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Fifteen men, classified by self-report as rapists and attempted rapists, but who had never been arrested or convicted, were compared to a matched control group on standardized instruments and content-coded interviews. Differences in hostility toward women, power motivations, and hypermasculinity were similar to findings from studies of convicted rapists. However, results suggest a greater role for the father in the etiology of rape-associated dynamics than has previously been reported.

Until very recently, the only source of data on the motives and psychodynamics of rapists has been studies of incarcerated populations. Since it is estimated that fewer than 10% of rapists ever reach the criminal justice system, and even fewer are ultimately incarcerated (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Russell, 1982), there are substantial grounds for questioning whether these data can be generalized to unincarcerated rapists (Cohen, Garofalo, Boucher, & Seghorn, 1971; Marshall & Barbarree, 1984), the men responsible for 90% of rapes. Furthermore, our understanding of these men and what motivates their behavior would contribute to identifying subgroups more at risk for committing sexual aggression, and to framing interventions for preventing their aggressive acts. Such understanding might also help women to avoid becoming victims of sexual attacks.

Recent research suggests that numerous factors must be considered in trying to understand the causes of sexual aggression, including attitudes (Rappaport & Burkhart, 1984), peer groups (Kanin, 1985), sexual arousal patterns (Barbaree, Marshall, & Lanthier, 1979; Malamuth, 1986), and use of drugs and alcohol (Kanin, 1984; Wolfe & Baker, 1980). Motives and psychodynamics must also be examined (Groth, 1979; Malamuth, 1986) and it is on these that the present study focuses.

Psychological studies of convicted rapists and other "sex offenders" span at least the last four decades. They have been marked by both methodological and ideological diversity, yet there has been considerable consistency in the principal motives and psychodynamic patterns attributed to the rapist. Three of these factors, in particular, have been recurrent: anger at women (Brandt, Ellis, & Doorbar, 1952; Groth, 1979; Malamuth, 1986), and with scale measuring "underlying anger," with feelings of being deceived and betrayed by women (Lisak & Roth, 1988). The power factor has also been identified in sexually aggressive college males: a) dominance as a motive for sexual behavior has been correlated with self-reported sexual aggression (Malamuth, 1986), and with high sexual arousal in response to rape depictions (Malamuth & Check, 1983) and this arousal has, in turn, been associated with sexual aggression (Check & Malamuth, 1983; Malamuth, 1986); b) sexually aggressive college men feel more threatened and put down by women, and feel a greater need to assert themselves with women (Lisak & Roth, 1988).

METHOD

The present study was designed to investigate further the general applicability of the data on incarcerated rapists through a multimethod assessment of the motives and psychodynamic patterns in a sample of self-reported, unincarcerated rapists. For the purposes of this study, motives refer to predominantly unconscious feelings or needs, such as anger and power, which may lead to aggressive acts directed at women. Psychodynamics refers to unconscious, emotionally-charged patterns—residues of experiences—which are the source of motivations. Thus, a man may need to dominate women because he is still emotionally bound to his mother and feels inferior and vulnerable to all women.

A battery of standardized instruments was used to measure the primary motivations of anger, power, and insecure masculinity. To assess the more complex and subtle psychodynamic patterns, two data sources were used: autobiographical interviews and projective testing. The interview material was analyzed, through content coding, for information pertaining to the subjects' relationships with their parents. The projective test material was used, in conjunction with the interview protocols, to compile case reports on each of the rapists who completed the study. It was deemed necessary to use case reports to obtain the individualized and detailed data required to identify psychodynamic patterns. In formulating the case reports there was a particular focus on identifying unconscious dynamics relevant to the subject's relationships to parental figures and to women. The latter is of obvious concern in examining the subject's motives for rape. The former represents a theoretical position which assumes that childhood...
relationships, particularly those with parents, are potentially of great importance in shaping the subject's adult, heterosexual relationships. The projective material was analysed following the approach outlined by Alexander (1988).

Subjects

Subjects for the study were recruited via posters, an advertisement in the student newspaper of a major southeastern university, and the distribution of a slightly modified version of the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982), a questionnaire which measures self-reported, sexually aggressive behavior. The subjects in the present study are a subset of those who participated in the survey, the results of which were reported elsewhere (Lisak & Roth, 1988). The survey included an offer of money for those who elected to sign up for further research by providing a first name and phone number. Of the 198 students in seven psychology classes who were asked to fill out the survey, 184 (92.9%) did so, and 133 (72.3%) signed up for further research.

