

Power, Gender and Initiation of Sexual Behavior

James R. Browning, Debra Kessler,

Elaine Hatfield, and Cynthia Clement

University of Hawaii

Running Head: Power, Gender, and Initiation

Abstract

Relationships among power, gender and initiation of sexual behavior were investigated by means of a questionnaire administered to 86 college undergraduates. Initiation of "usual" sexual behavior was largely a function of gender with women initiating female-active behaviors and men initiating both male-active behaviors and behaviors in which both genders are active. Unexpectedly, no main effects for gender were found for initiating "unusual" sexual behavior. Also contrary to expectations, both power based on relationship assets and love as a sexual motive tended to be associated with partner rather than with participant initiation. Partially as predicted, women with high relative resource power were more likely to report partner initiation of unusual sexual behaviors. Overall, the sexual script of men initiating sexual behavior prevailed, but with notable exceptions.

Is sexual behavior initiated primarily by men, by the more powerful partner, or does it depend on the specific sexual behavior in question?

Ehrmann (1959) found that males were more likely to initiate sex and that females usually refused it. Twenty years later, DeLamater and MacCorquodale (1979) found that males initiate male-active behaviors--that is, sexual behaviors in which males take the active role (e.g., stimulation of female breasts, cunnilingus, etc.) and that females initiated female-active behaviors (e.g, fellatio). Other researchers, however, have found that in dating situations, it is still men who usually initiate sexual behavior and try to seduce their partners while women set limits (Hatfield, Sprecher, Pillemer, Greenberger & Wexler, 1988; LaPlante, McCormick & Brannigan, 1980).

Because women have gained power in the last 30 years, one could argue that today women are more likely to initiate sexual behavior than they were 20 or 30 years ago. However, since men are sexually more permissive, eager, and daring than are women (Clark & Hatfield, 1989; Oliver & Hyde, 1993), we suspected that while increases in women's power may lead them to feel more free to initiate sexual behavior if so inclined, it

may also make them feel more able to refuse, delay or limit unwanted sexual behavior.

Thus we predicted an interaction between power and gender such that, for men, power will be strongly associated with initiating sexual behavior, while for women, power will be less or even negatively associated with initiating sexual behavior.

Based on the premises that men tend to initiate sexual behavior and women compared to men tend to be more serious and conservative about sex (e.g., Clark & Hatfield, 1989; Mercer & Kohn, 1979), we also predicted that men will be more likely to initiate unusual sexual behavior (e.g., anal sex, spanking, tying your partner up, etc.) more than will women. In addition, we predicted that there will be a power by gender interaction for initiation of unusual sexual behavior similar to that for usual sexual behavior: That is, a positive correlation between power and initiation for men and a weak or negative correlation between power and initiation for women.

We, therefore, tested the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Power will be associated with initiating sexual behavior for both men and women.

Hypothesis 2: Men will initiate overall sexual behavior more than will women.

Hypothesis 3: Men will initiate unusual sexual behavior more than will women.

Hypothesis 4: Power will be more strongly associated with initiating sexual behavior for men than for women.

Hypothesis 5: Power will be more strongly associated with initiating unusual sexual behavior for men than for women.

Method

The data for this study was obtained as part of an investigation primarily concerned with the relationship between power and both engaging in and initiating sexual behavior (see Browning, Kessler, Hatfield & Choo, 1997a).

Participants

Of the 117 participants, 73 were women and 44 were men from the University of Hawaii. All were enrolled in various social science classes. They were interviewed in groups of one to four and were given bonus points for their participation.

Participants' mean age was 22.9 years (SD = 5.37, range = 18 to 48). Reflecting Hawaii's multi-cultural

population, they were from diverse ethnic backgrounds: African (1.7%), Asian (54.3%), European (23.3%), Pacific Islander, including Hawaiian (9.5%), and Other (11.2%).

The percentage of participants in various relationship categories was as follows: Not currently dating anyone: 26%; casually dating: 17%; going steady or seriously involved: 38%; engaged or cohabiting: 14%; married: 5%.

Participants were asked whether the person they were dating was a man or a woman: Three percent of the men and four percent of the women reported that they were describing a relationship with someone of the same sex; 97% of the men and 96% of the women were describing a relationship with someone of the opposite sex.

