alpha=.87$). The physical subscale was also found to be reliable for the US sample ($\alpha=.88$), but no reliability was reported for the Korean sample since almost none of the participants experienced physical distress or outcomes of sexual coercion. The psychological subscale was reliable for both the US ($\alpha=.86$) and for the Korean sample ($\alpha=.86$).

In order to assess the actual outcomes of sexual coercion (i.e., consequences) scale, only reliability analyses were conducted since a PCA could not be conducted on these binary items. Cronbach’s alpha for the actual outcomes scale indicated that this scale was reliable for the US sample ($\alpha=.82$) and showed low reliability for the Korean sample ($\alpha=.65$). The physical subscale indicated a slightly lower reliability coefficient for the US sample ($\alpha=.54$). No reliability was reported for the Korean sample since almost none of the participants experienced actual physical outcomes of sexual coercion. The psychological subscale for the US sample was somewhat reliable ($\alpha=.78$), while the Korean sample showed low reliability ($\alpha=.62$).
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RESULTS

This section presents the findings of the study. The results of each hypothesis and research question were analyzed with the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS). First, means and standard deviations for each variable separated by country are presented (see Table 1). Consequently, the results of a bivariate correlation analysis are reported (see Table 2).

| Table 1. Comparison of the United States and Korea (Means and Standard Deviations) |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------|
|                                   | United States   | Korea           | t-test |
|                                   | Means (SD)      | Means (SD)      |       |
| Dimensions of Cultural Variability|                 |                 |       |
| Individualism-Collectivism (IDV)  | 4.11 (.52)      | 4.15 (.79)      | -.64  |
| Power Distance (PDI)              | 3.57 (.46)      | 3.90 (.56)      | -6.40*** |
| Masculinity-Femininity (MAS)      | 4.10 (.52)      | 4.14 (.80)      | -.71  |
| Prevalence of Sexual Coercion     |                 |                 |       |
| Prevalence                        | 1.23 (.46)      | 1.02 (.10)      | 6.16*** |
| Tactics of Sexual Coercion        |                 |                 |       |
| Psychological Coercion (PSY)      | 1.41 (.48)      | 1.04 (.10)      | 10.78*** |
| Deception (DEC)                   | 1.40 (.58)      | 1.02 (.08)      | 9.09*** |
| Mild Force (MIL)                  | 1.13 (.34)      | 1.00 (.00)      | 5.44*** |
| Severe Force (SEV)                | 1.11 (.34)      | 1.00 (.00)      | 4.58*** |
| Outcomes of Sexual Coercion       |                 |                 |       |
| Physical Outcomes (PHY)           | 1.30 (.47)      | 1.02 (.06)      | 7.76*** |
| Psychological Outcomes (PSYCH)    | 1.32 (.46)      | 1.06 (.18)      | 7.52*** |
| Consequences of Sexual Coercion   |                 |                 |       |
| Physical Consequences (PHYCO)     | .05 (.10)       | .00 (.02)       | 6.11*** |
| Psychological Consequences (PSYCO)| .27 (.33)       | .06 (.16)       | 8.15*** |

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Table 2. Correlation of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualism-Collectivism</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.98**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity-Femininity Prevalence of Sexual</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Coercion</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deception</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild Force</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Force</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Outcomes</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Outcomes</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Consequences</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Consequences</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001, (-) cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.
Correlational results for the US are presented below the divide and for Korea above the divide.
HYPOTHESES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Finally, correlations, t-tests, ANOVAs, and chi-square statistics were run on the various hypotheses and research questions. The results for each hypothesis and research question are provided.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 predicted that prevalence of sexual coercion would be higher among acquaintances and romantic partners compared to strangers regardless of culture. A chi-square goodness of fit test shows that there is a statistically significant difference among the different types of relationships, $\chi^2(1, N=104)=13.85, p<.01$. Of the 388 participants, those who have experienced sexual coercion reported the relational type as with strangers (4.4%), acquaintances (11.9%), and romantic partners (10.6%). This statistical difference indicates that sexually coercive experience is more likely to occur among acquaintances or romantic partners than strangers; thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

Research Questions 1 and 2

Research Question 1 asked about cultural differences and Research Question 2 asked about sex differences in the prevalence of sexual coercion (e.g., victimization and perpetration). Prevalence of experiences (i.e., done to me) was assessed by the Sexual Coercion in Intimate Relationship Scale (SCIRS; Goetz & Shackelford, 2010) which asked about experiencing communicative, behavioral, and psychological acts of sexual coercion. Results from a multiple-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated a main effect for country, where participants in the US reported experiencing more ($M=1.23, SD=.46$) acts of sexual coercion than those in Korea ($M=1.02, SD=.10$), $F(1, 374)=3.99, p<.001, \eta^2=.09$. However, there was no main effect for sex, $F(1, 374)=.08, p=.78$. Specifically, males ($M=1.12, SD=.39$) and females ($M=1.13, SD=.33$) did not differ in their reported experience of sexual coercion. Moreover, there was no interaction effect between sex and country, $F(1, 374)=1.05, p=.31$.

In addition to examining prevalence of experiences as assessed on the SCIRS, participants in each country were asked to indicate the number of times they have been the recipient and perpetrator of sexual coercion. Results of a series of independent samples t-tests
indicated that there were significant differences in overall reported victimization for the US ($M=1.29, SD=3.76$) and Korea ($M=.10, SD=.42$), $t(204.30)=4.43, p<.001, \eta^2=.05$. There were also significant differences in overall reported perpetration for the US ($M=.29, SD=1.24$) and Korea ($M=.02, SD=.18$), $t(207.68)=2.97, p<.01, \eta^2=.02$.

Supplemental correlational analyses were conducted to determine what relationship, if any, exists between the dimensions of cultural variability and prevalence of sexual coercion. The correlation of the dimensions of cultural variability with prevalence of sexually coercive acts (as assessed by the SCIRS) were as follows: individualism-collectivism, $r(373)=-.11, p<.05$; power distance, $r(375)=-.09, p=.09$; and masculinity-femininity, $r(372)=-.05, p=.33$.

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypothesis 2 proposed that participants would report being recipients of more psychological tactics than physical tactics, regardless of culture. A dependent samples t-test indicated that there is a significant difference between experiencing psychological and physical tactics, $t(381)=10.84, p<.001, \eta^2=.24$. Participants reported experiencing more psychological tactics ($M=1.23, SD=.40$) than physical tactics ($M=1.06, SD=.25$); thus, Hypothesis 2 was supported.

**Hypotheses 3 and 4**

Hypothesis 3 predicted that there would be an association between collectivism and receipt of psychological tactics. A bivariate correlation analysis revealed that there was no significant relationship between individualism-collectivism and the use of psychological tactics, $r(378)=-.04, p=.20$. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Hypothesis 4 posed that Korean participants would report being recipients of more psychological tactics than US participants. Using an independent samples t-test, the results indicated that Korean participants ($M=1.04, SD=.10$) reported experiencing less psychological tactics than US participants ($M=1.41, SD=.48$), $t(213.81)=10.78, p<.001, \eta^2=.24$. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was not supported.
Research Question 3

Research Question 3 asked about the relationship between the dimensions of cultural variability and the use of specific types of coercive tactics (e.g., psychological, deception, mild force, and severe force). Results of a series of correlational analyses revealed that individualism-collectivism was not correlated with: psychological coercion, $r(378)=-.04$, $p=.40$; deception, $r(381)=-.04$, $p=.48$; mild force, $r(380)=-.05$, $p=.34$; or severe force, $r(382)=-.03$, $p=.52$. Power distance was correlated with psychological coercion, $r(380)=-.10$, $p<.05$, but not with other types of tactics: deception $r(383)=-.08$, $p=.11$; mild force, $r(382)=-.02$, $p=.76$; or severe force, $r(383)=-.02$, $p=.78$. Last, masculinity-femininity was not correlated with: psychological coercion, $r(377)=-.00$, $p=.98$; deception, $r(380)=.02$, $p=.66$; mild force, $r(379)=-.04$, $p=.45$; or severe force, $r(382)=-.01$, $p=.82$.

Research Question 4

Research Question 4 inquired about the potential cultural differences in experiencing particular kinds of tactics: psychological coercion, deception, mild force, and severe force. The question was answered via a series of independent samples t-tests. First, psychological coercion was experienced more often for the US ($M=1.41$, $SD=.48$) than Korean ($M=1.04$, $SD=.10$) participants, $t(213.81)=10.78$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.24$. Second, deception was reported more for the US ($M=1.40$, $SD=.58$) and less for Korean ($M=1.02$, $SD=.08$), $t(205.09)=9.09$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.18$. Third, US participants indicated being recipients of more mild force ($M=1.13$, $SD=.34$) than Koreans ($M=1.00$, $SD=.00$), $t(196)=5.44$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.07$. Lastly, the US ($M=1.13$, $SD=.34$) participants indicated being recipients of more severe force compared to Koreans ($M=1.00$, $SD=.00$), $t(197)=4.58$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.05$. Overall, US participants reported being recipients of more psychological, deception, mild force, and severe force tactics.

Hypotheses 5 and 6

Hypotheses 5 and 6 predicted the degree to which participants would find hypothetical scenarios as sexually coercive based on the type of tactic used as well the relationship type. There were a total of three scenarios: the first two scenarios involved the use of psychological tactics and the last scenario consisted of a physical tactic. The two psychological scenarios were combined together to do a comparison with the physical tactic scenario. Hypothesis 5 proposed that participants would be less likely to perceive sexual
coercion if perpetrators used psychological tactics over physical tactics. Hypothesis 5 was tested through a series of dependent samples t-test. The results indicated that there was a significant difference in perceptions of sexual coercion based on the types of tactics used. When asked the extent to which they believed the perpetrator engaged in sexual coercion, physical tactics ($M=3.79$, $SD=.87$) were perceived as more sexually coercive than psychological tactics ($M=2.61$, $SD=1.39$), $t(374)=36.30$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.63$. Moreover, when asked about the extent to which they believed the victim to be the recipient of sexual coercion, psychological tactics ($M=2.43$, $SD=1.27$) were thought to be less coercive than physical tactics ($M=3.63$, $SD=.87$), $t(371)=36.92$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.64$. Thus, Hypothesis 5 was supported.

Hypothesis 6 proposed that participants would be more likely to perceive sexual coercion if perpetrators were strangers than relational partners or acquaintances. Hypothesis 6 was tested via a series of dependent samples t-test. Two scenarios where perpetrators were either an acquaintance or a romantic partner were combined together to compare the data with a scenario with a stranger. The results indicated that when asked the extent to which they perceived that the situation was sexual coercion perpetration depending on the relational type, people perceived that the situation was more coercive when the individuals involved in the situation were unfamiliar (i.e., strangers) ($M=3.78$, $SD=.86$) as opposed to known to each other (i.e., an acquaintance, a romantic partner) ($M=2.60$, $SD=1.38$), $t(386)=86.10$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.91$. When asked about the degree to which they believed the situation involved victimization, situations involving strangers ($M=3.76$, $SD=.84$) were perceived as more coercive compared to situations involving someone known ($M=3.62$, $SD=.85$), $t(382)=81.52$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.90$. Therefore, Hypothesis 6 was supported.

**Hypotheses 7 and 8**

Hypotheses 7 and 8 predicted negative relationships between collectivism and perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration ($H_7$) and victimization ($H_8$). The results of bivariate correlational analyses showed that there was no relationship between collectivism and perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration, $r(383)=-.01$, $p=.42$ or perceptions of sexual coercion victimization, $r(383)=-.03$, $p=.31$. Therefore, Hypothesis 7 and 8 were not supported.
Hypotheses 9 and 10
Hypotheses 9 and 10 predicted negative associations between masculinity and perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration (H9) and victimization (H10). The two hypotheses were tested via bivariate correlations. Test results indicated that there was no association between masculinity and perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration, \( r(379)=-.03, p=.31 \). Moreover, there was no relationship between masculinity and perceptions of victimization, \( r(379)=-.04, p=.20 \). Therefore, Hypothesis 9 and 10 were not supported.

