

a capacity of the individual or a personality characteristic, implies that empathy is a somewhat constant factor which the individual takes with him into all social situations. Following this line of reasoning, it might be logical to assume that individuals whose personality was characterized by high empathy would tend to be more successful on their dates and consequently to be more in demand as dating partners than individuals who were low in this quality. This in turn might be expected to contribute to more frequent dating by those with high empathy than by those with low empathy. Consequently, data were secured to test a fourth hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4: Individuals who have a high number of dates per month have higher empathy than those who have only a few dates per month.

When those individuals reporting a dating frequency of under seven per month were compared with those reporting a higher frequency than this, the difference was found to be significant at almost the .05 level, and in the expected direction of greater empathy scores accompanying more frequent dating. Thus, hypothesis 4 is apparently supported.

However, since those with a high degree

of involvement (those individuals going steady, pinned or engaged) would tend to concentrate in the high-dating frequency category, it was felt that this relationship might be merely another reflection of degree of involvement rather than dating frequency as such. Consequently, those who were "just dating" were analyzed separately. No significant relationship was found in this analysis.

On the basis of this finding, questions can be raised concerning the assumption upon which the hypothesis was founded—that empathy is a constant factor which an individual brings to all dates. A more adequate view in the light of this evidence would seem to be that which emphasizes the interplay of situational and personality factors.

In general the evidence which we have accumulated to test the four hypotheses has supported the initial assumption that empathy emerges from the interplay of actor and situation. This does not mean that personality factors or situational factors are not related to empathy. It does suggest, however, that it would be misleading to assume that either of these two factors alone accounts for empathy. In short, the evidence supports the view of empathy as a process.

MALE SEX AGGRESSION ON A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS *

CLIFFORD KIRKPATRICK AND EUGENE KANIN

Indiana University

A PERSON-TO-PERSON relationship that is characterized by exploitation and shared stigma provides the conceptual framework for this research. In abstract ideal-typical terms, member B of an AB pair is urged by member A to participate in behavior desired by A but prohibited by primary group and institutional controls. B may develop ambivalent resistance but yield to a point where stigma would be involved with disclosure. With B's apparent reluctance to seek guidance from the primary group or

to appeal to institutional protection, the exploitative advantage of A is increased, leading to further overtures. B's involvement and participation further increase stigmatization and isolation from primary group or institutional protection. Illustrations might include incest, homosexuality, sex aggression against children, violence between family members, illegally selling drugs, and procurer-prostitute relationships.

This type of person-to-person relationship was explored by an investigation of sexual aggressiveness in dating-courtship relationships on a university campus. The study was prompted by some case material reporting instances of violent male aggression with re-

* Acknowledgement is made of assistance from the Graduate School Research Fund of Indiana University. Appreciation must also be expressed to Sandra Rubinstein for helpful suggestions.

luctance on the part of the offended girls to invoke protection and punishment.

An eight page mimeographed schedule was distributed to the females in twenty-two varied university classes, the male members being dismissed. In general co-operation was excellent. Only two girls refused to fill out the schedules. However, the 291 female students whose usable schedules were completely analyzed cannot be regarded as a representative sample from a defined student universe. The responding group was biased in favor of underclassmen, the quota index for freshmen being 131.5, (100 equals proportionate representation), for sophomores 181.3, juniors 85.6 and seniors 49.7. Sorority girls were overrepresented as shown by a quota index of 173.7.

The questionnaire distinguished five degrees of erotic aggressiveness, namely attempts at "necking," "petting" above the waist, "petting" below the waist, sex intercourse, and attempts at sex intercourse with violence or threats of violence. The reporting of offensiveness by the respondents implied no confession that they were willing participants at any level of erotic behavior. Undoubtedly male behavior often became offensive after willing participation at milder levels of erotic intimacy. In the interest of gaining full co-operation the questionnaire was carefully devised to avoid probing the sex conduct of the female respondents. Instead the basic data were focused on the non-incriminating reports of being "offended" by intimacy level, frequency, and number of men. The girls could have been extremely prudish or could have been offended at the means rather than the erotic goals pursued by the offenders.