The 31 participants who were not dating anyone at the time were deleted from the sample. The remaining 51 women and 35 men were asked to complete a questionnaire based on the following measures.

Measures

Five measures were employed: a) subject's power (SP), b) partner's power (PP), c) relative resource power (RP), d) relative global power (GP), and e) dominance minus submission motive (DS).

Resource power measures. In the preface to the ratings of assets, participants were told:

"All we mean when we ask about power is 'Do you have the power to persuade your partner to give serious consideration to your suggestions; to do some of the things that you think are important at least some of the time?' We are interested in who has power in your relationship and why. In this first section, by 'power' we mean the control of valuable resources in your relationship. Below is a list of valuable assets in a relationship. After looking them over, please tell us how much power each of them give you and your partner in shaping your relationship."

Following is the list of Assets in Relationships:

Physical Attractiveness (Being good-looking and well-groomed)

Intelligence (Being smart, well-educated and informed)

Sex (Being a good sexual partner)

Physical Affection (Enjoying kissing, hugging, hand-holding)

Intimacy (Being understanding, accepting, supporting)

Money (Having comfortable finances)

Responsibility (Doing a fair share of making and carrying out decisions or duties)

Social Status (Being popular, friendly)

Services (Doing favors, e.g., fixing the car, helping with school)

Security (Being committed and faithful)

For each asset, the participant rated the extent to which it gave the participant power, using a 5-point scale (0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 100%). Using the same scale format, the participant also rated the extent to which each asset gave their partner power. Chronbach's alpha was .77 for the 10 SP items and .74 for the 10 PP items.

SP and PP were derived by asking the participant:
a) how much power each of 10 given assets (resources) in the relationship gave the participant (subject), the sum of which was the score for SP, and b) how much power each asset gave the participant's partner, the sum of which was the score for PP. RP was operationalized by subtracting PP from SP.

Relative global power measure (GP). GP was measured by a single item asking the participant to indicate on an 11-point scale: "All things considered, who has more power in your relationship?" Zero%

indicated "My partner has all the power" and 100% indicated "I have all the power".

Dominance-submission motive (DS). The items for this measure were taken from Nelson's (1978) scales designed to measure dominance and submission, respectively, as motives for engaging in sexual behavior. Nelson (1978) reported Chronbach alphas of .77 to .83 for these scales along with evidence of convergent and discriminant validity.

Although the two scales clustered together on one factor in Nelson's data, he used them as separate scales in his analyses (personal communication, June, 1996). Because we considered submission to be the opposite of dominance, we treated the factor items as one scale and reverse scored the submission items. Thus, we refer to our version of this scale as a dominance minus submission motive for sex. A confirmatory factor analysis (Hunter, Cohen, and Nicol, 1982) indicated that three items had relatively low communality scores and factor loadings and that deleting them from the scale resulted in a much better fit and an alpha of .75 for our data.

The following five items were retained for data analysis in our DS scale as reasons for engaging in sexual behavior ("R" indicates reverse scoring):

a) Because I enjoy the feeling of being overwhelmed by my partner (R)

b) Because sex allows me to feel vulnerable (R)

c) Because I enjoy the feeling of giving in to my partner (R)

d) Because in the act of sex more than any other time, I get the feeling I can really influence how someone feels and behaves

e) Because when my partner finally surrenders to me, I get this incredibly satisfying feeling

Response options to each item were on a 4-point scale of "very important", "pretty important", "not too important" and "not important at all". Filler items were taken from Nelson's (1978) pleasure motive (PM), love and affection motive (LM), conformity motive (CM) and recognition motive (RM) scales, each representing a motive for engaging in sexual behavior in order to give the presentation of the dominance-submission scale greater face validity. We also wanted some indication of how Nelson's other sexual functions might correlate

with our dependent variables (see Browning, Kessler, Hatfield and Choo, 1997b).