Hypotheses 11 and 12
Hypotheses 11 and 12 examined the relationship between power distance and sexual coercion perpetration and victimization. Negative correlations between power distance and perceived sexual coercion perpetration and victimization were predicted and the results indicated that there were negative, small associations between power distance and perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration, \( r(382)=-.22, p<.01 \) and victimization, \( r(382)=-.24, p<.01 \). Therefore, Hypothesis 11 and 12 were supported.

Hypothesis 13
Regarding Hypothesis 13, recipients of sexual coercion reported more psychological outcomes/consequences than physical ones, independent of culture. A dependent samples t-test revealed that participants perceived greater anticipated negative psychological outcomes (\( M=1.26, SD=.48 \)) than physical outcomes (\( M=1.16, SD=.36 \)), \( t(382)=-5.87, p<.001, \eta^2=.08 \). Furthermore, more actual psychological consequences (\( M=.17, SD=.28 \)) were reported than physical consequences (\( M=.03, SD=.08 \)), \( t(386)=-10.76, p<.001, \eta^2=.23 \). Thus, Hypothesis 13 was supported.

Research Questions 5 and 6
Research Questions 5 and 6 asked about culture and sex differences in (a) anticipated outcomes and (b) actual consequences of sexual coercion. To answer the first part (a) of Research Questions 5 (i.e., culture differences) and 6 (i.e., sex differences), a multiple-factor ANOVA was conducted and the results showed a main effect for country, where participants in the US reported more anticipated physical outcomes (\( M=1.28, SD=.47 \)) than those in Korea (\( M=1.02, SD=.06 \)), \( F(1, 381)=50.57, p<.001, \eta^2=.12 \). However, there was no main
effect for sex, $F(1, 381)=.51, p=.48$. Means of men ($M=1.16, SD=.31$) and women ($M=1.15, SD=.38$) did not differ statistically. Moreover, there was no interaction effect between sex and country, $F(1, 381)=.06, p=.81$. Regarding psychological outcomes, there was a main effect for country with the US participants anticipating more psychological outcomes ($M=1.43, SD=.56$) than those in Korea ($M=1.09, SD=.28$), $F(1, 382)=49.32, p<.001, \eta^2=.11$. However, there was no main effect for sex, $F(1, 382)=.14, p=.71$ with the means indicating no significant difference in anticipated psychological outcomes for males ($M=1.24, SD=.43$) and females ($M=1.28, SD=.50$). Moreover, there was no interaction effect for sex and country, $F(1, 382)=.34, p=.56$.

In order to answer the second part (b) of Research Questions 5 (i.e., culture differences) and 6 (i.e., sex differences) which asked about psychological and physical actual consequences, a chi-square test of association was conducted. The chi-square results indicate that a statistically significant difference exists between US participants and Korean participants in reporting physical consequences, $\chi^2(4, N=386)=38.04, p<.001, \phi=.31$, and psychological consequences, $\chi^2(4, N=385)=60.96, p<.001, \phi=.40$. More US participants reported experiencing physical consequences (23%) than Korean participants (2.1%). Also, more US participants reported experiencing psychological consequences (48.5%) than Korean participants (12.8%). Moreover, there was no significant sex difference found in the reporting of physical, $\chi^2(4, N=385)=1.35, p=.39$, or psychological outcomes/consequences, $\chi^2(4, N=386)=4.10, p=.39$. 
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DISCUSSION

Given the ongoing occurrence of sexual coercion among college students, research attempts to understand the prevalence of sexual coercion, perceptions of victimization and perpetration, tactics used, and associated outcomes/consequences are important. The present study was interested in assessing cultural differences in sexual coercion. First, the current study asked questions about cultural variability dimensional differences between the US and Korea. Then, this study investigated the prevalence of sexual coercion within a college population in each country to inquire about personal experiences of sexual coercion (i.e., perpetration or victimization). Sexual coercion tactical use experiences were also examined. Moreover, this study assessed perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration and victimization through situational vignettes. Finally, this study examined anticipated and actual outcomes/consequences of sexual coercion.

Cultural differences are often assessed using Hofstede’s dimensions of cultural variability. In the present study, three dimensions were examined as they relate to sexual coercion: individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, and power distance. According to Hofstede’s findings (2001), the United States and Korea should differ in individualism and collectivism as well as power distance. According to the findings of this study, the cultures only differed on the dimension of power distance. Previous research, however, has suggested that the dimension of individualism-collectivism does not play out as expected among college students. To illustrate, Gudykunst and Nishida (1994) indicate that college students, specifically those in the US and Japan, often do not exhibit their expected traits of individualism-collectivism. That is, research has found that college students in the United States often exhibit more collectivistic tendencies than expected and Japanese students often exhibit more individualistic tendencies than expected (Gudykunst & Nishida, 1994). Moreover, beyond college students, it is argued that there are individuals within each culture who often do not exhibit the overall dominant cultural traits (e.g., collectivistic individuals who are exceptions to American’s overall individualistic culture). Therefore, in the present
study, differences were examined in cultural variability traits (e.g., individualism-collectivism), regardless of culture, as well as national differences (US versus Japan).

Hypothesis 1 assumed that perpetrators of sexual coercion would be more likely to be those victims are familiar with such as friends or romantic partners. The data supported this hypothesis. Similar to previous research, more acquaintances and significant others were identified as perpetrators than strangers. Sexual coercion perpetration is committed far more by someone familiar or close to victims (Chan et al., 2008; Hines, 2007; Lottes & Winberg, 1997; Shackelford & Goetz, 2004). The significance of this finding is that sexual coercion is still occurring far more often within close interpersonal relationships, therefore individuals should be alerted that sexual violence is not only committed by a stranger but by someone they know very well or even trust. Advice often given by family members, friends, and others of authority is to be cautious of strangers (e.g., be careful when you go out or walk home alone). However, cautionary advice should also include being careful of potential problems within intimate personal relationships.

Research Question 1 inquired about cultural differences and Research Question 2 asked about sex differences in the pervasiveness of sexual coercion in terms of victimization and perpetration. In terms of prevalence, more participants in the US reported experiencing sexual coercion than those in Korea. This finding can be interpreted in several ways. First, both male and female adolescents in the US culture tend to have dating experiences and initiate first sex earlier, thus this provides more opportunity to experience sexual behaviors before their early twenties (Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006; Lottes & Winberg, 1997). It could possibly be that individuals in Korea are less sexually coerced than their US counterparts. One potential factor that might contribute to this is the amount of opposite-sex contact experienced by Koreans. To illustrate, men and women are often segregated by schools (i.e., boys’ high school, girls’ high school), and most college dormitories separate men and women in different buildings. Moreover, within social occasions, culturally it is not appropriate for males and females to interact one on one outside of a group environment and adolescents’ dating relationships tend to begin in their early twenties (Brown, Jejeebhoy, Shah, & Yount, 2001; Seepersad, Choi, & Shin, 2008; Youn, 1996). Thus, the fact that there is less opportunity with the opposite sex might be one factor that contributes to the low frequency in reporting sexual coercion experiences for Korean participants.
Another way of interpreting these findings is that the reason why less Korean participants reported being sexually coerced could be that victims are less likely to report their sexual experiences because they doubt receiving assistance from their networks and, most of all, fear the judgment from people around them (Patel, 2003; Wasti & Cortina, 2002). Thus, this might influence the likelihood of reporting sexual victimization of victims (Luthar & Luthar, 2002; Yoshihama et al., 1991), therefore participants in this study might have chosen to not share their experiences. Furthermore, the reason why there were no sex differences for both US and Korean participants could be due to their cultural characteristics. That is, since sexual behavior is widely occurring among young adults in the US culture (Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006), both men and women might have experienced sexual coercion more often. Also, since Korean culture is more reserved when it comes to sexuality, young adults are less likely to experience sexual behaviors (Youn, 1996), and this might explain the reason why there was no sex difference in reporting of sexual coercion for Koreans.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that participants would report being recipients of psychological tactics more than physical tactics, regardless of culture. A significant difference in experiences of psychological and physical tactics was found. As mentioned earlier, a variety of tactics are used by perpetrators, however psychological tactics are used most often (Byers & Eno, 1992; Gavey, 1992; Goetz & Shackelford, 2009; Livingston et al., 2004; Spitzberg, 1998; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003). This finding was supported in the present study. Both US and Korean samples reported being recipients of more psychological tactics than physical forces (e.g., trapped into somewhere, pinned down). This suggests that physical tactics across the two cultures are generally not committed. This finding is significant since people are able to be coerced into engaging in unwanted sexual acts without being physically forced. Sexual pressure works on victims because of social norms of engaging in this behavior or desire to be wanted. The social scripting of sexual relationships can lead to acceptance of some degree of force and requires victims to be passive rather than assertive (Abbey et al, 2004; Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004; Byers, 1996). Also, pressure to conform in order for being likable could be problematic as well (Bay-Cheng & Eliseo-Arras, 2008; Byers & Wilson, 1985; Lloyd & Emery, 2000).

Hypothesis 3 expected a relationship between collectivism and the experience of psychological tactics. No relationship was found between these concepts. Therefore,
Hypothesis 3 was not supported. One plausible explanation for why no relationship was found is that the scale reliability for the individualism-collectivism measure was very low. Hypothesis 4 anticipated that Korean participants would report being recipients of psychological tactics more than US participants. The results of this hypothesis were surprising. While a significant difference was found, the findings were in the opposite direction as predicted. Specifically, Korean participants reported being recipients of psychological tactics less than US participants. One potential explanation for this finding is that there was a lack of response variability within the Korean sample thus leading to a lack of reporting of the use of any type of sexual coercion tactic. This lack of variability in responses may be a result of response biases. According to research, individuals from more reserved cultures often do not utilize an entire response scale and tend to report more extreme (end-point) responses (Harzing, 2006; Johnson, Kulesa, Llc, Cho, & Shavitt, 2005; Marshall & Lee, 1998).

Research Question 3 inquired about the relationship between the dimensions of cultural variability and the use of types of coercive tactics, such as psychological, deception, mild force, as well as severe force. The results indicate that there was no relationship between any dimension of cultural variability and sexual coercion tactics, except for power distance. Specifically, power distance was found to be negatively related to psychological coercion. Moreover, the correlations were non-significant and also “trivial” or “small” according to Cohen (1988). There are several plausible explanations for these findings. First, it is important to note that the reliabilities for the dimensions of cultural variability for the US sample were low and this might affect the lack of a relationship between the dimensions of cultural variability and tactical use. There was, however, one significant relationship found. Specifically, the inverse relationship between power distance and psychological tactics could be understood from the perspective of the victim. That is, in high power distance cultures victims might felt that the coercer was very direct and had no need to play mind games with them.

Research Question 4 inquired about potential cultural differences in experiencing particular tactics of sexual coercion. The findings indicated that overall US participants reported being recipients of more psychological, deception, mild force, and severe force tactics than Korea participants. This could be explained with two logics. First, individuals
within the US society have had more experiences with sexual coercion. Research on the United States indicates that almost half of young people in college report experiencing sexual coercion and that number is increasing year after year (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004; Lottes & Weinberg, 1997; Russell & Oswald, 2002; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003). Also, sex is more liberally discussed in the US compared to Korea (Choi, 1995; Lie, 1995). Although the topic of sexuality is still a sensitive area of investigation within US culture, Korean culture is more reserved and such cultural characteristics might have influenced the reporting of tactical use in sexual coercion (Lee, Kim, & Lim, 2010). Another plausible explanation for this finding might be that this topic is unfamiliar to Korean culture. The findings of this research question might have been influenced by the lack of familiarity with the given topic for individuals in Korea. The current study asked participants to provide their own definition of sexual coercion and it was noticed that almost all Korean participants guessed the meaning from the words, were not sure about the concept (e.g., wrote ‘I don’t know’), or did not answer at all.

