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Abstract

Alfred Kinsey was a man whose work and personal opinions created seemingly endless controversy. The goal of his ground-breaking work was a modest one – provide accurate information about sexual matters to his students, and later the American people. Throughout his career, Kinsey was a firm believer in the concept that all sexual behaviors were natural. He did not classify any behaviors as 'normal' or 'abnormal'. Those beliefs allowed the influence of his research to reach numerous areas of American society including: the gay community, the feminist movement, the scientific community, and the media. The legacy of Kinsey’s sex research is one that will live on for many years to come.
The Impact of Alfred Kinsey’s Sex Research

Alfred Kinsey was a man who believed in change and scientific study. His pioneering research brought about a new era in American culture, and to an extent, global culture. To understand how one man’s research could have such a great effect on culture, one must first have a basic understanding on Kinsey himself.

Alfred C. Kinsey was born on June 23, 1894 to Sarah Charles and Alfred Seguine Kinsey (Jones, 1997). Alfred lived with his family in Hoboken until age ten at which time he and his family moved to South Orange (Christenson, 1971). Kinsey’s childhood was filled with the religious fervor of his father. “Much of what he heard was mean-spirited, hate-filled, and fearful calculated to produce feelings of dependence and submission rather than love and trust” (Jones, 1997, p. 72). This devout religious upbringing would later influence Alfred’s choice of careers. “Kinsey was influenced by his restrictive upbringing, by his class and gender, and by his education as a taxonomist” (Ericksen, 2000, p. 21). This strict religious upbringing would later influence Kinsey’s views towards non-socially accepted sexual practices.

During his childhood, Kinsey began collecting botanical specimens from the countryside near his home (Christenson, 1971). This childhood hobby would mark the beginning of his methodical collecting and cataloguing of gall wasps and eventually to 18,000 meticulous interviews Kinsey and his staff conducted during their sex research.

After his high school graduation, at his father’s request Kinsey attended the Stevens Institute for two years. Eventually he left there to attend Bowdoin College to study biology. He graduated magna cum laude in 1916 with a B.S. degree. In the fall of 1916, he began studying at the Bussey Institute, a biology laboratory on Harvard’s campus (Christenson, 1971). In 1920, Kinsey accepted a teaching position at Indiana University (Jones, p. 155). This move from the
East Coast to the Midwest would prove to be a turning point in Kinsey’s academic career.

In his first year at Indiana University, Kinsey met Clara McMillen, a chemistry student at the university. They fell in love and married on June 3, 1921; although, she had turned down his initial marriage proposal because she was still pondering one from another suitor. The marriage yielded four children: Donald, Anne, Joan, and Bruce (Christenson, 1971). Despite Clara’s devotion to her husband and to his work, she is mentioned very little in the literature. The main thing that is known of her is that she shared her husband’s passion for nature (Pomeroy, 1972).

Kinsey’s early years at Indiana University were spent teaching, writing, and collecting gall wasp specimens. Some of these early publications included: *Edible Wild Plants of Eastern North America, An Introduction to Biology*, and *Life Histories of American Cynipidae* (Wikipedia, 2008). Christenson (1971) described Kinsey’s early years thus:

> He had followed a fairly typical course for a hard-working academic biologist. Graduate training, a teaching job, marriage and family, field work, professional publications, textbook writing – all of these could be duplicated in the lives of hundreds of college professors. (p. 95)

That is until 1938, which is when he began teaching a marriage course at Indiana University. The lack of scientifically sound research on the subject of sex to use for his class prompted Kinsey to conduct his own research. This marked the beginning of the next phase of Kinsey’s academic career as a sex researcher.

Kinsey’s sexual research began while he was still teaching the marriage course. This research took him all over the country. He visited places such as Chicago, Berkeley, and even New York City to obtain case histories from people (Pomeroy, 1972). Eventually it took up so much of his time that the university’s president would force him to choose between continuing
his course or his research. He ultimately chose to continue his research (Christenson, 1971).