Of the 15 rapists and attempted rapists who ultimately comprised the sample, two were recruited via the advertisements and 13 from the questionnaires. Subjects qualified as rapists if they had used force or threat of force to obtain or try to obtain sexual intercourse or oral sex with a woman.

A control group of 15 subjects was randomly selected from among the respondents to the questionnaire. These control subjects were not virgins, but none of them had engaged in any type of sexually aggressive behavior.

Extensive consideration was given to the legal and ethical implications of conducting research with subjects who may have committed crimes. Refraining from making any judgments about a subject's behavior can be seen as tacit approval, or at least as an acceptance of it as normative. However, since the subjects did not consent to any form of therapy, or to any process that might lead them to revise their conception of themselves or their behavior, the decision was made to abide by the usual guidelines for ethical treatment of research subjects. Thus, no active effort was made to encourage subjects to examine their behavior, and no judgments were expressed. Virtually none of the subjects who reported sexually aggressive acts expressed any doubts or remorse about their behavior, and none labeled their acts as rape or themselves as rapists. This, despite the fact that all subjects read and signed a special consent form which stated that the researcher, if subpoenaed by a court, would have to supply any information requested.

All 30 subjects were junior or senior undergraduates in full-time attendance in university. Mean ages were 20.8 years for the rapists and 20.1 years for the controls. Subjects were demographically homogeneous. All but four (three rapists, one control) came from middle- or upper-middle-class families. Two subjects in each group were African-American, the rest were Caucasian. Three rapists and two control subjects came from divorced families, and one subject in each group grew up fatherless.

The 15 men in the rapists group accounted for 22 rapes and five attempted rapes (13 had committed rape or both rape and attempted rape). Six of the men were repeat rapists. Of the 22 rapes, four involved more than one assailant. The most frequent form of force was the use of overwhelming strength—using body weight to hold a woman down while pinioning her arms. More extensive violence was used in at least four cases in which the victim was either struck or pushed around. It should be noted that the assailants' reports of the amount of violence they used are very likely to underestimate what actually occurred. On several occasions, rapists revised their accounts at the end of the interview, acknowledging greater force once they became more self-disclosing with the interviewer. Investigators of imprisoned rapists have
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frequently noted the tendency of these men to underestimate, consciously or unconsciously, the amount of violence they used in their assaults (Groth, 1979).

Virtually all the men had some degree of acquaintance with their victims. Victims were dates, ex-girlfriends, girlfriends, "pick-up" at parties, or schoolmates. Only in one case was there a lesser degree of acquaintance—a prostitute who had been hired by the assailants.

In 14 of the 19 assaults (74%) for which information could be obtained, the assailant had consumed alcohol just prior to the assault. This may be a low estimate, because several of the recidivist subjects declined to discuss in detail one or more of their assaults.

Procedures

Preliminary contact with all subjects was made by telephone. Subjects were told that the object of the study was "male sexual behavior," and that it involved the intensive study of "a variety of men who have had a variety of sexual experiences." They were informed of the pay rate ($10 per hour), and the tasks in which they would be asked to participate. Following this, appointments were arranged for screening interviews.

The primary goal of the screening interview was to assess whether the subject had committed an act which meets most legal definitions of rape or attempted rape, i.e., whether he had used force or threat of force to obtain or attempt to obtain sexual intercourse or oral sex with a woman. On the basis of their response, either to the advertisement or to the questionnaire, 20 subjects were given screening interviews, and 15 were accepted into the study. The five who were excluded (two from the survey and three from the posters) did not meet the screening criteria. In most of these cases it was the interviewer's impression that the subjects had indeed used force, but that they were hesitant to disclose sufficient details to be classified with assurance. No subject who met the criteria for inclusion in the sexually aggressive group was excluded. On the basis of this self-report data, the 15 subjects were classified, and will be referred to for purposes of this study, as rapists.

Control subjects were submitted to the same screening process as the sexually aggressive subjects. In this case, the screening was intended to ensure that none of them met the criteria for the aggressive group. All of the initial 15 control subjects were admitted to the study.

All subjects followed the same procedure following screening. The first post-screening appointment was devoted to the completion of a battery of standardized measures. Subjects worked alone for one to two hours in a locked room until the battery was completed.