Hypothesis 5 and 6 expected that perceptions of sexually coercive, as presented in vignettes, would differ based on specific tactics used and the relational types of victims and perpetrators. Hypothesis 5 proposed that when physical tactics are used, they would be judged as more coercive than psychological tactics. This hypothesis was supported. The findings indicated that more participants perceived the situation as sexually coercive when physical tactics were used over psychological tactics. People were more likely to rate the situation as perpetration and victimization when physical force (e.g., slapping the victim, locking the car door, pushing the victim down) was used instead of psychological force (e.g., being mad at not having sex, pressuring the victim, whining). These results are consistent with existing research on sexual violence (i.e., perceptions on sexual harassment, rape) (see Durant & Carey, 2000; Forbes & Adams-Curtis, 2001; Kalof & Wade, 1995; Metts et al., 1992; Spitzberg, 1999; Testa & Livingston, 1999). When sexual violence involves no apparent physical aggression, most people consider it as nonviolent (Archer, 2000; Chan et al., 2008). This could be potentially alarming because the use of subtle or more verbal tactics might make the situation more difficult to interpret as sexual coercion. Also, this finding is significant because unless it is physical, the potential for a third-party intervention is less likely (Felson & Pare, 2005; Samuels, 2005). That is, when physical violence is used, others
might intervene to help and the issue could be also settled legally, but when the subtle forms of violence occur, others might be less likely to get involved because they do not perceive it as serious (e.g., “it must be just a boyfriend/girlfriend problem”).

Hypothesis 6 predicted that coercive situations would be perceived differently based on the relational type of the individuals involved. That is, when perpetrators were strangers as opposed to relational partners or acquaintances, it was assumed that people would be more likely to rate the situation as coercive. The results of the study showed that people rated situations as less coercive when sexual coercion was committed by someone victims knew or were intimate with (e.g., an acquaintance or a intimate partner). This finding was consistent with existing research (see Byers, 1996; Chan et al., 2008; Koss et al., 1988; Spitzberg, 1999; Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003; Testa & Livingston, 1999; Waldner-Haugrud & Magruder, 1995) and significant for various reasons. First, if you are with someone familiar or intimate with, you might perceive the same behaviors that someone else (e.g., a stranger) would engage in as being acceptable instead of unacceptable. That is frightening since it might be too late when someone realizes that they are in a difficult situation and it becomes intimate partner violence. Also, as an observer or outsider, you might look at behavior between significant others differently than you would if the people were strangers. Again you might be less inclined to consider going to the assistance of someone.

A series of hypotheses (Hypothesis 7-11) examined the relationship between dimensions of cultural variability and perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration and victimization. Hypotheses 7 and 8 examined the relationship between collectivism and perceptions of sexual coercion. The results indicated no relationship between these concepts. Similarly, Hypotheses 9 and 10 found no relationship between masculinity and perceptions of sexual coercion. There is a plausible explanation for why these hypotheses (Hypothesis 7-10) were not supported. As indicated previously, there were low scale reliabilities for the dimensions of cultural variability for the US sample; thus, the findings might have been affected because of this.

Hypotheses 11 and 12, which examined the relationship between power distance and perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration and victimization, did find significant results. Specifically, Hypothesis 11 examined the relationship between power distance different perceptions of sexual coercion perpetration. The results indicated that there was a negative
relationship between these concepts. In other words, when there is high power distance, individuals are less likely to view perpetration of sexual coercion. Hypothesis 12 predicted that there would be a relationship between power distance and perception of victimization in a given situation. The results also indicate that there was a negative relationship between power distance and sexual coercion victimization. These findings are not surprising given the research on power distance and its relation to individual differences in perception on sexual violence (e.g., severity, judgment). As indicated previously, research indicates that sexual violence (e.g., sexual harassment at workplace) is often judged less severely or not perceived as coercive by individuals in high power distance cultures (see Fiedler & Blanco, 2006; Kirkman et al., 2009; Wasti & Cortina, 2002; White et al., 2001).

Hypothesis 13 expected that more psychological outcomes/consequences than physical ones would be reported by recipients of sexual coercion, regardless of culture. The study result showed that more participants indicated that they were worried about anticipated psychological outcomes than physical outcomes from sexual acts. This was consistent with previously conducted research that argues psychological consequences as more lasting and harmful ones in terms of its post-assaults effects (see Abbey et al., 2004; Brown et al., 2009; Craig, 1990; Frieze, 2005; Gutek & Done, 2001; Heise et al., 1999; Katz et al., 2002). Moreover, more individuals reported experiencing actual psychological consequences than physical consequences. As existing research asserts, this is worrisome since psychological harms are more detrimental to victims of sexual coercion than physical damages (see Busby & Compton, 1997; McBride et al., 2008; Murnen et al., 1989; Riggs et al., 1992; Temple et al., 2007; Ullman et al., 2006). These significant findings, however, should be interpreted with caution since what was actually measured was outcomes/consequences of engaging in sexual acts, not in sexual coercion.

Finally, Research Questions 5 and 6 asked whether there would be any culture and sex differences in expected outcomes and actual consequences. A difference in the anticipated physical and psychological outcomes was found between the US and Korea. Specifically, US participants indicated anticipating more physical worries (e.g., “might cause injury or pain to myself”) as well as psychological worries (e.g., “might ruin the relationship with friends and family”) than Korean participants. This cultural difference signifies that experiencing different types of consequences/outcomes are likely to be shaped by cultural
norms and socialization (e.g., different emphasis on sex education such as practicing safe sex or maintaining virginity before marriage). Hesitancy for Korean participants to admit to having concerns from sexual activities might have directed Koreans to engage in underreporting (Youn, 1996). Moreover, this could also be the result of unfamiliarity with the topic of the study. Although sexual coercion exists in Korean culture, research on this given topic is new and not established in Korean culture unlike other types of sexual research (e.g., rape). There were, however, no sex differences found in anticipated psychological and physical outcomes. A plausible explanation for this finding could be the fact that there are some consequences that are mutually shared between men and women, such as contracting a sexually transmitted disease or experiencing unwanted pregnancy.

Similar to anticipated (i.e., worried) outcomes/consequences, there were cultural difference in actual psychological and physical consequences. More US participants than Korean participants experienced actual physical consequences as well as psychological consequences. Differences in reporting for the US and Korean samples could be the result of a lack of variability in responses from Koreans. Almost all Korean respondents did not choose experiencing actual consequences (i.e., chose “no” over “yes”) from their sexual acts unlike those US participants. The lack of reporting in terms of frequency might have influenced the findings of the study. The potential reason why there was no sex difference in reporting actual outcomes/consequences could be that both men and women are similarly concerned with their sexual behaviors and following consequences (e.g., having relational troubles with their friends or family, receiving STDs) from the previous conducted studies (Campbell et al., 2009; Faulkner, 2003).

**LIMITATION**

The current study was not without limitations. First of all, this was a cross-sectional study that examined only one point in time. While this study provided an estimate of the prevalence of sexual coercion within a given population (i.e., college students) across two cultures, it does not account for the recency of the sexual coercion experiences reported. Consequently, the recollection of events may or may not be altered based on when these events occurred. To illustrate, Benoit and Benoit (1988) asserted that the reliability of verbal
reports of participants is questionable because data are mainly based on memory. Recalled memory of participants’ sexual coercive experiences might be inaccurate.

Second, there might be potential response bias, especially for the Korean sample. It was noted in the present study that the Korean participants often did not choose some response options. For example, most respondents from the Korean sample did not indicate that they have experienced sexually coercive acts (e.g., “my partner hinted that he/she would withhold benefits that I depend on if I did not have sex with him/her,” or “my partner hinted that it was my obligation or duty to have sex with him/her”). Research on cross-cultural response bias asserts that the way participants respond to questionnaires is heavily influenced by their cultural norms and values (Fischer, 2004; Smith, 2004). To illustrate, Tanzer (1995) found cultural differences in responses between Chinese and Australian samples; specifically, it was found that most Chinese respondents avoided choosing extreme choices (e.g., “strongly agree,” or “strongly disagree”) in likert-type questionnaires compared to their Australian counterparts. Moreover, Fischer, Fontaine, van de Vijver, and van Hemert (2009) found results consistent with existing research on social desirability; that is, it was found that respondents have a tendency to answer in a way that is expected or socially agreeable. Furthermore, the lack of variability in reporting the extent to which sexual coercion may or may not have occurred could be the result of a reserved cultural background which affects answering sex-related questions, as frequently addressed as a limitation in most sexuality research (see Cardoso, 2008; Davis & Whitten, 1987; Durant & Carey, 2000; Seki, Matsumoto & Imahori; 2002; Stone, Shackelford, & Buss, 2007).

Third, the distribution of sex across cultures could have influenced the results of this study. In this current study, more females than males were participants. Due to the uneven sex ratio, sex difference comparisons must be made with caution. Finally, since this study used a convenient sample, caution should be considered when using this research to generalize these findings to college students in general.

A fourth limitation is about the scale used to measure outcomes/consequences of sexual coercion. The scale used did not exclusively measure outcomes/consequences of sexual coercion. Instead, the scale asked participants to indicate their anticipated outcomes and actual negative consequences of engaging in sexual acts. Therefore, using or creating the scale regarding outcomes/consequences of being sexually coerced is needed.
Another limitation of the study pertains to the reliability and validity of the vignettes. The current study used hypothetical situations for examining perceptions of sexual coercion. There is little constructed scenario research for sexual coercion and the attempt to build this form of research measurement is an on-going process by some researchers in this given area (e.g., Glenn & Byers, 2004). Furthermore, the feasibility of the situations could be problematic. Whether the hypothetical situations are realistic enough to occur in each culture has not been assessed.

The last limitation is in regard to the reliability of Hofstede’s value survey index for the US sample. Although existing research utilizing Hofstede’s dimensions of cultural variability have found the scales measuring individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, and power distance to be reliable, the current study produced low reliabilities when assessing the US participants. Specifically, the dimensions of individualism-collectivism and power distance showed low scale reliabilities.

**Future Research**

Despite limitations, the knowledge gained from this research is significant as it extends the boundary of traditional monocultural research. The current study lays a foundation for investigating cross-cultural differences in sexual coercion. Moreover, the results add to the body of existing research. Based on how this research was prepared and conducted and with their limitations, a variety of suggestions for future research will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

Thus far, a limited amount of research has been conducted to examine cross-cultural differences, especially in sexual coercion. Some eastern cultures (e.g., Japan, Hong Kong) have investigated sexual coercion, but still most research is focused on monocultural groups. Future research needs to not only compare cultures but also compare more than two cultures. Gudykunst (2002) asserts that when designing cross-cultural research, more than two cultures should be compared and studied and that current international and cross-cultural research often makes mistakes by generalizing group differences from an investigation of two cultures. Such inference is dangerous and researchers should be cautious of what they are presenting to the academic world.
Future research needs to create new scales. Thus far, scales used to measure sexual aggression across cultures were created within a specific culture (i.e., the US) and have been just translated and used in other cultures. This is reflective of an imposed etic approach to measurement, which assumes that the same concepts exist in other cultures (Berry, 1989). However, an emic level approach (i.e., cultural context) for creating measures is needed. To illustrate, Farh, Cannella, and Lee (2006) suggest that by using four different approaches (i.e., translation, adaptation, de-contextualization, contextualization), cross-cultural researchers might be able to strengthen their research. The current study used translation and adaptation approaches which involve using the translated version measurement of the particular culture with its native language and implementing or substituting appropriate concepts. More research design should be geared toward using a contextualization approach (i.e., developing scales from scratch by reflecting the cultural traits to study particular cultures) since this emic level approach maximizes the appropriateness of psychological constructs and instruments to local cultures, thus creating an opportunity to contribute to culture-specific knowledge of the given topic.