Dependent variables. Participants were asked to "indicate whether you have participated in the following sexual activities during the last month with your current sexual partner, and, if so, who generally initiates them. Please answer honestly. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential":

1. 'dry' kissing, on the mouth
2. French-kissing (open mouth/tongue)
3. Kissing of neck and ears, hickeys
4. Stimulation of breasts with hands
5. Oral stimulation of breasts
6. Stimulation of male genitals with hand
7. Stimulation of female genitals with hand
8. Fellatio (oral stimulation of male genitals)
9. Cunnilingus (oral stimulation of female

genitals)

Sexual intercourse

10. Partner on top
11. You on top
12. Rear vaginal entry ('doggie style')
13. Anal sex
14. Masturbated yourself for your partner

15. Had your partner masturbate him/herself for you

16. Read erotic literature with your partner

17. Watched pornographic films with your partner

Dominance/Submission

18. Tied your partner up

19. Been tied up by your partner

20. Spanked your partner

21. Been spanked by your partner

Cross-dressing

22. I dressed as the opposite sex

23. My partner dressed as the opposite sex

24. Participated in a threesome, group sex or
swapped partners

25. Used sexual aids (e.g., vibrator)

Response options for each item were "Yes" and "No", and for "Who generally initiates this activity" the response choices were "Me" and "Partner". Items 1 through 12 were categorized as usual sexual behaviors and items 13 through 25 were categorized as unusual sexual behaviors.

Questionnaire format. The questionnaire asked information in the following order: Personal Background (gender, age, ethnicity, dating status, gender of partner), Assets (Resources) of Relationships, Relative

Global Power, Sexual Behavior, and Reasons for Engaging in Sexual Behavior.

Procedure

Participants were administered the questionnaire in groups of four, with each person seated in one corner of a room. Before filling out the questionnaire, an attempt was made to ensure participants of confidentiality by asking each one to put the completed questionnaire in a manila envelop and to place it randomly in the pile of questionnaires in a reception box.

Results

Power Measures

Table 1 shows the correlations among the five power measures. SP (subject's power) and PP (partner's power) were highly correlated ($r = +.79$). For a discussion of the meaning of this correlation see Browning, et. al., 1997a). SP had a significant positive correlation with RP (relative resource power) of .43 and with GP (relative global power) of .31.

Insert Table 1 about here

In spite of these significant intercorrelations, SP, PP and RP were each employed in the data analysis as separate measures to see how each might correlate with initiation of sexual behavior.

Overview

Since we were analyzing a large number of dependent variables with five power measures, effects for specific behaviors that fell between the .01 and .05 level of probability should be interpreted with caution as some of them could have occurred by chance. Due to the somewhat exploratory nature of this study, we included effects significant at the .05 level and looked mainly for patterns and significant effects with composite variables.

Our approach to analyzing most of the data was to perform multiple regression analyses on each dependent variable. Since all of our predictions regarding initiation of sexual behavior (Hypotheses 1 to 5) consisted of main effects for gender or for power or an interaction between the two, the first step for each dependent variable was a multiple regression analysis with a specific power measure as the only predictor variable. The next step was to add gender as a second

predictor and test the change in R-squared. The third step was to add a gender by power interaction term to the equation and again test the change in R-squared. This 3-step procedure was performed for each power measure for each dependent variable.

Power and Initiation of Sexual Behavior

Table 2 shows the results of multiple regression analyses for participant initiation of each of the reported sexual behaviors and for the total number of sexual behaviors initiated by the participant (TNSBI) and for the total number of unusual things tried that were initiated by the participant (NUTTI).

Insert Table 2 about here

As can be seen from Table 2, SP is the only power measure significantly correlated with TNSBI ($r = -.26$, $n = 80$, $p = .02$), and, except for french kissing ($r = -.26$, $n = 63$, $p < .05$), this is mainly due to its significant correlation with initiation of unusual things tried (r with NUTT = $-.30$, $n = 42$, $p = .05$). Specifically, SP was significantly correlated with

partner initiation of anal sex, masturbating yourself for your partner, watching porno films with your partner, and being spanked by your partner.

The direction of these relatively high correlations (ranging from $-.49$ to $-.91$) indicates that high SP was strongly associated with partner initiation of these behaviors. Also, RP correlated significantly with NUTTI ($r = -.36$, $n = 42$, $p < .02$). That is, relative resource power was also associated with partner initiation of unusual sexual behavior.