Following the completion of the standardized measures, subjects returned for a second appointment to complete the projective testing. A modified Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) was administered individually in the following manner: each subject was given the full set of cards and asked to write a story for each of the pictures, using his imagination freely. As with the standardized measures, the subject was then left alone in a room to complete the test. Subjects took from two to six hours to finish. Any subject who took longer than two hours returned for a second session.

Following the completion of the projective testing, subjects returned for the autobiographical interview. Interview length varied considerably with the range of self-disclosure and verbal adeptness of the subjects. The shortest interview was 90 minutes, the longest five hours. Of the 15 rapists who began the testing and interview process, three dropped out before completing the interviews, in each case saying that they simply did not want to continue. No effort was made to dissuade any subject who expressed a wish to withdraw. Many of the self-reported rapists expressed moderate to considerable war-
ness about their participation, and demanded assurances of confidentiality.

**Standardized Measures**

Tests were selected to represent the major motivational factors outlined above: power, anger, and insecurity about masculinity. The battery comprised the following tests:

*Hostility Toward Women Scale*. This 30-item instrument was developed to assess hostility specifically directed toward women. It has been significantly correlated with a variety of rape-supportive beliefs and has been used to predict, in conjunction with other variables, self-reported sexual aggression in college men. It has an alpha coefficient of .89 (Malamuth, 1986).

*Underlying Anger-Hurt Scale*. This three-item scale measures the degree to which the respondent feels betrayed, deceived, and manipulated by women. It has successfully differentiated sexually aggressive from nonaggressive men, and has an alpha of .76 (Lisak & Roth, 1988).

*Sex Subscale*. This eight-item subscale of a six inventory developed by Nelson (1979) assesses the importance of dominance as a motive in sexual relations. The measure has been used successfully to predict sexual arousal in response to tape depictions (Malamuth & Chock, 1981) and self-reported sexual aggression (Malamuth, 1986), and has an alpha coefficient of .78 (Malamuth, 1986).

*Underlying Power Scale*. This five-item scale measures the degree to which subjects feel that women put them down, belittle them, and make them feel inadequate. It has differentiated sexually aggressive from nonaggressive men and has an alpha of .67 (Lisak & Roth, 1988).

*Femininity subscale of the California Personality Inventory*. This 38-item subscale assesses the "masculinity" and "femininity" of respondents' interests. It was included as an index of "hypermasculinity," which has been described as a compensation for underlying insecurity about masculinity.

Low scorers tend to be seen as masculine and opportunistic in interpersonal relations (Gough, 1975), qualities that are consonant with the profile of the date rapist as described by Kanin (1984, 1985) and Mosher and Anderson (1986), and with that of certain types of convicted rapists, especially those described as "hypermasculine" (Bromberg, 1948; Cohen et al., 1971; Medea & Thompson, 1974). The subscale has test-retest correlations of .59 for high school males and .73 for incarcerated males.

*Sex Role Stereotyping Scale*. This nine-item scale measures respondents' belief in common sexual stereotypes relating to work and male-female relations. It was included as an additional index of hypermasculinity, in that it was predicted that these men would need to compensate for their insecurity by adhering to rigid beliefs about the "proper place" for women. The scale was developed by Burt (1980) and has an alpha coefficient of .80 (Malamuth, 1986).

*Projective Measures*

These comprised cards 6GF, 6BM, 7BM, 8BM, 9BM, and 13MF from the TAT, and a selection of photographs of women in various ambiguous poses. Cards were selected for their ability to elicit themes relevant to unconscious motivations and dynamics—primarily heterosexual interactions and relationships with female figures. The projective testing provided ideographic data which were used in the compilation of case reports on the 12 rapists who completed the interview process.

*Interviews*

A standard interview procedure was followed which permitted subjects to express themselves freely with minimal involvement of the interviewer. Subjects were asked to relate their life story in their own words, starting as far back as they could remember. The interviewer interpreted questions only to clarify material or to fit in missing time periods. In addition, subjects were asked to provide verbal portraits of each other.
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their family members, and to describe their relationships with women. The interview took detailed notes during the interview, and all interviews were also tape recorded. No effort was made to have the interviewer "blind" to the group membership of the subjects since the content of the interviews would quickly have eliminated such blindness. Rather, the interviewer's participation in the process was minimized through the use of a standard sequence of topics.