The current study utilized Hofstede’s dimensions of cultural variability as a way of assessing cultural differences. However, this measure of culture has been criticized. Hofstede’s Value Survey has often been criticized as a measure of culture because it examines nations in order to understand culture, and is based on an assessment of workers in an organization (Hofstede, 2001). Therefore, adopting another measure for examining culture might be more informative. For instance, Schwartz’s Values Surveys (1992), which suggests that cultures differ on seven dimensions (i.e., Conservatism, Hierarchy, Mastery, Affective Autonomy, Intellectual Autonomy, Egalitarian Commitment, and Harmony), might be more informative.

Future research should also present a clear theoretical framework for understanding sexual coercion. Hofstede’s dimensions of cultural variability are not a theoretical approach; therefore, a theoretical framework that might help us to understand sexual coercion is needed. Gudykunst and Lee (2002) argue that cross-cultural research should be theoretically based. Contextual factors and other potential influences on prevalence, perceptions, use of tactics, and outcomes/consequences of sexual coercion might be explained by a specific theory (e.g., evolutionary theory, feminist theory, social learning theory, etc.).
Furthermore, a longitudinal study would also be informative since people might experience sexual coercion at different points in their lives. Specifically, research on sexuality argues that Korean youngsters engage romantic dating relationships later (Choi, 1995; Seepersad et al., 2008; Youn, 1996) than other cultures. This would help us understand how the prevalence of sexual coercion occurs at different points in time.

Overall, this research examined the prevalence, perceptions, and consequences of sexual coercion across cultures. The findings of this study signify that there are differences in experiences of sexual coercion between the US and Korea, but similarities in perceptions of perpetration and victimization of sexual coercion regardless of cultures. Although there were limitations in the current study, the findings of this study could be used as a base to further explore sexual coercion in different cultures as this field of research is still under-investigated outside of Western cultures and has potential to be omnipresent in many cultures.
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APPENDIX A

STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT
(ENGLISH/KOREAN)
Appendix A: Statement of Informed Consent (English)

San Diego State University
Consent to Act as a Research Subject

Sexual Coercion across Cultures:
An examination of prevalence, perceptions, and consequences of sexual coercion
in Korea and the United States

You are being asked to participate in a research study. Before you give your consent to participate, it is important that you read the following information so that you are aware of what you will be asked to do.

Investigators:
Ji Hye Kim, M.A. Candidate, School of Communication, San Diego State University
Carmen M. Lee, Ph.D., School of Communication, San Diego State University

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to investigate the prevalence of sexual coercion and your perceptions of sexually coercive behaviors. This study will involve approximately 400 participants completing a web-based, self-report survey.

Description of the Study: This study involves completing several self-report surveys. You will be asked questions about your general values that are influenced by your culture and your unique experiences (for example, I have sufficient time for my personal or home life; I do work that is interesting). Also, you will be asked to indicate the extent which you have engaged in or been the recipient of certain behaviors (for example, I called my partner a name because they would not have sex with me; my partner pressured me to have sex with them). Additional demographic questions (for example, sex, age, and ethnicity) will also be asked. The completion of this survey will take no longer than 50 minutes. You must be 18 years or older to participate. For confidentiality purposes, this web-based survey will not allow you to go back to the previously asked questions. As a precaution to protect your privacy, ensure that you are located in a private setting and that you close your browser window and shut down your computer after survey completion.

Risk or Discomforts: When responding to the questions, you may reflect on potentially sensitive areas of your experiences and your beliefs about the nature of relationships with others. If you are uncomfortable with any part of this survey, you may choose not to respond without penalty (i.e., this will not affect your grade in a class or your relationship with your instructor). If you are an SDSU student and find that the questions in this survey cause you to reflect on a specific situation that is troubling for you, contact Counseling and Psychological Services at San Diego State University at 619-594-5220.

Benefits of the Study: By participating in the study, a more comprehensive perspective of cross-cultural differences will be uncovered. Personally, you may benefit from the study by increasing your awareness of the frequency of these types of behaviors across cultures. I cannot guarantee, however, that you will receive any benefits from participating in this study.
Confidentiality: Your privacy will be protected to the extent allowable by law. Your name will not be linked to your responses in this survey at any time. Moreover, your questionnaire responses will be kept anonymous and only the experimenter(s) of this study will have access to the information collected. The data itself when downloaded will not contain any identifiable information unique to you. Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may refuse to answer any particular question and if, for any reason and at any time, you do not wish to continue your participation in the research project just described, you may stop without penalty. Your choice to participate will not influence your grade in this class nor your relationship with your professor.

Incentives to Participate: You may or may not receive extra credit from your instructor for completing this questionnaire; it is at the discretion of your instructor. If your instructor will be providing you with extra credit, a separate survey link will be presented at the end of this survey so that you can provide relevant information for credit awarding purposes.

Voluntary Nature of Participation: Participation in this study is voluntary. Your choice of whether or not to participate will not influence your future relations with San Diego State University or Hankuk University of Foreign Studies (HUFS). If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to stop your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are allowed.

Questions about the Study: If you have any questions about the research, please contact the following investigators.

Ji Hye Kim, M.A. Candidate
School of Communication
San Diego State University
juliakim0620@yahoo.com

Carmen M. Lee, PhD
School of Communication
San Diego State University
clee@mail.sdsu.edu

If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a study participant, or are dissatisfied at any time with any aspect of the study, you may contact—anonymously, if you wish—the Institutional Review Board at San Diego State University) at 619-594-6622 or via email: irb@mail.sdsu.edu.

Consent to Participate: The San Diego State University Institutional Review Board has approved this consent form. The consent form must be reviewed annually and expires on the date indicated on the stamp.

Please take your time in completing this survey, while answering questions honestly. Thank you in advance for considering participation in this study.

Please choose one of the following options:

_____ I understand my rights as a participant and I agree to participate in this survey.

_____ I decline to participate in this survey.
부록 A: 연구 참여 동의서 (한글)

샌디에고 주립 대학교

연구 참여 동의서

"문화를 넘어선 성적 위압에 대한 이해:
한국과 미국의 성적 위압에 대한 빈도 및 인식과 결과"

귀하는 조사 연구에 참여해 달라는 요청을 받으셨습니다. 참여 동의를 하시기 전, 어떤 것들을 질문 받게 될 것인지 인지 하실 수 있게 다음의 정보를 읽으실 것을 매우 중요합니다.

연구가: 김지혜, 석사 과정, 커뮤니케이션 대학, 샌디에고 주립 대학교
카르멘 M. 리, 박사, 커뮤니케이션 대학, 샌디에고 주립 대학교

연구 목적: 본 연구의 목적은 성적 위압의 빈도와 성적으로 위압적인 행동들에 대한 귀하의 인식에 대하여 조사하고자 함에 있습니다. 본 연구는 웹 기반의 자기 보고 설문조사를 완료할 약 400여 명의 참가자를 포함 할 예정입니다.


위험 및 불쾌감: 질문들에 응답을 할 때 귀하는 귀하가 했던 경험들 중 잠재적으로 민감한 부분이나, 귀하와 다른 이들과의 관계의 본질에 대한 신념들에 대해 되돌아 보실 수 있을지도 모릅니다. 만약 본 설문의 어떤 부분에서라도 불편함을 느끼신다면, 귀하는 불이익 없이
응답을 하지 않도록 선택 하실 수 있습니다. (즉, 이것은 수업에서 귀하의 성적이나 교수 혹은 강사와의 관계에 영향을 미치지 않을 것 입니다.) 만약 귀하가 샌디에고 주립대의 학생이며 본 설문의 질문들이 특정한 상황을 생각나게 하여 귀하를 괴롭다면면, 샌디에고 주립대학교의 상담 및 심리 서비스 (전화: 1-619-594-5220)에 연락하십시오.

연구 혜택: 본 연구에 참여함으로써, 더욱 포괄적인 교차 문화의 차이점에 대한 관점이 밝혀질 것입니다. 개인적으로 귀하는 문화를 넘어서서 이러한 종류의 행동들이 일어나는 빈도에 대한 귀하의 인지도를 높여 본 연구에서 이득을 받으실 수도 있습니다. 그러나 귀하가 본 연구에 참여함으로써 받으실 혜택에 대해서 보장을 드릴 수는 없습니다.

기밀성: 귀하의 개인 정보는 법률에 의해 허용되는 범위까지 보호됩니다. 귀하의 성명은 본 설문지에 응답할 귀하의 답변들과 시기를 막론하고 연관되지 않을 것입니다. 또한 귀하의 설문 응답들은 익명으로 남을 것이며, 본 연구의 연구가들만 수집된 정보에 접근 할 수 있을 것입니다. 데이터 다운로드 시, 고유하게 식별이 가능한 귀하의 그 어떤 정보도 담겨져 있지 않을 것입니다. 본 연구의 참여는 전적으로 자발적입니다. 귀하는 어떤 특정한 질문에 대답을 하는 것을 거부하실 수 있으며, 만약 어떠한 이유에서던 방금 모사된 본 연구 프로젝트에 계속 참여 하시길 원하지 않으신다면, 귀하는 불리한 점 없이 언제든지 참여를 그만 두실 수 있습니다. 귀하의 참여 선택은 귀하가 듣고 있는 수업의 성적이나 교수 혹은 강사와의 관계에 영향을 주지 않을 것입니다.

참여에 대한 보상: 귀하는 본 설문지를 완료하는데 있어서 귀하의 교수 혹은 강사로부터 추가 점수를 받으실 수도 있습니다. 이것은 그들의 재량에 달려 있습니다. 만약 귀하의 교수 혹은 강사가 추가 점수를 부여한다면, 귀하가 점수 부여의 목적으로 관련된 정보를 제공할 수 있도록 개별적인 설문 링크가 본 설문지 마지막에 보여질 것입니다.

참여의 자발성: 본 연구의 참여는 자발적입니다. 귀하의 참여의사 결정은 미래에 샌디에고 주립대학교와의 관계에 전혀 영향을 주지 않을 것입니다. 만약에 귀하가 참여하시기로 결정하셨다면, 귀하는 동의를 자유롭게 철회하실 수 있으며, 언제든지 불리함 없이 당신에게 주어진 혜택을 잃지 않고 참여를 중단할 수 있습니다.

연구에 대한 질문 사항: 만약 본 연구에 대해서 어떠한 질문이라도 있으시다면, 다음의 연구가들에게 연락을 하시기 바랍니다.
만약 연구 참여자로서의 권리에 대해 질문사항 혹은 우려하시는 점들이 있다거나, 언제라도 본 연구의 어떤 면에서라도 불만 사항이 있으시다면, 원하실때 샌디에고 주립 대학교 검토 위원회 기관 (전화: 1-619-594-6622, 또는 이메일: irb@mail.sdsu.edu)으로 익명성이 보장되게 연락을 하실 수 있습니다.

참여 동의: 샌디에고 주립 대학교 검토 위원회 기관은 본 동의서를 승인 하였습니다. 본 동의서는 매년 검토되어야 하며 스탬프에 찍힌 날짜까지만 유효합니다. 질문들에 솔직하게 대답하여 주시고, 서두르지 말고 본 설문조사의 응답을 천천히 완료하여 주십시오. 본 연구의 참여를 고려하여 주시는 것에 대해서 미리 감사를 드립니다.

아래 선택 사항 중 하나를 택하여 주십시오.

______ 본인은 참여자로서의 권리를 이해하며, 본 설문에 참여하는 것에 동의합니다.
______ 본인은 본 설문에 참여하는 것을 거절합니다.
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE
(ENGLISH/KOREAN)
Appendix B: Questionnaire (English)

I. Demographics

Please answer the following questions by filling in the blank and/or selecting the appropriate responses.

What is your sex? ______ Male ______ Female

What is your age? (please indicate numerically, e.g., 19, 20, etc.) ______

What is your current relational status?

_____ Single  _____ Engaged  _____ Other (please specify): ______________

_____ In a relationship  _____ Married

What is your current standing in college?

_____ Freshman  _____ Junior  _____ 5th year or beyond

_____ Sophomore  _____ Senior  _____ Other (please specify): ______________

What is your ethnicity?