In order to collect data about sexual issues, Kinsey used personal interviews to obtain detailed case histories about each person with whom he met. He asked questions such as: “how old were you when you first masturbated?”, “how old were you when you first ejaculated?”, and “have you ever paid for intercourse?” (Pomeroy, 1972, p. 117, 129, 131). However, Kinsey and his interviewers usually began with less invasive questions. They would ask about the subject’s religious history and their nonsexual activities in high school and if applicable, college (Pomeroy, 1972). Kinsey taught all of his assistants how to put the interviewees at ease with the questions, so his subjects’ inhibitions would not interfere. In total, he and his assistants would collect more than 18,000 case histories. This was a staggering amount of case histories considering this was long before the days of email and instant messaging.

In 1948, the book Sexual Behavior in the Human Male was released. In 1953, this book’s counterpart Sexual Behavior in the Human Female was published. The books were filled with statistics, graphs, and charts detailing American’s sexual preferences. Both books were bestsellers despite their scientific nature, and also caused a wealth of media coverage. Some of it was good, and some of it was bad (Christenson, 1971).

In 1954, the Rockefeller Foundation cut its funding for Kinsey’s research due to the level of opposition his findings incited. “Upon the release of his information about American females also being sexually interested and active, however, [conservative opponents] recoiled and quickly put the lid on this maverick researcher who dared to speak such heresy” (Ren, 2006, p. 27). After the loss of his funding, Kinsey died in 1956, a defeated researcher. His death left many projects that he and his team had been working on unfinished.

However, his team, which was made up of Clyde Martin, Wardell Pomeroy, and Paul
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Gebhard, pushed forward without Kinsey, and the Institute for Sex Research continues its research to this day. The Institute is currently conducting a study on the definition of the phrase “had sex”. Over the past sixty years, the Institute has conducted innumerable studies on topics including: sexual inhibition in women, the subjective experience of sexual arousal, the public opinion on condom use to prevent sexually transmitted diseases, and homosexuality (Kinsey Institute, 2008).

Despite only living until the age of sixty, Kinsey left a legacy that carried into the twenty-first century. He will always be known for revealing America’s true sexual preferences. And, also for creating a controversy that persists even now.

According to Dr. William Granzig (2006) of Maimonides University, “Dr. Alfred C. Kinsey was an unlikely professor to change the face of sexology” (p. 99). However, due to his firm beliefs in rigorous scientific study, Kinsey perceived the previous sexual research as flawed and set out to “provide correct information” (Granzig, 2006, p. 99). Part of the ground-breaking nature of his research was his approach. They “were attempting to study human sexual behavior as if it were the behavior of any other creature on the planet” (Potter, 2006, p. 31). Never before had such a project been undertaken, but Kinsey and his team boldly pressed forward with their ground-breaking new study.

Kinsey’s mission was to gather the most data about human sexuality as was possible. This mission changed the relationship between science and people (Pryce, 2006). Instead of science being thought of as something that happens in a laboratory filled with elite scientists, Kinsey brought it down to the level of ordinary people by directly involving them in the study.

Kinsey’s research not only changed the way people viewed science, but also how science viewed people. “Indeed sexology is now at the heart of most Western medicalized notions of the
body and sexuality, underpinning contemporary ‘truths’ of rational, taxonomic ‘quantifiable’
sexualities, health and disease, ‘safer sex’ and the control and regulation of bodies” (Pryce,
2006). Kinsey’s research led to a change in how the medical community treated sex-related
issues and the human body in general. Instead of merely advising patients to abstain from sex
until marriage, it was now acceptable for doctors to advise patients of available contraceptives
and ways to protect themselves from sexually transmitted diseases.