EROTIC OFFENSIVENESS

Of the 291 responding girls 55.7 per cent reported themselves offended at least once during the academic year at some level of erotic intimacy. The experiences of being offended were not altogether associated with trivial situations as shown by the fact that 20.9 per cent were offended by forceful attempts at intercourse and 6.2 per cent by "aggressively forceful attempts at sex intercourse in the course of which menacing threats or coercive infliction of physical pain were employed." There is no reason to think

that offended girls had merely a single unpleasant experience with one partner. The 162 offended girls reported 1022 offensive episodes. While for some girls offensive experience was no doubt trivial, considerable mention was made of fear and guilt reactions.

A seasonal variation may exist in the reported offensive behavior of male students. Since the schedules covered the period only from September 15, 1954, to May 15, 1955, the full record of exposure during September and May is not available. If the number of episodes for September and May are extrapolated by doubling the episodes reported for half month periods, then a U shaped curve can be drawn from the data indicating a higher prevalence in fall and spring.

A 3×3 table yielding a Chi square significant at the .05 level suggests that episodes of lesser offensiveness are concentrated in the fall and the more offensive episodes in the spring. The excess of mildly offensive episodes in the fall may have been due to imperfect communication between members of newly formed pairs. The concentration of episodes more seriously offensive in the spring may have been due to involvement in continuing affairs in which offensive behavior reflected frustration of sex tensions and perhaps assumed exploitability of the female because of her emotional involvement.

CHARACTERISTICS OF OFFENDED GIRLS

The offended girls reported themselves younger than did the non-offended. The mean age of the offended girls was 18.8 and the corresponding mean age of the 129 non-offended girls was 19.0 (C.R.=2.5). A 2×3 table relating victims and non-victims to three age categories yielded a Chi square $.02 > P > .01$. The number of semesters of college work is closely related to age. The mean semester standing of the 162 offended girls was 3.6 while that of the 129 non-offended girls was 4.1 (C.R.=2.0). The difference could be due either to prudishness of younger students or to their assumed exploitability.

Frequency of dating is a personal characteristic which might be associated with differential proneness to be offended in the course of dating-courtship behavior. In response to a question concerning total number of dates in April, 1955, the mean figure given

by the offended was 11.6 in contrast to 10.3 for non-offended girls (C.R.=1.3). The *eta* between number of dates per month (April) and total number of episodes reported by offended girls was only .24. Thus it would seem that dating frequency is an exposure variable which need not be taken seriously into account in interpreting other findings. Dating frequency in relation to maximum level of offensiveness reported by the offended girls yielded an insignificant Chi square (.70>P>.50).

Girls with lower group status characteristics rendering them more exploitable would seem more likely to report themselves offended. A 2×2 table distributing sorority and non-sorority girls as offended or non-offended, however, showed sorority girls in slight excess among the offended (.30>P>.20).

It might still be argued that of the offended girls the sorority members, less exploitable as compared with non-sorority girls, would experience offensiveness at milder maximum levels. A 2×5 table, including the five intimacy levels at which maximum offensiveness occurred, showed such a trend but yielded a Chi square without statistical significance (.30>P>.20).

The non-significant findings concerning sorority status do not take into account the number of episodes at various levels of offensiveness. In Table 1 it is shown more clearly that the offensive experience of sorority girls is relatively concentrated at the milder levels of offensiveness.¹

The implications of sorority status in the present context are not clear. It may be that high group status makes such girls offended easily even at mild levels of aggression or it may be that greater dating frequency means exposure to offensiveness at a mild level. The dating frequency of sorority girls who were offended was 12.4 as compared to 9.5 for offended non-sorority girls (C.R.=3.6). It can be said that the *savoir faire* attributed to sorority girls did not prevent them from getting into situations reported as offensive.

Respondents were asked, "Do you consider yourself religious?" In spite of theoretically greater intolerance of male aggres-

sion, girls answering "yes" seem less likely to report offensive experience (Chi square at .10>P>.05 level).