_____ African American/Black  _____ Pacific Islander

_____ Asian American  _____ European American/White

_____ Mexican American/Latino(a)/Hispanic  _____ Other (please specify): ______________

_____ Native American

What is your nationality? (i.e., what is your main country of citizenship) ________________

What was your nationality at birth (if different)? ________________

What is your first/native language? ________________
II. Cultural Dimensions

In this following section, we would like to know your general values that are influenced by your culture and your unique experiences. Think about your own feelings concerning each of these statements and answer for yourself, not how you think other people would answer.

Please think of an IDEAL JOB, disregarding your present job, if you have one. IDEAL JOB, how important would it be to you to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>of very little or</th>
<th>of little importance</th>
<th>of moderate importance</th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>of utmost importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>have sufficient time for your personal or home life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have a boss (direct superior) you can respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get recognition for good performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have security of employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have pleasant people to work with</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do work that is interesting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be consulted by your boss in decisions involving your work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live in a desirable area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have a job respected by your family and friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have chances for promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do you think the following occurs? Never Always

How often, in your experience, are subordinates afraid to contradict their boss (or students their teacher?)

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

An organization in which certain subordinates have two bosses should be avoided at all cost.

Strongly Disagree Agree

III. Defining Sexual Coercion

In this section, we would like you to DEFINE ‘Sexual Coercion.’ Regardless of whether or not you have personally experienced sexual coercion, please provide a clear, detailed definition of what the concept of sexual coercion means to you.
IV. Sexual Coercion Experience

In this section, you will be asked about your own experiences with sexually coercive behavior. Please provide honest answers.

Sexual Coercion is defined here as “verbal or nonverbal behaviors designed to get another person to engage in unwanted sexual behavior.”

I have been the recipient (i.e., on the receiving end) of sexual coercion ______ time(s).
(Please indicate numerically; e.g., 0, 1, 2, 3, etc.)

I have been the perpetrator (i.e., person doing it) of sexual coercion ______ time(s).
(Please indicate numerically; e.g., 0, 1, 2, 3, etc.)

If you have experienced sexual coercion, please indicate the relationship you had with the person(s) engaging in the sexually coercive behaviors. (Please check ALL that apply)

_____ stranger  _____ close friend  _____ acquaintance
_____ romantic partner  _____ other (please specify):____________________

V. Prevalence of Sexual Coercion

Below is a list of acts that can occur in any of your relationships (e.g., friends, strangers, romantic partners). Indicate the number choice that best represents your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act did NOT occur</th>
<th>Act occurred 1 time</th>
<th>Act occurred 2 times</th>
<th>Act occurred 3 to 5 times</th>
<th>Act occurred 6 to 10 times</th>
<th>Act occurred 11 or MORE times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My partner hinted that he/she would withhold benefits that I depend on if I did not have sex with him/her.  1  2  3  4  5  6

My partner threatened to withhold benefits that I depend on if I did not have sex with him/her.  1  2  3  4  5  6
My partner withheld benefits that I depend on to get me to have sex with him/her.

My partner hinted that he/she would give me gifts or other benefits if I had sex with him/her.

My partner gave me gifts or other benefits so that I would feel obligated to have sex with him/her.

My partner reminded me of gifts or other benefits he/she gave me so that I would feel obligated to have sex with him/her.

My partner persisted in asking me to have sex with him/her, even though he/she knew that I did not want to.

My partner pressured me to have sex with him/her against my will.

My partner initiated sex with me when I was unaware (e.g., I was asleep, drunk, or on medication) and continued against my will.

My partner threatened to physically force me to have sex with him/her.

My partner physically forced me to have sex with him/her.

My partner made me feel obligated to have sex with him/her.

My partner hinted that he/she would have sex with another person if I did not have sex with him/her.

My partner threatened to have sex with another person if I did not have sex with him/her.

My partner told me that other couples have sex more than we do, to make me feel like I should have sex with him/her.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My partner hinted that he/she might pursue a long-term relationship with another person if I did not have sex with him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner threatened to pursue a long-term relationship with another person if I did not have sex with him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner hinted that if I were truly committed to him/her I would have sex with him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner told me that if I were truly committed to him/her I would have sex with him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner hinted that if I loved him/her I would have sex with him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner told me that if I loved him/her I would have sex with him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner threatened violence against me if I did not have sex with him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner threatened violence against someone or something I care about if I did not have sex with him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner hinted that other people were interested in a relationship with him/her, so that I would have sex with him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner told me that other people were interested in a relationship with him/her, so that I would have sex with him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner hinted that other people were interested in having sex with him/her, so that I would have sex with him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner told me that other people were interested in having sex with him/her, so that I would have sex with him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My partner hinted that other people were willing to have
sex with him/her, so that I would have sex with
him/her.

My partner told me that other people were willing to have
sex with him/her, so that I would have sex with
him/her.

My partner hinted that it was my obligation or duty to
have sex with him/her.

My partner told me that it was my obligation or duty to
have sex with him/her.

My partner hinted that I was cheating on him/her, in an
effort to get me to have sex with him/her.

My partner accused me of cheating on him/her, in an
effort to get me to have sex with him/her.

My partner and I had sex, even though I did not want to.

VI. Sexual Coercion Scenarios

In this section, you will find three scenarios that describe sexual encounters between two
individuals. After reading each scenario, you will be asked to assess the likelihood that the
situation constitutes/is a form of sexual coercion.

Scenario A:
Indicate the extent to which you believe the situation is definitely not (1) or definitely is (5)
sexual coercion. Your answers will be completely anonymous.

1= it DEFINITELY IS NOT sexual coercion
2= it PROBABLY IS NOT sexual coercion
3= it MAY OR MAY NOT BE sexual coercion
4= it PROBABLY IS sexual coercion
5= it DEFINITELY IS sexual coercion
John and Jenny know each other from their English class and occasionally have lunch together after class. They get along very well and both of them like to hang out with each other. Tonight, John asks Jenny to watch a movie together and invites her over to his place. While watching the movie, there is a kissing scene and both of them become awkwardly silent.

John moves a little closer to Jenny and Jenny does not move away. John tries to look into Jenny’s eyes but Jenny avoids his gaze. John touches her face and Jenny is a bit startled. After pausing for a moment, John moves on and strokes her hair. He then moved closer to Jenny who closes her eyes tightly and adjusts her face downward to look at the floor. John grabs her chin and kisses her.

In this situation, what John does to Jenny is a form of sexual coercion perpetration.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT

In this situation, how Jenny reacts to John is a form of sexual coercion victimization.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT

When John moves closer to Jenny and strokes her face and hair she does not move. When he turns her head to kiss her, Jenny kisses him back. John grabs her waist while kissing her and Jenny puts her arms around his shoulders. They continue kissing and John slowly moves his hands to Jenny’s upper body (i.e., her breasts). Jenny twitches slightly and mumbles some sounds like “no” but keeps kissing him. John’s hand touches her chest again and this time she stops kissing him for a second and gives him a look of reluctance. Then, John and Jenny go back to kissing.

In this situation, what John does to Jenny is a form of sexual coercion perpetration.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT

Definitely IS
In this situation, how Jenny reacts to John is a form of sexual coercion victimization.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT                   Definitely IS

John slowly tries to put his hands under her shirt and when he did that Jenny gasps a little bit and is stunned for a while. John looks into her eyes and Jenny avoids his eyes. John moves his hands again to her chest and Jenny moans slightly. John takes that sounds as ‘yes’ and continues to touch her chest.

In this situation, what John does to Jenny is a form of sexual coercion perpetration.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT                   Definitely IS

In this situation, how Jenny reacts to John is a form of sexual coercion victimization.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT                   Definitely IS

As Jenny moans a little louder, John’s right hand moves under her skirt while the other hand is touching her chest. Jenny grabs his hand but does not say “no.” Instead, she squeezes his shoulder and shakes her head a little bit. John whispers in her ear saying, “trust me” and pushes away her hand gently with the other hand and continues touching her thighs. She sheepishly mumbles “please” but she does not push him away.

In this situation, what John does to Jenny is a form of sexual coercion perpetration.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT                   Definitely IS

In this situation, how Jenny reacts to John is a form of sexual coercion victimization.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT                   Definitely IS
Scenario B:
Indicate the extent to which you believe the situation is definitely not (1) or definitely is (5) sexual coercion. Your answers will be completely anonymous.

1= it DEFINITELY IS NOT sexual coercion
2= it PROBABLY IS NOT sexual coercion
3= it MAY OR MAY NOT BE sexual coercion
4= it PROBABLY IS sexual coercion
5= it DEFINITELY IS sexual coercion

Mark and Lisa have been officially dating each other for 6 months. They like each other a lot and both of them care for each other. They decide to go on a weekend trip together. They have fun at the beach and the food is great. At night, they come back to the hotel and sit on the bed together.

Mark and Lisa start to kiss romantically and Mark touches Lisa’s body. Lisa starts to kiss him more passionately and Mark unbuttons her shirt. Lisa grabs Mark’s hand and says, “it’s just too fast.” Mark kisses her again and says “but you know how much I care for you.” Lisa mumbles “I know but...” and while she hesitates, Mark continues his moves. Lisa just lets him touch her.

In this situation, what Mark does to Lisa is a form of sexual coercion perpetration.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT Definitely IS

In this situation, how Lisa reacts to Mark is a form of sexual coercion victimization.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT Definitely IS

Mark’s hand reaches the back of Lisa’s bra and he tries to unhook it while kissing Lisa. Lisa stops kissing Mark and says, “I’m not ready for it.” Mark says “don’t worry, you’ll be fine
just like everyone else.” Lisa says, “I like you and everything but I don’t want to do that right now.” Mark says “but do you hate when I am touching you?” Lisa answers weakly “I like it but... oh I don’t know how to explain this...” Mark kisses her again and whispers in her ear ‘you know I am in love with you.’ Lisa kisses him back again and Mark unhooks her bra.

In this situation, what Mark does to Lisa is a form of sexual coercion perpetration.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT  Definitely IS

In this situation, how Lisa reacts to Mark is a form of sexual coercion victimization.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT  Definitely IS

Mark touches all over Lisa’s body and Lisa says, “I think we should stop here.” Mark looks at her and says “but I’ve been very patient so far. Most couples would make love within a couple of months after being official.” Lisa replies “but if you care for me you would wait until I feel comfortable.” Mark says “but do you feel uncomfortable when I’m with you?” Lisa says, “it’s not like that...” Mark asks, “is it because you don’t love me?” Lisa says “no, I love you but...” Mark asks once more “then what’s the problem?” Lisa is just silent and at a loss for words. Mark leans forward and touches her body again.

In this situation, what Mark does to Lisa is a form of sexual coercion perpetration.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT  Definitely IS

In this situation, how Lisa reacts to Mark is a form of sexual coercion victimization.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT  Definitely IS

Mark removes her blouse while kissing her and whispers ‘I love you.’ Lisa mutters “I think I’m not really ready for this” and Mark says, “if you love me, you’re ready for this.” Lisa
says “but...” Mark says “no more “but”! Don’t you feel pity for me? I’ve been waiting too long and it’s not fair! If you didn’t want this to happen, you shouldn't have asked me to go on a trip together!” Mark suddenly stands up and walks away to the bathroom.

In this situation, what Mark does to Lisa is a form of sexual coercion perpetration.

1  2  3  4  5
Definitely NOT  Definitely IS

In this situation, how Lisa reacts to Mark is a form of sexual coercion victimization.

1  2  3  4  5
Definitely NOT  Definitely IS

Lisa goes to the bathroom to look for Mark and says, “are you mad at me? Please don’t be. I’m just scared, that’s all. I just don’t think I’m ready for this yet.” Mark hugs Lisa and says “but you know you’ll be fine with me.” Lisa hesitates but does not know what else to say. Mark takes that as a positive response and lifts her to the bed and continues from where he left off.

In this situation, what Mark does to Lisa is a form of sexual coercion perpetration.