Thus Hypothesis 1 was not confirmed. In fact, to the extent that power was correlated with initiation of sexual behavior, the correlation was in the opposite direction from that predicted. Specifically, both subject's absolute resource power (SP) and subject's relative resource power (RP) were significantly associated with one's partner initiating certain (mainly unusual) sexual behaviors rather than with the participant initiating them.

The one exception to this finding was that DS (dominance minus submission as a motive for sex) was significantly, positively correlated with participant initiation of "dog style" sex ($r = .35$, $n = 39$, $p < .05$). Thus, for this specific sexual behavior, power, measured

in this way, was associated with participant initiation, but for nearly all usual sexual behaviors, power was unrelated to initiation, and for several unusual sexual behaviors, power was associated with partner initiation.

Examination of the significant correlations between power and initiation of unusual sexual behaviors separately for males and females revealed that most of the participants were female and that, of the five significant correlations between SP and behavioral initiation, four were due almost entirely to high correlations for females with near-zero correlations for males. In other words, for women, SP was associated with partner initiation of several unusual behaviors, but for men, there was no significant correlation between power and who initiated these same behaviors.

Gender Differences

As can be seen from Table 2, there were significant gender differences in initiation of 10 of the 12 usual sexual behaviors. Also, TNSBI (total number of sexual behaviors initiated) was significantly greater for men than for women. Most of these behaviors were initiated more by men than by women. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was confirmed. Specifically, participants reported that men more than women initiated french kissing, kissing neck

and ears, stimulation of breasts (both manually and orally), manual stimulation of female genitals, cunnilingus, you on top and dog style. However, manual stimulation of male genitals and fellatio were significantly initiated more by women than by men.

Thus, women initiated female-active behaviors and men initiated male-active behaviors and most behaviors in which both partners are active. As can also be seen from Table 2, there were no gender differences in initiation of unusual sexual behaviors. Also, NUTTI (number of unusual things tried and initiated) was not significantly different for men and women ($r = -.11$, $n = 42$, n.s.). Thus, Hypothesis 3, which proposed that men especially initiate unusual sexual behaviors more than do women, was not supported.

Power by Gender Interactions

As shown in Table 2, there were no significant power by gender interactions for TNSBI or for NUTTI. Thus, Hypotheses 4 and 5, which posited that the correlation between power and initiation of sexual behavior in general and of unusual sexual behavior, in particular, is positive for men and negative for women, were not supported in the analyses of composite variables.

Looking at specific unusual behaviors, however, there were three significant exceptions to this conclusion. There was a Global Power by Gender interaction ($p < .01$, R-squared change = .39) for "had partner masturbate for you" in which men scoring high on GP were more likely to initiate the behavior than were low GP men ($r = +.74$), while women scoring high on GP were less likely to initiate it than low GP women ($r = -.57$). The same pattern was found in an RP (relative resource power) by Gender interaction for initiation of "read erotic literature with your partner" ($p < .01$, R-squared change = .62, male $r = +.81$, female $r = -.87$) and an RP by Gender interaction for initiation of "spanked partner" ($p < .05$, R-squared change = .25, male r indeterminate since all the men who engaged in it initiated it; female $r = -.85$).

There was also a trend for a GP by Gender interaction for initiation of "watched pornographic films with your partner" ($p < .07$, R-squared change = .29, male $r = +.73$, female $r = -.50$). Thus, though not a pattern for initiation of sexual behavior in general, there was evidence of an interaction between relative power and gender for the initiation of several unusual behaviors, such that relative power was associated with

participant initiation for males and with partner initiation for females, thus providing partial support for Hypothesis 5.

Unique Contributions to R-squared

For comparison purposes stepwise regressions were conducted for TNSBI and NUTTI. Predictor variables included gender, each power measure and its interaction with gender.

Although no predictions were made regarding sexual motives other than dominance minus submission (DS), we found that one or more of the love and affection (LM for love motive), pleasure (PM) and conformity (CM) sexual motives (Nelson, 1978), as measured by the two LM, one CM and three PM items that were included as fillers with the DS items, yielded significant simple correlations with each of the composite dependent variables in the overall study. Therefore, LM, PM and CM and their interactions with gender were included as predictor variables in the stepwise regressions. This resulted in 17 initial predictor variables for each stepwise regression.