The interview data were used in the compilation of the case reports of the 12 rapists who completed the interview phase of the study. In addition, subjects' statements about their mothers and fathers, as transcribed by the interviewer, were evaluated for "negative" and "positive" content by two raters. Negative content was defined as any statement describing negative qualities or attributes of the parent ("bad," "mean," "a failure," "weak," etc.), reappraisal of the parent, negative experiences with the parent, such as an inability or unavailability of the parent, or dislike or disapproval of the parent. Positive content was defined as any statement describing positive qualities or attributes of the parent ("good," "successful," "strong," "loving," etc.), approval of the parent, positive experiences with the parent, or references to the parent's availability and involvement. In both cases, statements could be explicit or implicit. An example of implicit negative content would be: "My father started his own business but it went bankrupt two years later."

Twelve control subjects were randomly selected to match the 12 rapists who had complete interview protocols. Two from each group were then randomly selected to provide material to train the two raters and to achieve reliable coding. Ratings were then made on the content of the remaining 20 protocols.

Each of the subjects' statements was rated as "negative," "positive," or "neutral." Inter-rater reliability was assessed using Cohen's (1960) kappa, a coefficient which gives a measure of reliability achieved after chance agreement between raters has been partialled out. For the ratings of the 630 statements from the 20 protocols, kappa = .89, indicating very good reliability.

**RESULTS**

**Standardized Measures**

Intercorrelations among the six standardized tests are reported in Table 1 and several are of particular note. The very strong correlation between Hostility Toward Women and Dominance (r = .70) suggests the great difficulty in separating these two primary motivational factors. In further support of this, Underlying Power correlated almost equally with both variables: r = .64 with Dominance and r = .71 with Hostility Toward Women. On the other hand, Underlying Anger-Hurt seemed to differentiate better between the two motivations, correlating .32 with Dominance and .61 with Hostility Toward Women. The three questions comprising the Underlying Anger-Hurt scale referred specifically to experiences of being wronged by women, and may have tapped a purer form of anger directed at females. The two scales which indexed hypermasculinity, Femininity and Sex Role Stereotyping, were highly correlated (r = -.71; the lower the Femininity score, the greater the hypermasculinity), but not redundant. Only Sex Role Stereotyping was significantly correlated with Hostility Toward Women and Underlying Power.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>SIMPLE CORRELATIONS AMONG STANDARDIZED MEASURES FOR RAPISTS (N = 15) AND CONTROLS (N = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEASURES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Hostility Toward Women; 2 = Underlying Anger-Hurt; 3 = Dominance; 4 = Underlying Power; 5 = Femininity; 6 = Sex Role Stereotyping; *p < .05; "p < .01.
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A one-way multivariate analysis of variance was performed on the six variables, resulting in a Wilks Lambda of .31, F(6,23) = 8.54, p < .001. One-way analyses of variance between the rapists and controls were then calculated on the six variables (see Table 2 for means and standard deviations), all of which differentiated the two groups. Hostility Toward Women, F(1,28) = 20.01, p < .001, Underlying Anger-Hurt, F(1,28) = 6.47, p < .05, Dominance, F(1,28) = 38.13, p < .001, Underlying Power, F(1,28) = 7.02, p < .05, and Sex Role Stereotyping, F(1,28) = 10.96, p < .01 were all significant, with rapists scoring higher than controls in each case. Femininity, F(1,28) = 7.48, p < .05 was also significant, with rapists scoring lower, i.e., with less femininity than controls.

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>RAPISTS (N = 19)</th>
<th>CONTROLS (N = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hostility Toward Women (150)</td>
<td>79.13</td>
<td>20.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlying Anger-Hurt (150)</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>25.97</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlying Power (55)</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity (21)</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Role Stereotyping (46)</td>
<td>26.07</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures in parentheses denote maximum possible scores.

**Table 3**

| SUBJECT | POS | NEG | NEUT | %POS | %NEG | NEUT | %POS | %NEG | NEUT | %POS | %NEG | NEUT | %POS | %NEG | NEUT | %POS | %NEG | NEUT | %POS | %NEG | NEUT | %POS | %NEG | NEUT | %POS | %NEG | NEUT | %POS | %NEG | NEUT | %POS | %NEG | NEUT | %POS | %NEG | NEUT | %POS | %NEG | NEUT | %POS | %NEG | NEUT | %POS | %NEG | NEUT | %POS | %NEG |
|---------|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------ |
very dominant. She always makes the decisions but I always wanted my father to do that. Instead he’d just back her up.