1  2  3  4  5
Definitely NOT  Definitely IS

In this situation, how Lisa reacts to Mark is a form of sexual coercion victimization.

1  2  3  4  5
Definitely NOT  Definitely IS
Scenario C:
Indicate the extent to which you believe the situation is definitely not (1) or definitely is (5) sexual coercion. Your answers will be completely anonymous.

1= it DEFINITELY IS NOT sexual coercion
2= it PROBABLY IS NOT sexual coercion
3= it MAY OR MAY NOT BE sexual coercion
4= it PROBABLY IS sexual coercion
5= it DEFINITELY IS sexual coercion

After the semester is over, Michelle and her roommates attended a party near campus. At the party, Michelle meets a guy named James and they do not know each other at all. James brings Michelle a bottle of beer and they continue to talk. James suggests that he and Michelle leave the party and go somewhere else to do something fun. Michelle hesitates but decides to go along with him.

Michelle gets into James’s car and James drives for a while and parks somewhere in the park. James leans toward Michelle and kisses her. Michelle kisses him back and James starts to kiss her neck and fondle Michelle’s breasts. Michelle tugs his hair and James’s hand reaches under Michelle’s skirt. Then, Michelle abruptly grabs James’s hand and says “I’m not interested in going all the way tonight.” James says “you’re just teasing me, right?”

In this situation, what James does to Michelle is a form of sexual coercion perpetration.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT Definitely IS

In this situation, how Michelle reacts to James is a form of sexual coercion victimization.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT Definitely IS
Michelle says, “no, I’m serious.” James scoffs at her saying “okay, no sex then” and continues to touch her body. James kisses her and Michelle kisses him back. They kiss for a while and James tries to reach his hand under her skirt again. Michelle stops kissing him and says “Didn’t I make it clear? I’m not that kind of girl.” James ignores what she says and continues to touch her down there.

In this situation, what James does to Michelle is a form of sexual coercion perpetration.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT Definitely IS

In this situation, how Michelle reacts to James is a form of sexual coercion victimization.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT Definitely IS

Michelle says, “okay if you are not listening to me, I’m out of here.” Michelle tries to get out of the car. James locks the door, grabs her firmly and says “seriously? You come to the party with that kind of dress and make-up and ditch your friends for a guy and kiss him in his car and you want me to believe you’re only into kissing? Are you kidding?”

In this situation, how James reacts to Michelle is a form of sexual coercion victimization.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT Definitely IS

In this situation, how Michelle reacts to James is a form of sexual coercion victimization.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT Definitely IS

Michelle pleads by saying, “oh please let me go. I just came along because you seem to be a nice guy.” James ignores what she says and continues to kiss her hard and tries to take her
shirt off. Michelle starts to cry and begs him to stop. James completely ignores her and attempts to take her skirt off as well.

In this situation, what James does to Michelle is a form of sexual coercion perpetration.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT Definitely IS

In this situation, how Michelle reacts to James is a form of sexual coercion victimization.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT Definitely IS

This time, Michelle yells at him to let her go and James slaps her face and lifts her skirt all the way up. Michelle does not know what to do and it seems as if nobody is around the park. She shoves him hard and James grabs her hands so she cannot move at all. Michelle fights back but it is impossible for her to get out of his hands.

In this situation, what James does to Michelle is a form of sexual coercion perpetration.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT Definitely IS

In this situation, how Michelle reacts to James is a form of sexual coercion victimization.

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely NOT Definitely IS

VII. Sexual Coercion Tactics
People pursue sex through a wide variety of ways. We are interested in whether or not you have ever experienced any of the following actions in an attempt to obtain sex from you in your life.

Here, “Sex” is defined as: (1) sexual intercourse, (2) oral or anal penetration by tongue, penis, or object, (3) petting, caressing, or handling breasts, genitals, or buttocks; or (4)
disrobing or otherwise removing your clothing to obtain physical access to your body for the purpose of romantic physical contact.

To what extent have you ever in your life experienced SOMEONE ELSE engaging in any of the following actions in attempting to get you to engage in sexual activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Some Times</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used verbal persuasion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kept asking for sex until you gave in</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claimed to be too aroused for you to stop them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whined or begged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used bribes of some sort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made you feel inadequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made you feel guilty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used psychological or verbal pressure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used verbal coercion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used continual arguments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used surprise or shock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Said things they didn’t mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely professed their love</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely promised things (e.g., engagement)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displayed mock or “pretend” force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lied to you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricked you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened to end your relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened to harm your reputation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaguely implied that bad things would happen to you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened to leave you stranded somewhere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used verbal threats or blackmail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intimidated you by their size or strength 1 2 3 4
Threatened to hurt you 1 2 3 4
Started undressing you without your consent 1 2 3 4
Started feeling your body without your consent 1 2 3 4
Trapped you in a closed space (e.g., car, room) 1 2 3 4
Displayed or threatened to use some sort of weapon 1 2 3 4
Physically restrained you 1 2 3 4
Got you too drunk, stoned, or drugged to resist 1 2 3 4
Used a “date rape” drug on you 1 2 3 4
Physically forced you 1 2 3 4
Got on top of you so you couldn’t move 1 2 3 4
Twisted your arm to restrain you 1 2 3 4
Pinned you down 1 2 3 4
Physically slapped, shoved, or hit you 1 2 3 4
Choked you 1 2 3 4
Beat you 1 2 3 4
Used a weapon of some sort 1 2 3 4
Injured you physically 1 2 3 4

VIII. Outcomes of Sexual Behavior

Below is a list of things that some people WORRY ABOUT as a result of their sexual activities (including things people do alone and those they do with others). Please indicate the extent to which the following apply to you. I am WORRIED that the things I have done sexually:

might have placed me or one of my sex partners at risk for pregnancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might have places me or one of my sex partner at risk for a sexually transmitted infection (e.g., herpes, gonorrhea, or crabs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might have placed me or one of my sex partners at risk for HIV/AIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might have resulted in pain, injury, or other problems for one of my sex partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might have resulted in pain, injury, or other problems for myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might have presented the potential for serious physical injury or death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might be leading to problems with my friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might be leading to problems with my family members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might be leading to problems with my boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might have placed me at risk of being arrested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might have been against the law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might have led to financial problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might have caused me to waste my money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were interfering with my ability to complete tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might have presented the potential for me to lose my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could lead to school-related problems, such as probation, expulsion, or other sanctions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were inconsistent with my spiritual beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were inconsistent with my religious values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were making me feel guilty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were making me ashamed of myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is a list of things that sometimes HAPPEN TO people as a result of their sexual activities (including those they do alone and those they do with others). Please indicate whether these things have HAPPENED TO YOU as a result of your sexual activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I or my sexual partner(s) became pregnant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I contracted a sexually transmitted infection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I contracted HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gave someone else sexually transmitted infection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gave someone else HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I caused pain, injury, or other physical problems for myself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I caused pain, injury, or other physical problems for a sex partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My relationships with friends and/or family members were damaged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My relationships with a spouse or other relationship partner were damaged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was arrested</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experienced financial problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experienced problems at school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experienced problems at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experienced spiritual distress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was embarrassed or ashamed of myself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt guilty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much for your participation!
부록 B: 설문지 (한글)

I. 자료 분류용 질문
다음의 질문들은 빈칸을 채우거나 알맞은 답변들을 선택하여 대답을 하여 주십시오.

귀하의 성별은 무엇입니까? ______ 남성 ______ 여성
귀하의 연령은 무엇입니까? (수치로 표시하시기 바랍니다. 예: 18, 19, 20, 등) _____

현재 연예 관계는 무엇입니까?
_____ 싱글 _____ 약혼 _____ 기타 (명시해 주십시오) : ______
_____ 교제 중 _____ 기혼

현재 대학교에서 몇 학년 입니까?
_____ 1 학년 _____ 3 학년 _____ 5 학년 혹은 그 이상 재학 중
_____ 2 학년 _____ 4 학년 _____ 기타 (명시해 주십시오) : ______

국적은 무엇입니까? (즉, 시민권이 있는 나라는 어디입니까?) __________________
만약 현재와 다르다면, 태어난 나라는 어디입니까? __________________
모국어는 무엇입니까? __________________

II. 문화적 차원
이 섹션에서는 당신의 문화와 고유한 경험으로 영향을 받은 당신의 일반적 가치관에 대해서
알고자 합니다. 각각의 진술문들에 대한 당신 자신의 느낌에 대해서 생각해 주시고, 다른
이들이 어떻게 대답 할지 생각하지 말고 스스로 답해주십시오.

현재 직업이 있으시더라도 연관시키지 마시고, 가장 이상적인 직업에 대해서만 생각해
주십시오. 그 이상적 직업을 선택하는데 있어서, 다음의 항목들이 당신에게 얼마나 중요한지
답변하여 주십시오.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>결코</th>
<th>거의</th>
<th>가끔</th>
<th>대체로</th>
<th>항상</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>두려워하지 않음</td>
<td>두려워하지 않음</td>
<td>두려워함</td>
<td>두려워함</td>
<td>두려워함</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

당신은 다음의 서술문에 대해서 어느정도로 두려워하거나 두려워하지 않으십니까?

결코 두려워 | 항상 하지 않음 | 두려워함
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

당신의 경험에 비추어 볼 때, 부하 직원들이 직장 상사 (혹은 학생들의 경우 교사)와 반대되는 입장을 취하는 것을 얼마나 두려워하십니까?

전혀 중요하지 않다 | 별로 중요하지 않다 | 중요하다 | 매우 중요하다 | 최고로 중요하다
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
당신은 다음의 서술문에 대해서 어느정도 동의하거나 동의하지 않으십니까?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>매우 동의하지</th>
<th>매우 동의함</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>동의하거나 동의하지 않음</td>
<td>동의함</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

부하직원들이 두 명의 상관의 지시를 받게 하는 조직구조는 어떠한 경우에도 있어서는 안된다.

III. 성적 위압에 대한 정의

이 섹션에서 우리는 성적 위압에 대한 당신의 정의를 듣고자 합니다. 개인적으로 성적 위압을 경험했던 하지 않았던것에 상관없이, 당신에게 있어서 성적 위압은 무엇인가에 대해서 분명하고 자세한 정의를 내려 주십시오.
IV. 성적 위압 경험

이 섹션에서는 당신의 개인적인 성적 위압 경험에 대해서 묻고자 합니다. 솔직한 답변을 부탁드립니다.

"성적 위압"이란 말이나 행동을 사용하여 다른 상대가 원하지 않는 성적 행동에 관여하게 만드는 것을 의미합니다.

나는 성적 위압을 누군가로부터 _____번 받은적이 있다.
(성적 위압을 경험한 횟수를 숫자로 나타내어 주십시오. 예: 0, 1, 2, 3, 등)

나는 성적 위압을 누군가에게 _____번 행한적이 있다.
(성적 위압을 실행한 횟수를 숫자로 나타내어 주십시오. 예: 0, 1, 2, 3, 등)

성적 위압을 경험했다면, 성적으로 위압적인 행동에 관여한 상대와의 관계를 나타내어 주십시오. (해당되는 모든 사항을 체크해 주십시오.)

____ 낯선 사람 ______ 친한 친구 ______ 지인
____ 애인 ______ 기타 (명시해 주십시오):____________________

V. 성적 위압의 빈도

아래 목록들은 당신의 주변 어느 사람들과의 관계에서나 (예: 친구, 낯선사람, 애인) 일어날 수 있는 행동들입니다. 다음 스케일을 이용해 과거 얼마나 자주 당신과 관계를 맺은 아무나와 이러한 행동들이 일어났는지 나타내어 주십시오.

행동이 일어나지 않은 횟수
행동이 1번 일어남
행동이 2번 일어남
행동이 3번에서 4번째 일어남
행동이 5번에서 6번 일어남

내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 갖지 않으면 내가 의존하고 있는 혜택을 주지 않을것이라 암시했다.
내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 갖지 않으면 내가 의존하고 있는 혜택을 주지 않음을이라 협박했다.