TNSBI. Table 3 shows the R-squared contributions of predictor variables in the stepwise regressions of TNSBI and NUTTI. For total number of sexual behaviors

initiated, LM (love motive) and SP (Subject's Power) added .11 and .03 unique R-squared, respectively. Both LM and SP were associated with partner initiation of sexual behavior, but only the contribution of LM was significant.

Insert Table 3 about here

This model, however, overlooks the fact that gender correlated positively with participant initiation of some behaviors and negatively with others; that is, men initiated some behaviors and women initiated others. The composite measure, TNSBI, by summing across behaviors, masked these gender effects. Separate stepwise regressions and tests for R-squared contributions for initiation of each sexual behavior (the details of which are not shown in this report) revealed that gender contributed a large amount of unique R-squared for initiation of six of the 12 usual behaviors (manual and oral stimulation of breasts, of female genitals, and of male genitals. For five of these behaviors, its addition to R-squared ranged from

.68 to .89, or about two-thirds to 90% of the total variance.

Thus, although LM was significantly associated with partner initiation of sexual behaviors in general, gender alone accounted for the large majority of the total variance for almost half of the usual sexual behaviors, with men initiating male-active behaviors and women initiating female-active behaviors, as reported in previous analyses.

NUTTI. As can be seen in Table 3, due to the small sample size for initiation of unusual things tried and initiated ($n = 36$), even predictors that added .067 and .07 to R-squared (relative resource power and love motive, respectively) did not reach statistical significance. RP and LM each correlated with partner initiation of "unusual" sexual behavior; however, the RP by Gender interaction, which added about 10% unique R-squared to the model indicated that for men there was no association between RP and NUTTI ($r = -.02$), whereas for women, RP correlated $-.47$ ($p < .01$) with participant initiation (i.e., $+.47$ with partner initiation). Sample sizes were too small to perform separate stepwise regressions for initiation of each unusual sexual behavior.

Discussion

Gender Differences

Our finding that women initiated female-active behaviors and men initiated both male-active behaviors and most behaviors in which both men and women are active supports both LaPlante, et. al.'s (1980) evidence for the traditional sexual script of men generally initiating sexual behavior and DeLamater and MacCorquodale's (1979) conclusion that men initiate male-active behaviors and women initiate female-active behaviors.

Our unexpected finding of no gender difference for initiating unusual sexual behavior suggests that there is no script for these behaviors. Perhaps this is because they are generally not socially acceptable. Put another way, the script for unusual sexual behaviors may be that neither men nor women are supposed to initiate them because neither is supposed to engage in them.

Power and Initiating Sexual Behavior

Subject's Power and Relative Resource Power each significantly correlated with partner initiation of various unusual sexual behaviors. Subject's Power also significantly correlated with initiation of sexual

behaviors in general (TNSBI), but this was mainly due to partner initiation of unusual behaviors.

The main question these results evoke is why, contrary to prediction, did power tend to be associated with partner rather than with participant initiation. Although, except for french kissing, this tendency appeared only for unusual sexual behaviors, one possible explanation is that the person with greater power may be the one whose attention (and sexual response) is most sought after. That is, the one with greater power may be more attractive or less interested (Waller, 1937), and thus less likely to be the initiator of sexual behavior.

As appealing as this argument may be, especially in view of the empirical support for Waller's least interest principle (e.g., Felmlee, 1994; Sprecher, 1985), the fact that this effect was found almost exclusively for unusual sexual behaviors invites additional explanation. This is especially the case since, in the stepwise regression analyses, Subject's Power fell short of accounting for significant, unique variance in the model for initiation of unusual sexual behavior, whereas, the effect of Relative Resource Power, which did account for significant, unique

variance in the model, was qualified by a Relative Resource Power by Gender interaction.

Power by Gender Interactions

In the Relative Resource Power by Gender interaction, which accounted for 10% of unique variance in the model for initiation of unusual sexual behavior, for men, there was a near-zero correlation (.02) between relative power and initiation, and for women, there was a substantial, negative correlation (-.47) between relative power and participant initiation. In other words, for men who engaged in unusual sexual behavior, power was unrelated to who initiated it, but for women who engaged in unusual sexual behavior, her power was associated with her partner initiating it.