During his early adolescence Charles joined a gang of rowdy but smart boys who did well in school but flaunted authority by skipping classes and arguing with teachers. At college he spent much of his time and energy at parties and picking up girls in bars. The girls were easy. They’d come over and cook and clean. Sex was expected. You could have a different girl every night.

After two years Charles transferred to another college where he soon got involved in the fraternity scene and through it resumed his life of hard drinking and partying. But he found the women were different. “They’re real bitchy. They’re too much work here. They’re all concerned about going to law school and staying virgin. Here you have to get them drunk. Alcohol lessens them up and lessens your own restraint.” Charles would survey the premises at a fraternity party and his friends would pick out “singers,” women who looked like they could be gotten drunk. He would then “work on them,” plying them with drinks, taking them to the back of the room, and carrying them up to his room. “Most of the time at that point they’re too drunk to resist even if they want to.”

The positive and negative view of women which Charles evinced during the interview emerged especially in several of his projective stories. In story 9 (based on the picture of a woman’s face behind a spider’s web), Charles clearly depicts his fear of women, his view of them as cunning, treacherous, and capable of “deceiving” men: “This picture shows the resemblance between a girl and a spider. The girl represents a woman, and the spider a woman’s parents and a spider a spider’s web. For the innocent, unknowing victim of the spider, the picture shows how easily the spider can ensnare and deceive her. The spider catches her in her own web and then, like a spider, is captured and eaten by the woman’s parents.”

In story 10 (related to a woman running from a man), Charles draws upon a fear of being too weak and too big for strength. He succeeded in “pinning” her with his body and had sex with her. He was thus able to relieve himself of the pressure of his own sexual tensions and to use his physical power to control and dominate her.
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Frank was the oldest child and only male in a family of six. He had never known his biological father, who left his mother before he was born. His mother remarried again two years later. At school, he was popular and very active, but he was shy with girls, a trait that persisted into junior high school, when he started dating seriously. Frank described his mother as very “loving” and “caring,” but also as overprotective and “too attached” to him. When Frank started dating girls during junior high school, his mother got very upset. “She didn’t like the idea of her only son having a girlfriend. She didn’t want me to leave the nest.” Frank’s mother would often embarrass him in front of his male friends by teasing them about his girlfriend. “She never wanted me to leave, or have a girlfriend, or even go to college.”

Frank described his stepfather as the “opposite” of his mother. “My Dad’s very calm. He never gets upset. He’s so quiet.” He described him as “the perfect father,” but applied the term more to his stepfather’s style than to the substance of their relationship. He compared their relationship to a song by Harry Chapin, “the one about the father and son who are estranged.” The father never had any time for the son and eventually the son grew up and never had any time for the father.” He attributed the estrangement to his stepfather’s inability to handle the strain of the family’s financial problems.

Seven of Frank’s 13 stories dealt directly or indirectly with the issue of power between men and women. In story 2 (In Meek’s Field) the issue is spelled out most clearly: There is a “clash of wills” between a “rich and powerful” man who “always gets what he wants” and a “physically weak” woman who “is not extremely intelligent” but whose “good looks give her power.” The man has the last word because “he was not a physical match for her.” This story is an extreme example of how Frank depicts his father as the male model for his future relationships.

The same theme—taking from the female what she tries to withhold from you—permeates two other stories. In story 11, a “man swears and looks at the woman lying in bed next to him, his ‘conquest’ from the previous night. She had taken him back to her room but had then refused to have intercourse with him. Instead she went to him and then passed out from drinking too much. The man ‘waited’ for this, and then ‘mounted’ her and had sex with her, feeling that it was an ‘overeating’ with a woman, yet intimate object.” The dominance here is expressed both in the language (“conquest” and “mounted her”) and in the dynamic (the man ultimately gets from her what she tried to withhold—access to her body). A very similar scenario is depicted in story 13, in which a man fantasizes about having his girlfriend turn the deck in front of him “just to see the hole it would make.” Then he wonders “what it would be like to make love to a dying woman.” The violent fantasy suggests a component of anger in the struggle to dominate women. The end result is the same: the male gains access to the female body when she is unable to withhold it from him.