내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 갖게 하기 위해 내가 의존하고 있는 혜택을 주지 않았다.

내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지면 선물이나 다른 혜택을 주겠다고 암시했다.

내 파트너는 내가 의무적으로 성관계를 가져야한다고 느끼게 선물이나 다른 혜택을 주었다.

내 파트너는 내가 의무적으로 성관계를 가져야 한다고 느끼게 자신이 준 선물이나 다른 혜택을 나에게 상기시켜 주었다.

내 파트너는 내가 의무적으로 성관계를 가져야 한다고 느끼게 나에게 상기시켜 주었다.

내 파트너는 내가 원하지 않는 것을 알면서도 나에게 성관계를 갖도록 집요하게 요구했다.

내 파트너는 내 의사에 반하여 성관계를 갖도록 압박했다.

내 파트너는 내가 의식하지 못 할때 (예: 자는 도중, 만취상태, 약물 복용) 나와 성관계를 시작했고, 나의 의사에 반하여 계속 진행했다.

내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 갖도록 물리적인 폭력을 가하겠다고 협박했다.

내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 갖도록 물리적 폭력을 가했다.

내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 갖도록 나에게 의무감을 느끼게 했다.

내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지지 않으면 다른 사람과 성관계를 갖겠다고 암시했다.

내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지지 않으면 다른 사람과 성관계를 갖겠다고 협박했다.

내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지지 않으면 다른 사람과 성관계를 갖겠다고 암시했다.

내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지지 않으면 다른 사람과 성관계를 갖겠다고 암시했다.

내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지지 않으면 다른 사람과 성관계를 갖겠다고 협박했다.
내 파트너는 내가 정말로 내 파트너에게 헌신적이라면 성관계를 가질 것이라고 암시했다.
내 파트너는 내가 정말로 내 파트너에게 헌신적이라면 성관계를 가질 것이라고 말했다.
내 파트너는 내가 내 파트너를 사랑한다면 성관계를 가질것이라고 암시했다.
내 파트너는 내가 내 파트너를 사랑한다면 성관계를 가질것이라고 말했다.
내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지지 않으면 나에게 폭행을 가하겠다고 협박했다.
내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지지 않으면 내가 아끼는 누군가나 무언가에 폭행을 가하겠다고 협박했다.
내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지게 하도록 다른 사람들이 자기와 사귀고 싶어 한다고 암시했다.
내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지게 하도록 다른 사람들이 자기와 사귀고 싶어 한다고 말했다.
내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지게 하도록 다른 사람들에게 자기와 성관계를 가지고 싶어 한다고 암시했다.
내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지게 하도록 다른 사람들에게 자기와 성관계를 가지고 싶어 한다고 말했다.
내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지게 하도록 내가 바람을 피우고 있다고 암시했다.
내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지게 하도록 내가 바람을 피우고 있다고 말했다.
내 파트너는 나에게 자기와 성관계를 가지는 것이 의무라고 암시했다.
내 파트너는 나에게 자기와 성관계를 가지는 것이 의무라고 말했다.
내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지게 하도록 내가 바람을 피우고 있다고 암시했다.
내 파트너는 내가 성관계를 가지게 하도록 내가 바람을 피우고 있다고 비난했다.
내 파트너와 나는 내가 원치 않았음에도 성관계를 가졌다.
VI. 성적 위압 시나리오

이 섹션에서는 두 인물의 성적 경험을 서술한 세 개의 시나리오를 읽게 되실 것입니다. 각 시나리오를 읽은 후, 서술된 상황의 성적 위압 가능성에 대한 평가를 하시게 될 것입니다.

성적 위압 시나리오 A:

상황이 얼마나 성적으로 위압적이라고 생각되시는지, "절대 성적 위압이 아니다(1)"에서 "절대 성적 위압이다(5)"로 나타내어 주십시오. 당신의 답변은 완전히 익명성이 보장됩니다.

1= 절대 성적 위압이 아니다
2= 아마도 성적 위압이 아니다
3= 성적 위압일 수도 있고, 그렇지 않을 수도 있다
4= 아마도 성적 위압이다
5= 절대 성적 위압이다

성민과 지현은 영어 강의를 듣다가 서로 알게 된 사이이고 강의가 끝나면 가끔 점심을 같이 먹고, 둘은 친하게 잘 지내고, 같이 어울려 노는 걸 좋아한다. 오늘 밤, 성민은 지현에게 같이 영화를 보자고 하고 자기 집으로 그녀를 초대한다. 영화를 보는 도중, 키스 장면이 나오고 둘 사이에는 어색한 침묵이 흐른다.

성민과 지현은 영어 강의를 듯다가 서로 알게 된 사이이고 강의가 끝나면 가끔 점심을 같이 먹고는 한다. 둘은 친하게 잘 지내고, 같이 어울려 노는 걸 좋아한다. 오늘 밤, 성민은 지현에게 같이 영화를 보자고 하고 자기 집으로 그녀를 초대한다. 영화를 보는 도중, 키스 장면이 나오고 둘 사이에는 어색한 침묵이 흐른다.

성민은 지현에게 조금 더 가까이 다가가고, 지현은 가만히 있는다. 성민이 눈을 바라보려고 하지만, 지현은 그의 시선을 피한다. 성민이 얼굴을 만지자 지현은 조금 놀란다. 점점 멀어질 땐, 성민은 계속해서 그녀의 머리카락을 쓰다듬는다. 그리고나서 그는 눈을 꼭 감고 얼굴은 바닥을 향해 내려보고 있는 지현에게 가까이 간다. 성민은 그녀의 턱을 잡고 키스한다.

이 상황에서 성민이 지현에게 한 행동은 성적 위압의 한 형태이다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>절대 아니다</td>
<td>절대 그렇다</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

이 상황에서 지현이 성민에게 한 반응은 성적 위압 피해의 한 형태이다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>절대 아니다</td>
<td>절대 그렇다</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
성민이 가까이 다가가 지현의 얼굴과 머리카락을 쓰다듬자 지현은 움직이지 않는다. 성민이 그녀의 고개를 돌려 키스하자 지현은 그에게 다시 키스한다. 성민은 지현에게 키스하는 동안 그녀의 허리를 잡고, 지현은 손을 그의 어깨에 올려놓는다. 둘은 계속 키스하고 성민은 천천히 그의 손을 지현의 상체로 (즉, 가슴) 옮긴다. 지현은 약간 씨름거리고 "안돼" 비슷한 말을 중얼거리지만 계속 그에게 키스한다. 성민의 손은 다시 그녀의 가슴을 만지고, 이번에 지현은 잠깐 키스를 멈추고 성민에게 약간 주저하는 눈빛을 보인다. 그러고나서 성민과 지현은 다시 키스한다.

이 상황에서 성민이 지현에게 한 행동은 성적 위압의 한 형태이다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>절대 아니다</td>
<td>절대 그렇다</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

이 상황에서 지현이 성민에게 한 반응은 성적 위약 피해의 한 형태이다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>절대 아니다</td>
<td>절대 그렇다</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

성민은 지현의 티셔츠 속으로 손을 집어 넣으려 하고, 천천히 집어 넣자 지현은 약간 ‘학’ 하고 숨을 내쉬며 잠깐동안 멍하니 있는다. 성민은 그녀의 눈을 쳐다보고 지현은 그의 시선을 피한다. 성민은 손을 다시 그녀의 가슴으로 옮기고 지현은 약간 신음한다. 성민은 그 소리를 허락의 의미로 받아들이고, 그녀의 가슴을 계속해서 만진다.

이 상황에서 성민이 지현에게 한 행동은 성적 위압의 한 형태이다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>절대 아니다</td>
<td>절대 그렇다</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

이 상황에서 지현이 성민에게 한 반응은 성적 위압 피해의 한 형태이다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>절대 아니다</td>
<td>절대 그렇다</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

지현이 조금 더 크게 신음하자, 성민의 다른 한손이 그녀의 가슴을 만지는 동안 오른 손은 그녀의 치마속으로 향한다. 지현은 그의 손을 옮겨잡지만 "안돼"라고 말하지는 않는다. 대신 지현은 그의 어깨를 꺽 붙잡고 머리를 약간 촉든다. 성민은 그녀의 귀에 "날 믿어"라고
속삭이며, 다른손으로는 그녀의 손을 부드럽게 밀어내며 계속해서 그녀의 허벅지를 만진다. 지현은 소심하게 “제발”이라 중얼거리지만 그를 밀어내지는 않는다.

이 상황에서 성민이 지현에게 한 행동은 성적 위압의 한 형태이다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>절대 아니다</td>
<td>절대 그렇다</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

이 상황에서 지현이 성민에게 한 반응은 성적 위압 피해의 한 형태이다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>절대 아니다</td>
<td>절대 그렇다</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
성적 위압 시나리오 B:

상황이 얼마나 성적으로 위압적이라고 생각되시는지, "절대 성적 위압이 아니다(1)"에서 "절대 성적 위압이다(5)"로 나타내어 주십시오. 당신의 답변은 완전히 익명성이 보장됩니다.

1= 절대 성적 위압이 아니다
2= 아마도 성적 위압이 아니다
3= 성적 위압일 수도 있고, 그렇지 않을 수도 있다
4= 아마도 성적 위압이다
5= 절대 성적 위압이다

지훈과 유진은 공식적으로 사귄지 6개월째다. 둘은 서로를 많이 좋아하고 소중히 여긴다. 지훈과 유진은 주말에 여행을 같이 가기로 결정한다. 둘은 해변에서 즐거운 시간을 보내고 맛있는 음식도 먹는다. 밤이 되어 호텔로 돌아온 둘은 침대에 같이 앉는다.

지훈과 유진은 서로 껴안으며 입을 맞추기 시작하고 지훈은 유진의 몸을 만진다. 유진은 더 열정적으로 키스하고 지훈은 유진의 서냐 단추를 풀은다. 유진은 지훈의 손을 움켜잡고 "이건 좀 너무 빨라"라고 얘기한다. 지훈은 그녀에게 다시 키스하며 "그렇지만 내가 널 얼마나 소중히 여기는지 알잖아"라고 말한다. 유진은 "아는데…"라고 중얼거리고, 그녀가 머뭇거리는 동안 지훈은 계속 하던것을 진행한다. 유진은 그날 그가 만지게 놔둔다.

이 상황에서 지훈이 유진에게 한 행동은 성적 위압의 한 형태이다.

1 2 3 4 5
절대 아니다 절대 그렇다

이 상황에서 유진이 지훈에게 한 반응은 성적 위압 피해의 한 형태이다.

1 2 3 4 5
절대 아니다 절대 그렇다

지훈의 손은 유진의 브래지어 뒷쪽으로 향하고 키스하는 동안 풀으려고 한다. 유진은 더 열정적으로 키스하고 지훈은 유진의 서냐 단추를 풀은다. 유진은 지훈의 손을 움켜잡고 "이건 좀 너무 빨라"라고 얘기한다. 지훈은 그녀에게 다시 키스하며 "그렇지만 내가 널 얼마나 소중히 여기는지 알잖아"라고 말한다. 유진은 "아는데…"라고 중얼거리고, 그녀가 머뭇거리는 동안 지훈은 계속 하던것을 진행한다. 유진은 그날 그가 만지게 놔둔다.
사랑하는 거 알잖아'라고 속삭인다. 유진은 그에게 다시 키스하고 지훈은 그녀의 브래지어를 풀한다.