Thus, none of the power measures interacted with gender for initiating usual sexual behavior, but relative power, based on relationship assets, did significantly interact with gender in accounting for who initiated unusual sexual behavior.

The primary questions raised by these results are why, contrary to expectation, power was correlated with partner initiation of unusual sexual behaviors rather than with participant initiation, and why these

correlations were virtually limited to unusual sexual behaviors for women only.

An explanation that provides an answer to both of these questions begins with the premise that unusual sexual behaviors are less socially acceptable, and that women's attitudes tend to be more closely allied to cultural norms (Diggory, 1953). Those women willing to engage in these behaviors who have greater relative resource power are more likely to have the option to let (or wait for) her partner to initiate them, thereby reducing her perceived responsibility for engaging in them. For men, however, whose norms for sexual behavior may be far more permissive (Mercer & Kohn, 1979; Oliver & Hyde, 1993) initiation of unusual sexual behaviors is unrelated to their perceived relative power, just as it is with usual sexual behavior.

Love and Initiation of Sexual Behavior

Love as a motive for sex was significantly associated with partner initiation of sexual behavior in general. This finding, though not predicted, makes sense in that, emphasizing love as a reason for engaging in sexual behavior would tend to be associated with waiting for love to develop before getting sexually involved, which in turn, would tend to make partner

initiation more likely than participant initiation.

Conclusion

Initiation of *usual* sexual behavior was mainly a function of gender, with a strong tendency for females to initiate female-active behaviors and for males to initiate both male-active behaviors and behaviors in which both genders are active. Unexpectedly, no main effects were found for initiating *unusual* sexual behaviors, suggesting that there may be no script for these behaviors. Also contrary to expectations, both love as a sexual motive and power based on relationship assets were associated more with partner than with participant initiation. Partially in line with predictions, there was a tendency for women with high relative resource power to report partner initiation of unusual sexual behaviors.

Thus, the age-old tradition of males initiating sexual behavior appears to be alive and well except that the modern script includes women initiating female-active behaviors, and a tendency for both men and women with greater relationship assets and those who give greater endorsement to love as a reason for engaging in sex to let their partner initiate sexual activity.

References

- Browning, J. R., Kessler, D., Hatfield, E., & Choo, P. (1997a). Power, gender and sexual behavior. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Browning, J. R., Kessler, D., Hatfield, E., & Choo, P. (1997b). Sexual motives and interactions with gender. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Clark, R. D. III, & Hatfield, E. (1989). Gender differences in receptivity to sexual offers. Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 2, 39-55.
- DeLamater, J., & MacCorquodale, P. (1979). Premarital Sexuality: Attitudes, relationships, behavior. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Diggory, J. C. (1953). Sex differences in the organization of attitudes. Journal of Personality, 22, 89-103.
- Ehrmann, W. (1959). Premarital dating behavior. New York: Holt.
- Felmlee, D. H. (1994). Who's on top?: Power in romantic relationships. Sex Roles, 31, 275-295.
- Hatfield, E., Sprecher, S., Pillemer, J., Greenberger, D., & Wexler, P. (1988). Gender differences in what is desired in the sexual relationship.

Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 1, 39-52.

Hunter, J. E., Cohen, S. H., & Nicol, T. S. (1982).

Package. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State Univ.

LaPlante, M., McCormick, N., & Brannigan, G. (1980).

Living the sexual script: College students' views of influence in sexual encounters. Journal of Sex Research, 16, 338-355.

Mercer, G. W., & Kohn, P. M. (1979). Gender differences in the integration of conservatism, sex urge and sexual behaviors among college students. Journal of Sex Research, 15, 129-142.

Nelson, P. A. (1978). Personality, sexual functions, and sexual behavior: An experiment in methodology. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida.

Oliver, M. B., & Hyde, J. S. (1993). Gender differences in sexuality: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 114, 29-51.

Sprecher, S. (1985). Sex differences in bases of power in dating relationships. Sex Roles, 12, 449-462.

Waller, W. (1937). The rating and dating complex. American Sociological Review, 2, 727-734.