The relative academic class standing of offended and offenders was obtained from the schedules. Of the 388 offenders known only as reported by offended girls, 358 were students with known class standing. Of these students 9.5 per cent offended girls one or two years more advanced than themselves, 34.1 per cent offended girls of the same class standing, 43.6 per cent offended girls one class below, and 12.8 per cent offended girls three or four years lower in class standing. The mean difference in class standing in favor of the offenders was 1.2 with a sigma of .05. The evidence shows that offenders tend to be of higher academic class than the offended respondents, but exploitation is not proven since the normal class discrepancies

TABLE 1. OFFENSIVE EPISODES EXPERIENCED BY SORORITY AND NON-SORORITY GIRLS BY LEVELS OF EROTIC INTIMACY

	Sorority	Non-Sorority	Total
Necking and petting above the waist	333	415	748
Petting below the waist	55	136	191
Attempted intercourse and attempted intercourse with violence	28	55	83
Total	416	606	1022

$\chi^2=17.35$; d.f.=2; $P<.001$

for pairs dating without erotic offensiveness are not known.

Some limited evidence is available concerning relative socio-economic standing of the offended girls and the men whom they described as offenders. Of the 388 offenders, 68.1 per cent were reported as of the same "socio-economic status" as their offended partners, 13.9 per cent were reported as lower and 18.0 per cent reported as of higher status. Ratings of relative socio-economic status probably are lacking in reliability and validity. Offenders could be down-graded because they were offensive or up-graded to soothe a latent guilt feeling at having been involved with offensive behavior.

The proportion of fraternity men among the offenders is high implying a quota index

¹ Levels of aggression are telescoped in order to satisfy requirements for Chi square.

of 205.8 with reference to the proportion of fraternity men in the male student body. It is possible, however, that fraternity men date more, without being more aggressive per date, than non-fraternity men. A table distributing the female offended and the male offenders by organizational (fraternity-sorority) status shows a rather clear pattern of homogamy rather than supporting a theory that men are especially predatory toward non-sorority girls. It does seem clear that open communication and *savoir faire* attributed to sorority girls and fraternity men does not prevent experiences reported as offensive. There seem to be misunderstandings even among the "Greeks."

involvement and the aggressiveness of offending males. A ratio $\frac{E}{M}$ may be defined as number of episodes at a certain level of erotic intimacy divided by the number of men offensively aggressive at that level.

The tolerance ratios $\frac{E}{M}$ of Table 3 represent frequency of repeated offensiveness by the same man at a given level. A ratio of 2.00 would mean that on the average each offending man was guilty of two offensive episodes at a given level. A ratio of 1.00 means that no man was permitted a repetition of his offensive conduct at a particular level. Pre-

TABLE 2. RELATIONSHIP INVOLVEMENT AND EROTIC INTIMACY LEVEL AT WHICH OFFENSIVENESS OCCURS, BY EPISODES

	Necking and Petting Above the Waist		Petting Below the Waist		Attempted Intercourse and Attempted Intercourse with Violence		Total
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	
Ride home							
First date							
Occasional date	411	55.0	60	31.4	25	30.1	496 (48.5%)
Regular or Steady date	295	39.4	104	54.5	43	51.8	442 (43.3%)
Pinned							
Engaged	42	5.6	27	14.1	15	18.1	84 (8.2%)
Totals	748	100.0	191	100.0	83	100.0	1022 (100.0%)

$\chi^2=57.26$; d.f.=4; $P<.001$; $C=.230$.

Data are available in Table 2 concerning relationship involvement and erotic intimacy level at which offensiveness occurs. Table 2, which includes column percentages, suggests that there is a significant association of offensiveness at a mild level of erotic intimacy with a non-involved pairing and offensiveness at a serious level with "pinned" or engagement relationships. It could be plausibly argued that offensive experience at a mild level of intimacy and involvement is due to misunderstanding while experiences at a more serious level and with greater relationship involvement are due to male exploitation of feminine involvement.

The experience of being offended might be further related to selectivity in formation and disruption of courtship relationships. Offended girls may express their dissatisfaction with a promptness depending upon in-

sumably the ratios vary according to successful prevention of aggression and with termination of relationships which led to offensive behavior.

It is interesting to note that at the milder

TABLE 3. NUMBER OF MEN, EPISODES, AND TOLERANCE RATIO FOR FIVE LEVELS OF EROTIC INTIMACY

Levels of Aggression	Men	Episodes	$\frac{E}{M}$
Necking	231	367	1.58
Petting above the waist	177	381	2.15
Petting below the waist	92	191	2.07
Attempted intercourse	48	73	1.52
Attempted intercourse with violence	10	10	1.00
Man-level total	558*	1022	
Number of men	388		

* Multiple count due to some men active more than once at same or different levels.