이 상황에서 지훈이 유진에게 한 행동은 성적 위압의 한 형태이다.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>절대 아니다</td>
<td>절대 그렇다</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

이 상황에서 유진이 지훈에게 한 반응은 성적 위압 피해의 한 형태이다.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>절대 아니다</td>
<td>절대 그렇다</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


이 상황에서 지훈이 유진에게 한 행동은 성적 위압의 한 형태이다.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>절대 아니다</td>
<td>절대 그렇다</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

이 상황에서 유진이 지훈에게 한 반응은 성적 위압 피해의 한 형태이다.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>절대 아니다</td>
<td>절대 그렇다</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

이 상황에서 지훈이 유진에게 한 행동은 성적 위압의 한 형태이다.
1 2 3 4 5
절대 아니다 절대 그렇다

이 상황에서 유진이 지훈에게 한 반응은 성적 위압 피해의 한 형태이다.
1 2 3 4 5
절대 아니다 절대 그렇다

유진은 화장실로 가서 지훈을 찾고 "오빠 화났어? 화내지마. 그냥 무서워서 그래. 나 그냥 아직 준비가 안 된거 같아"라고 말한다. 지훈은 유진을 끌어안으며, "그렇지만 나랑있으면 괜찮을거 알잖아"라고 말한다. 유진은 양설이지만 무슨 말을 해야할지 모른다. 지훈은 이걸 긍정의 의미로 받아들이고 그녀를 들어올려 침대로 데리고 가며 하던 것을 마저 진행한다.

성적 위압 시나리오 C:
상황이 얼마나 성적으로 위압적이라고 생각되시는지, "절대 성적 위압이 아니다(1)"에서 "절대 성적 위압이다(5)"로 나타내어 주십시오. 당신의 답변은 완전히 익명성이 보장됩니다.

1= 절대 성적 위압이 아니다
2= 아마도 성적 위압이 아니다
3= 성적 위압일 수도 있고, 그렇지 않을 수도 있다
4= 아마도 성적 위압이다
5= 절대 성적 위압이다

학기가 끝나고 지은과 롱메이트들은 캠퍼스 근처에서 열린 파티에 참석한다. 파티에서
지은은 민준이란 남자를 만나는데 들은 서로 아는 사이가 아니다. 민준은 지은에게 맥주를 가져다주고 들은 계속해서 이야기를 나눈다. 민준은 지은에게 파티에서 나가 다른곳에서 재밌는것을 하러 가자고 제안한다. 지은은 망설이지만 민준을 따르기로 한다.

지은이 민준의 차에 타고, 민준은 얼마동안 운전하다가 공원의 어딘가에 주차한다. 민준은 지은에게 몸을 숙여 키스를 한다. 지은도 같이 키스 하자, 민준은 그녀의 목을 키스하기 시작하고 가슴을 애무한다. 지은은 그의 머리카락을 잡아당기고, 민준의 손은 지은의 치마 밑으로 향한다. 그러자 지은은 갑자기 민준의 손을 잡아채고, "오늘밤 끝까지 가고 싶진 않아" 라고 말한다. 민준은 "그냥 나 애태우는거지?"라고 말한다.

이 상황에서 민준이 지은에게 한 행동은 성적 위압의 한 형태이다.
1 2 3 4 5 절대 아니다 절대 그렇다

이 상황에서 지은이 민준에게 한 반응은 성적 위압 피해의 한 형태이다.
1 2 3 4 5 절대 아니다 절대 그렇다

지은은 "아니야 진심이야" 라고 말한다. 민준은 그녀의 말을 비웃으며, "그래, 그럼 섹스는 하지말자" 라고 말하며 그녀의 몸을 계속 만진다. 민준은 그녀에게 키스하고 지은도 그에게 키스한다. 들은 한동안 키스를 하고 민준은 다시 그녀의 치마 밑으로 손을 벗는다. 지은은 키스하던 걸 멈추며, "내가 확실히 말하지 않았어? 나 그런 여자 아니야"라고 말한다. 민준은 그녀의 말을 무시하고 계속해서 그녀의 밑에 쪽을 만진다.

이 상황에서 민준이 지은에게 한 행동은 성적 위압의 한 형태이다.
1 2 3 4 5 절대 아니다 절대 그렇다

이 상황에서 지은이 민준에게 한 반응은 성적 위압 피해의 한 형태이다.
1 2 3 4 5 절대 아니다 절대 그렇다

이 상황에서 민준이 지은에게 한 행동은 성적 위압의 한 형태이다.
1    2    3    4    5
절대 아니다    절대 그렇다

이 상황에서 지은이 민준에게 한 반응은 성적 위압 피해의 한 형태이다.
1    2    3    4    5
절대 아니다    절대 그렇다

지은은 “아, 제발 가게 해줘. 그냥 너가 좋은 사람같아서 따라왔단말야”라고 애원하며 말한다. 민준은 그녀의 말을 무시하고 계속해서 세계 키스하며 그녀의 셔츠를 벗기려고 한다. 지은은 울기 시작하고 그에게 멈출것을 애원한다. 민준은 완전히 그녀를 무시하며 치마도 벗기려고 한다.

이 상황에서 민준이 지은에게 한 행동은 성적 위압의 한 형태이다.
1    2    3    4    5
절대 아니다    절대 그렇다

이 상황에서 지은이 민준에게 한 반응은 성적 위압 피해의 한 형태이다.
1    2    3    4    5
절대 아니다    절대 그렇다

이번에 지은은 놓아달라 그에게 소리지르고, 민준은 그녀의 빵을 때리며 치마를 끝까지 꺼어올린다. 지은은 씩 해야할지 모르겠고, 공원 주변에는 아무도 없는듯하다. 지은은 그를 세계 밀지만 민준은 그녀의 손을 올려잡아 아예 움직이기 못하게 한다. 지은은 저항하지만 그의 손을 벗어나기엔 역부족이다.

이 상황에서 민준이 지은에게 한 행동은 성적 위압의 한 형태이다.
1    2    3    4    5
절대 아니다  절대 그렇다

이 상황에서 지은이 민준에게 한 반응은 성적 위압 피해의 한 형태이다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>절대 아니다</td>
<td>절대 그렇다</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. 성적 위압 전략

사람들은 폭 넓고 다양한 방법을 통해 성관계를 추구합니다. 우리는 지금껏 살면서 당신에게 성관계를 얻기 위해 시도된 다음의 행동들 중 어느 것이라도 경험한 적이 있는지에 관심이 있습니다. 여기서 "성관계"란 다음 중 어느것이라도 해당됩니다: (1) 성교, (2) 허, 음경, 혹은 물건을 통한 구강 또는 항문 관통, (3) 강한 애무, 어루만짐, 가슴, 성기, 혹은 엉덩이 접촉, (4) 애정이 담긴 신체 접촉을 목적으로 몸을 만질수 있는 접근성을 얻기 위해 달의.

지금껏 살아오면서 다른 누군가가 당신을 성적인 행동에 관여하도록 만들기 위해 다음의 행동들을 한 것을 어느정도로 경험해 보았습니까?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>절대 없음</th>
<th>가끔</th>
<th>자주</th>
<th>매우 자주</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>말로 설득함.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>굴복할 때까지 성관계를 계속 요구함.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>멀추기엔 너무 흥분해 있다고 주장함.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>징징거리거나 애원함.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뇌물이나 그 비슷한 종류를 사용함.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>무능하다고 느끼게 만들.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>죄책감이 들게 만들.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>심리적으로 혹은 말로 압력을 사용함.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>말로 강요함.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>반복되는 언쟁을 사용함.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>놀라게 하거나 충격을 사용함.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뜻하지 않은 말을 함.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>거짓으로 사랑을 고백함.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>거짓으로 약속을 함. (예: 약혼)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>조롱을 하거나 폭력을 행할것처럼 행동함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>거짓말을 함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>술임.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>관계를 그만두겠다고 협박함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>평판을 해하겠다고 협박함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>애매하게 나쁜일이 일어날 것이라 암시함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>어딘가에 혼란하게 버려두어 집에 못 돌아가게 할것이라고 협박함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>말로 협박하거나 원하는 것을 해주지 않으면 혼란한 일에 처하겠다고 협박함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>신체크기나 힘으로 위협함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>다치게 하겠다 협박함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>동의없이 옷을 벗기기 시작함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>동의없이 몸을 만지기 시작함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>닫힌 공간에 가둠. (예: 자동차, 방)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>어떠한 종류의 무기를 쓰겠다 보여주거나 협박함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>물리적으로 구속함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>술이나 약물에 취하게 하거나 약을 먹여 저항 못하게함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>데이트시 강간할때 쓰이는 약을 사용.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>물리적으로 폭력을 가함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>움직이지 못하게 몸 위에 올라탐.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>팔을 꺾어 구속함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>꼿꼿 못하게 몸을 누름.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>육체적으로 빼를 때리거나 밀거나 때림.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>목을 줄라 숨 막히게 함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>때림.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>무기나 그 비슷한 종류를 사용.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>신체적으로 다치게 함.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 VIII. 성적인 행동의 결과

아래의 리스트는 몇몇 사람들이 성적인 행동의 결과(혼자 혹은 다른 사람들과 한 행동들 포함)로 걱정하는 것들입니다. 어느 것들이 당신에게 해당되는지 그 정도를 나타내 주십시오.

난 내가 성적으로 한 행동들 때문에 (이러한 것들이) 걱정이다:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>절대</th>
<th>가끔</th>
<th>자주</th>
<th>항상</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>내 자신이나 성관계 파트너 중 하나를 임신 할 위험에 처하게 했을지도 모름.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>내 자신이나 성관계 파트너 중 하나를 성적으로 감염될 수 있는 병에 (예: 포진, 임질, 매독) 걸리게 했을지도 모름.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>내 자신이나 성관계 파트너 중 하나를 에이즈/HIV 바이러스에 걸리게 했을지도 모름.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>내 성관계 파트너 중 하나를 아프게 하거나, 다치게 하거나, 혹은 다른 문제를 불러 일으켰을지도 모름.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>내 자신을 아프게 하거나, 다치게 하거나, 혹은 다른 문제를 불러 일으켰을지도 모름.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>심각한 물리적 부상이나 죽음의 가능성을 줬을지도 모름.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>친구들과의 문제를 초래 할지도 모름.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>가족들과의 문제를 초래 할지도 모름.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>남자친구나 여자친구 혹은 배우자와의 문제를 초래 할지도 모름.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>체포될 위험에 처하게 했을지도 모름.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>법에 저촉되는 일이었을지도 모름.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>재정적인 문제를 초래 했을지도 모름.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>돈을 낭비하게 했을지도 모름.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>업무를 끝내는데 지장을 줬음.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>내 직장을 잃을뻔한 가능성을 제시했을지도 모름.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
학교에 관련된 문제, 예를 들어 근신이나 퇴학, 혹은 다른 처벌로 이어졌을 수도 있음. | 1 2 3 4
---|---
종교적 신념과 맞지 않았음. | 1 2 3 4
종교적 가치와 맞지 않았음. | 1 2 3 4
죄책감이 들게 만들었음. | 1 2 3 4
내 자신에게 수치심이 들게 만들었음. | 1 2 3 4

아래의 리스트는 성적인 행동의 결과로 사람들에게 가끔씩 일어나는 것들 (혼자서나 다른 사람들과 한 행동 포함) 입니다. 이런 것들이 당신의 성적인 행동의 결과로 일어난 적이 있는지 나타내어 주시시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>아니오</th>
<th>예</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>내 자신이나 성관계 파트너(들)는 임신을 했다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>성적으로 전염된 병에 걸렸다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>에이즈/HIV 바이러스에 걸렸다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>누군가를 성적으로 전염되는 병에 걸리게 했다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>누군가를 에이즈/HIV 바이러스에 걸리게 했다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>고통이나 부상, 혹은 다른 물리적 문제를 내 자신에게 야기했다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>고통이나 부상, 혹은 다른 물리적 문제를 성관계 파트너에게 야기했다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>친구들 또는 가족들과의 관계에 피해가 생겼다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>배우자나 다른 파트너와의 관계에 피해가 생겼다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>체포 되었다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>재정적인 문제를 경험했다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>학교에서 문제를 경험했다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>직장에서 문제를 경험했다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>종교적인 고충을 경험했다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>내 자신에게 부끄럽거나 수치스러웠다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>죄책감을 느꼈다.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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