Table 1

Correlations among Power Measures

| | SP | PP | RP | GP | DS |
|---------------------|----|-----|------|-----|------|
| Subject Power (SP) | | .79 | .43 | .31 | -.01 |
| Partner Power (PP) | | | -.22 | .07 | -.01 |
| Relative Power (RP) | | | .40 | .00 | |
| Global Power (GP) | | | | .06 | |
| Domin-Submis (DS) | | | | | |

Table 2

Regression Analyses Employing Power, Gender, and Power
by Gender as Predictors of Initiating Sexual Behavior

| Behavior | Measure | | | | |
|-------------|----------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| | Gender | SP | PP | RP/GP | DS |
| Dry kiss | | | | | |
| French kiss | 8.37** | 4.43* | | | |
| Kiss neck | 5.35* | | | | |
| Hand/breast | 559.34** | | | | |
| Oral/breast | 216.23** | | | | |
| Hand/male | | | | | |
| genitals | 171.03** | | | | |
| Hand/female | | | | | |
| genitals | 201.54** | | | | |
| Fellatio | 47.21** | | | | |
| Cunnilingus | 104.14** | | | | |
| Partner on | | | | | |
| top | | | | | |
| You on top | 18.69** | | | | |
| Dog style | 17.84** | | | | 5.32* |
| Anal sex | | 13.81* | 9.45* | | |

(table continues)

| Behavior | Measure | | | | |
|---------------|---------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| | Gender | SP | PP | RP/GP | DS |
| Mastrbat self | | | | | |
| for partner | | 5.71* | 5.39* | | |
| Partn masturb | | | | GPxGend | |
| self for you | | | | 9.54** | |
| Read erotic | | | | RPxGend | |
| lit w/partnr | | | | 15.76** | |
| Watched porno | | 11.78** | | | |
| Tied up partn | | | | | |
| Tied up by | | | | GP | |
| partner | | | | 12.19* | |
| Spanked | | | | | RPxGen |
| partner | | | | | 7.86* |
| Partner | | | | | |
| spanked you | | 6.95* | 19.13* | | |
| I x-dressed | | | | | |
| Partn cross- | | | | | |
| dressed | | | | | |
| Group sex/ | | | | | |
| swapping | | | | | |

(table continues)

| Behavior | Measure | | | | |
|-------------|---------|-------|----|----------|----|
| | Gender | SP | PP | RP/GP | DS |
| Used sexual | | | | | |
| aids | | | | | |
| TNSBI | 6.00* | 5.56* | | | |
| NUTTI | | 4.04* | | RP 5.70* | |

Note. N = 53 to 73 for the first 11 items, 39 for dog style, 4 to 19 for anal to spanking, zero for cross-dressing and group sex, and 11 for sexual aides; SP = subject's power; PP = partner's power; RP = relative resource power; GP = global relative power; TNSBI = total number of sexual behaviors initiated; NUTTI = number of unusual things tried and initiated.

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

Table 3

Unique R-squared Contributions of Predictor Variables in
Stepwise Regressions of Composite Variables

| Predictor | Dependent Variable | | | |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| | TNSBI | | NUTTI | |
| | R-sq incr | F incr | R-sq incr | F incr |
| Gender | | | | |
| SP | .031 | 3.11 [^] | | |
| PP | | | | |
| RP | | | .067 | 3.31 [^] |
| GP | | | | |
| DS | | | | |
| LM | .110 | 11.06** | .070 | 3.47 [^] |
| PM | | | | |
| CM | | | | |
| SPxGender | | | | |
| PPxGender | | | | |
| RPxGender | | | .099 | 4.89* |
| GPxGender | | | | |
| DSxGender | | | | |
| LMxGender | | | .037 | 3.74 [^] |

(table continues)

| Predictor | Dependent Variable | | | |
|------------|--------------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| | TNSBI | | NUTTI | |
| | R-sq incr | F incr | R-sq incr | F incr |
| PMxGender | | | | |
| CMxGender | | | | |
| Model R-sq | .272 | 9.22** | .254 | 4.21* |
| Model DF | | 3,74 | | 3,36 |

Note. TNSBI = total number of sexual behaviors initiated; NUTTI = number of unusual things tried and initiated; SP = subject's power; PP = partner's power; RP = relative resource power; GP = global relative power; DS = dominance minus submission motive; LM = love motive; PM = pleasure motive; CM = conformity motive; sq = squared; incr = increase.

[^]p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01