TABLE 4. EMOTIONAL REACTIONS OF OFFENDED RESPONDENTS BY LEVEL OF EROTIC INTIMACY

	Necking and Petting Above the Waist		Petting Below the Waist		Attempted Intercourse and Attempted Inter- course with Violence		Total
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	
Anger	138	48.4	45	42.0	27	35.0	210 (44.78%)
Guilt	53	18.6	28	26.2	16	20.8	97 (20.68%)
Fear	42	14.7	25	23.4	29	37.7	96 (20.47%)
Disgust, dis- illusionment or confusion	52	18.3	9	8.4	5	6.5	66 (14.07%)
Totals	285	100.0	107	100.0	77	100.0	469 (100.0%)

$\chi^2=30.03$; d.f.=6; $P<.001$

level of necking, about half the men repeated their offensive behavior. For others the situation was defined after the first offense or the relationship terminated. Since it has been shown in Table 2 that offensiveness at the necking level was associated with casual dating, it is probable that dating relationships without emotional involvement were selectively broken, thus curtailing offensive behavior. It is interesting to note a higher tolerance ratio at the next two levels of erotic intimacy, meaning that on the average offensive behavior was repeated about twice. The probable explanation is greater emotional involvement of the girls in more meaningful relationships with corresponding exploitability. At the fourth level the tolerance ratio drops to 1.52 suggesting that in spite of emotional involvement the aggres-

sion went beyond whatever tolerance was furthered by emotional involvement. Given violence and threats of violence no repetition was permitted, even though seven out of the ten such episodes involved girls in regular-dating, "pinned," or engaged relationships. Whether these seven episodes led to selective termination or redefinition of courtship relationships is unknown.

EMOTIONAL EFFECTS, REACTIONS AND HYPOTHETICAL REACTIONS

The offended respondents were asked to define their emotional reaction to offensive episodes by adjectives such as anger, guilt, and fear. While the terminology varied, it proved easy to group responses in the four categories of Table 4. Table 4 indicates that guilt feelings may vary with involvement

TABLE 5. ANSWERS OF RESPONDENTS TO THE QUESTION "WHAT DID YOU DO?"

	Necking and Petting Above the Waist		Petting Below the Waist		Attempted Intercourse and Attempted Inter- course with Violence		Totals	Critical Ratios— Columns 1 and 3
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent		
Selective avoidance	126	36.95	21	25.30	21	30.88	168 (34.15%)	
Discussion and warning re age group	115	33.73	17	20.48	11	16.18	143 (29.06%)	3.4
Secrecy	66	19.35	38	45.78	33	48.53	137 (27.85%)	4.5
Discussion with aggressor	11	3.23	3	3.62	3	4.41	17 (3.46%)	
Report to authority	23	6.74	4	4.82	0		27 (5.48%)	
Totals	341	100.00	83	100.00	68	100.00	492 (100.0%)	

and degree of aggression. The stress upon guilt is at a maximum at the intermediate level, probably associated with emotional involvement on the part of the girls and possibly provocation. Guilt feelings seem to be somewhat relieved by more extreme male aggressiveness for which girls could disclaim responsibility. It is probable that, within limits, involvement furthers guilt feelings, shared stigma, and corresponding exploitability.

The offended respondents were also asked

while secrecy became the more common policy.

Evidence is available from both offended and non-offended respondents concerning comparative hypothetical reactions. The offended were asked "What would you now do?" presumably after reflection upon offensive experience. In every case non-offended respondents volunteered answers to this hypothetical question in spite of their own lack of offensive experiences. The responses could be readily grouped within the eleven cate-