During the interview Frank explicitly described his mother’s overprotectiveness and overattachment to him. During story 10 (a woman and a child) he provides an important clue as to the origins of this pattern. A distraught housewife and mother is angry with her young child but the source of her anger is really her husband (a theme which echoes one of Frank’s earliest memories). He is “again” working late at the office and she had grown suspicious of these innumerable late evenings. Finally, she forgets her anger at the child when she concludes that “my kids are what’s important to me now.” The import of the story is clearly that the woman’s husband (the child’s father) is chronically absent. The sequence echoes Frank’s descriptions of his family: his stepfather’s preoccupation with work and long absences from home, and his mother’s overattachment to her only son.

Frank’s autobiographical and testing data present a complex psychodynamic picture. Two of the primary elements of this picture are the overinvestment in the father by his mother, and the abduction by the father of his role in the family. Frank’s stepfather appears to have withdrawn from the family, leaving Frank’s mother to invest her emotional energy in her son. This intrafamilial dynamic is probably the wellspring of his preoccupation with dominating women, for it has left him at an impasse common to many of the rapists: an intense struggle for separation from his mother. This intensification stems from two aspects of the familial dynamic. First, the mother’s overinvestment in Frank has little to no substitute to separate. Second, his stepfather’s abdication of his role deprived Frank of a crucial model and guide through that separation process.

DISCUSSION

The data from this study suggest that the principal motives and psychodynamics
found to be characteristic of convicted rapists are also important in understanding their unincarcerated counterparts. In the present study, unincarcerated rapists showed more hostility toward women, felt more betrayed and deceived by women, had stronger dominance motives for engaging in sexual activity, felt more threatened and demeaned by women, and were more hypermasculine in their attitudes and interests than a matched group of controls. The portrait painted by this collection of motivations is strikingly similar to that which has repeatedly been employed in descriptions of convicted rapists.

The study also provided some evidence useful in hypothesizing the roots of these motivations, although here the evidence is at some variance with published descriptions of incarcerated rapists. Results of the coding of the subjects’ statements about their parents suggest strongly that it is the rapists’ almost uniformly negative relationships with their fathers that is most associated with their angry and power-oriented relations with women. While the rapists expressed more ambivalence toward their mothers than did the controls, it was their overwhelming negative feelings about their fathers that correlated strongly with their higher scores on Hostility Toward Women, Dominance, Underlying Power, and Sex Role Stereotyping. While some researchers have noted the prevalence of “weak” fathers among rapists, much more emphasis has been placed on the “dominating” and “rejecting” mother. None of the research has accorded as much importance to the father-son relationship as that indicated by these results.

In contrast, the literature on juvenile delinquency contains ubiquitous references to father absence and inadequate fathering. Siegelman (1966), Singh and Sharma (1978), Mother (1969), Andry (1960), Medlinnus (1965), McComb and McCord (1958), and Bach and Bremer (1947) have all found associations between paternal deprivation and delinquency, criminality, and antisocial behavior. Inadequate fathering has also been linked to a wide variety of pathological and maladaptive behavior and conditions, including schizophrenia (Gerard & Siegel, 1950), drug abuse (Lieberman, 1974), poor cognitive development (Shinn, 1978), low self-esteem (Hunt & Hunt, 1975), and hypermasculine behavior (Lynn & Savrey, 1959; Miller, 1958). This extensive array of adverse correlates of “paternal depriva-
tion” (Biller, 1974) suggests that, if there is indeed a causal link between inadequate fathering and sexual aggression, it is probably a predisposing factor rather than an exclusive link.

Some clues to the nature of the link between paternal deprivation and sexual aggression are found in the research on delinquency. Miller (1958), Nash (1965), and Lynn and Savrey (1959) have all suggested that in male delinquents the normal process of identification has been impaired by inadequate fathering, resulting in an insecure masculine identification which is compensated for by a hypermasculine disposition. A similar picture emerges from the present study, in the correlation between negative paternal relationship and stereotyped sex role attitudes, as well as in the case material of the individual rapists. Impaired identification may well be a crucial link in the association between paternal deprivation and the other principal motivations for rape: anger and power.

Lacking strong father figures with whom to identify, the rapists in the present study seemed to be caught between the developmental imperative of separating from the mother, and an inadequate relationship with the father who should have been their primary guide through that separation process. The father’s abdication of his role in the family, as in the case of Frank, may be the first step in a sequence: it leaves the mother with no emotional outlet, possibly leading her to overinvest in her children: the son is thus trapped in an intensified relationship with his mother, and without the support he needs from his father to maneuver his way out of the nest and into a secure, masculine identification.

The crucial role of the father in supporting this separation process is vividly described by anthropologists who have studied initiation rituals in other cultures. For example, Webster (1908), in his survey of such rituals, defined their purpose as the “transfer of the child from mother-right to father-right and tribal-right” (p. 21). In most cultures, male initiates are physically separated from their mothers and often further contact with them is proscribed. They are subjected to a rigorous indoctrination, the goal of which is to transform them into male members of the tribe who can be eligible for warrior status (Eliade, 1958; Webster, 1908). (Interestingly, this warrior theme was also evident in Charles’s projectile material.) An example of one such indoctrination, reported by Webster, reveals the links between the initiate’s separation from his mother and his new status as a responsible male member of the tribe who must treat women correctly. It includes an explicit injunction against rape and also indicates the importance in this process of a positive, paternal figure:

Each lad is attended by one of the elders, who instruct him every evening in his duties, and gives him advice to regulate his conduct through life—advice given in so kindly, fatherly, and impressive a manner as often to soften the heart and draw tears from the youth. He is told to conduct himself discreetly towards women . . . not to take advantage of aitinwoman if he finds her alone (p. 51; emphasis added).

The rapist’s difficulty with the separation process may be responsible for his sensitivity to being belittled and dominated by women (and his compensatory need to assert himself with them). The projective material suggests that the power which the mother still holds over the rapist may be projected by him onto all women. Thus, for example, Charles’s story about the woman and the spider web may reflect his fear that all women will entrap him in the same way that he still feels entrapped by his mother, unable to separate adequately. Fearing this entrapment, he fights back with an attitude in which all women are potential enemies and therefore appropriate targets for his predation. This fear of the potential power of women emerged graphically in many TAT stories, but it was also-indexed in the quantitatively measured: many of the items strongly endorsed by the rapists express a view of women as potentially hostile, powerful adversaries who must be controlled and dominated. Numerous authors (Dinnerstein, 1978; Miller, 1958; Medea & Thompson, 1974; Nash, 1965, Neumann, 1954) have noted a link between lack of separation from the mother and a fear of her power, a fear that is readily displaced and generalized to all women.
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The relationship among maternal and observer ratings of infant temperament, observer ratings of maternal responsivity, and maternal drug abuse habits, was studied in a population facing multiple risk factors. Intensity of maternal drug abuse was found to be negatively related to maternal ratings of infant temperament, and ratings of temperament were positively related to maternal responsivity. Implications for research and practice are explored.

The present study examined behavioral characteristics of a population of mothers at multiple risk — many of whom abused drugs during pregnancy — and their infants. The intent of the study is to generate a deeper understanding of some of the factors underlying mother-infant interaction in this population, thereby to identify areas upon which intervention and treatment programs might productively focus.

MATERNAL DRUG ABUSE

The last 25 years have seen a dramatic rise in the incidence of drug abuse during pregnancy. Maternal abuse of drugs during pregnancy places both the mother and her soon-to-be-born child at risk (Chasnoff, Hatchet, & Burns, 1982; Fried, 1984; Kallai, Graziani, & Finnegran, 1978; Litz, Wilson, Smith, & Desmond, 1985; Marcus, Hans, & Jerome, 1982; Marcus, Hans, Patterson, & Morris, 1984; Rosen & Johnson, 1985). Maternal drug abuse is associated with increased rates of complications during pregnancy as well as during labor and delivery, of premature deliveries, and of neonatal complications. After delivery, these mothers are at high risk for difficulties in parenting, including child neglect and abuse (Lawson & Wilson, 1979).

Furthermore, many of the infants exposed to heroin and methadone prenatally experience narcotics abstinence syndrome (withdrawal), which may last up to six months and in some cases necessitates medication and prolonged hospitalization (Straus, Starr, Ostrow, Cheney, & Snyder, 1976). At least through age three, these drug-exposed children show higher rates of neuropsychological abnormalities and significantly more of them have head circumferences that fall below the third percentile (Rosen & Johnson, 1982, 1985).

Initially, the research on maternal drug abuse during pregnancy focused on comparing drug-exposed and drug-free infants on a variety of neonatal and neurobehavioral developmental measures. These analyses...