TABLE 6. COMPARATIVE HYPOTHETICAL ADJUSTIVE REACTIONS OF OFFENDED AND NON-OFFENDED RESPONDENTS

	Offended		Non-Offended		Critical Ratios— Offended vs. Non-Offended
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	
Discussion with aggressor: reason and rebuke	157	37.92	109	16.42	8.1
Deterrence or avoidance: physical and verbal	135	32.61	187	28.16	
Selective avoidance	76	18.36	169	25.45	3.2
Vague or cynical	24	5.80	31	4.67	
Discussion and warning re age group	13	3.14	47	7.08	2.7
Secrecy	6	1.45	17	2.56	
APPEALS TO AUTHORITY					
Report to parents	2	.48	26	3.92	
Report to academic authority	1	.24	39	5.87	
Report to civic authority	0		18	2.71	
Report to clergy	0		2	.30	
"Report it" and "Report it to authorities"	0		19	2.86	
Total Appeals to Authority		.72		15.66	
Totals	414	100.00	664	100.00	

with the aid of an 8 item checklist what they did about offensive episodes and had opportunity to make responses in their own words. The replies were readily grouped into the five categories of Table 5. Table 5 shows the limited reliance upon authority. The percentage of girls reporting offensive episodes to authorities was insignificant in spite of the claims of a counseling service. "Discussion and warnings" within the companion group, such as a sorority, was less common at the more extreme levels of erotic intimacy

gories shown in Table 6, five of which could be grouped under the heading "Appeals to Authority." Especially striking is the greater emphasis of the offended upon personal interaction with the aggressor in terms of reason and rebuke.² While appeals to authority were

² It may seem strange that in Table 6 "secrecy" and "discussion and warning re age group" are infrequently mentioned as adjustive reactions as compared with their prominence in the checkings of Table 5. The answer probably lies in the fact that the data of Table 5 were largely derived from

generally unfavored, girls reporting offensive experiences were especially disinclined to favor this type of adjustive reaction. There is some support for our ideal-typical formulation that exploitation and stigma lead to withdrawal from institutional protection with ultimate increased dependence upon the pair relationship.

In terms of possibly altered selective perception it might be expected that offended girls would give higher estimates of the prevalence of offensive behavior than would non-offended girls. The offended girls estimate that the average college girl experiences 4.2 offensive episodes in the course of a college year. The corresponding mean estimate made by non-offended respondents was only 2.7 (C.R.=4.9).

a checklist rather than from volunteered statements as in the case of Table 6. Respondents given an open ended question as to what they would *do* would naturally neglect the passive reaction of secrecy.

SUMMARY

There is evidence on one campus suggesting that in courtship relationships there is a progressive pattern of exploitation, involvement, ambivalent resistance, awareness of shared stigma and reduced reliance upon institutional controls with corresponding stress on control within the dyadic relationship.

One possible educational implication of this study is that college girls should be trained in *informed* self-reliance. Extreme offensive experience associated with stigma seems to reduce reliance upon parents, peer groups and certainly upon formal agencies of control and guidance. However, to avoid cumulative personal exploitation and exploitation of other victims because of secrecy, parents, peer groups and formal agencies should operate so as to avoid stigmatization. The self-reliant girl, really in need of help and judiciously aware of that need, should not be made to fear a confusion of punitive and advisory functions.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP AND POPULARITY ROLES IN SMALL GROUPS *

GEORGE A. THEODORSON

Pennsylvania State University

THIS paper examines the changes that occur in the relationship between leadership roles and popularity roles in a small group under conditions of high and low cohesiveness. Previous research in small group cohesiveness provides social psychological definitions that enable us to differentiate between psychologically cohesive and psychologically non-cohesive groups. Our findings concerning psychologically cohesive

and psychologically non-cohesive groups are then related to research on the relationship between leadership and popularity. Bringing together these two previously unrelated areas of research makes it possible to develop and test hypotheses on *the relationship of group role structure to changes in cohesiveness*.

Cohesiveness in the field of small group research has been treated primarily as a social psychological concept, commonly defined as the attraction of the group for its members, accompanied by a strong "we-feeling." This concept emphasizes the feelings and attitudes of individual members toward each other and toward the group as a whole, and the satisfactions the individual obtains from group membership.

Although the distinction between leadership and popularity roles has been made by

*This article is based in part on an unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1954. The writer wishes to express his indebtedness to Robin M. Williams, Jr., the chairman of his doctoral committee; to Nelson N. Foote, for making available the facilities of the Family Study Center, University of Chicago; and to Eugene T. Sweeney, Director of the World Politics Program at the University of Chicago, for his co-operation in making available the World Politics groups used in this study.