Kinsey’s sex research not only caused a stir within the scientific community, but it also
attracted media attention that continues even to date. Due to the extent of his fame, he appeared
on magazine covers such as *Time* magazine, had four biographies written about him, and was
even portrayed by Liam Neeson in the film *Kinsey* (Bullough, 2004). The biographies were
written by Cornelia Christenson, James Jones, Johnathan Gathorne-Hardy, and Wardell Pomeroy,
his former research assistant. In the film, Kinsey was portrayed as a diligent scientist who
experimented sexually. This seems to be an accurate portrayal. His female volume’s publication
day was referred to a ‘K-Day’ by many media sources. Eventually, *Sexual Behavior in the
Human Male* and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*, both published by W.B. Saunders,
became bestsellers despite their scientific nature and content. The fact that such scientifically
based publications could become bestsellers was astounding.

However, all of the media attention Kinsey’s studies received was not positive. “Not
surprisingly, the two studies were as controversial as they were popular” (Steinberg, 2005, p. 19).
Despite selling an overwhelming number of copies of the two books, the political climate of the
time was not favorable for such books. “With the intensification of the cold war and the rise of
aggressive McCarthyism… *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* was greeted both by an
avalanche of sensationalist media hype… and by intensified scrutiny of Kinsey” (Herzog, 2006,
At the time of the female volume’s publication, McCarthy’s ideas that anything different must be Communist had the country worked into a panic. And Kinsey’s study was certainly different. This led to increased attention that would ultimately lead to the loss of funding for Kinsey’s research.

Beyond giving media outlets ample material to publish and discuss, Kinsey’s research also changed the face of media itself. Because of its treatment of what had been unacceptable, it had the effect of changing the strictures on sexual content and nudity. Now it is perfectly normal to see mostly nude models on billboards, in magazine ads, or even in television commercials. It is also common to see lengthy sex scenes in movies and television shows. In the 1940s or even the 1970s, such advertisements and features would not have been allowed (Pryce, 2006). By making sex and sexuality part of mainstream America, Kinsey opened the door for today’s risqué movies and advertisements.

A change in female sexuality can be directly attributed to his research: “throughout the decades of social reform that have ensued, the echoes of Kinsey’s work have been significant in the construction of cultures and subcultures, the growth of contemporary sexual consumption and the profound reconstruction of gender and sexual diversity” (Pryce, 2006, p. 66). One of the main advances in this area was that Kinsey “challenged long-held myths about female sexuality” (Bullough, 2004, p. 277). The idea of a woman as an unfaithful partner within a marriage or as a lesbian was not part of mainstream America until Kinsey’s studies were published. His findings that women were just as sexually diverse as men astounded readers. Most could believe that men engaged in premarital sex or same-sex encounters. However, the idea that women were behaving in the same way was a concept that was highly contested by Kinsey’s opponents.

Kinsey showed that women were not so different from men, at least in all things sexual.
“His research also provided fodder for the feminist movement that has led to greater equality toward the sexes” (Bullough, 2004, p. 277). Feminists now had another way in which men and women were similar, and similarities between the sexes were one of the main arguments for equality.

In the 1940s and 1950s homosexuality was not part of mainstream American culture to the extent that it is today. Kinsey’s research has allowed for many subcultures within United States to grow and even flourish because he showed that deviation from the norm was not abnormal at all (Pryce, 2006). Those findings led to great progress for homosexuals over the course of several decades.

His research greatly affected the homosexual subculture because it changed the way Americans perceived sexuality. “The sexuality Kinsey created had an enormous impact that freed many individuals from the stigma of abnormality” (Bullough, 2004, p. 285). Because homosexuality was viewed as being abnormal, the revelation that it was not abnormal was a great step forward for the closeted community. Kinsey personally viewed homosexuality as being “not pathological” in nature (Ericksen, 2000, p. 22). This standpoint was very revolutionary for those times.

In addition to being classified as ‘abnormal’ by the general public, homosexuality was still classified as a disease by the medical community in the 1950s. However, in 1973 Kinsey’s research made what is possibly one of its greatest contributions to the gay community and to Americans in general. This achievement was the removal homosexuality from the list of diseases found in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) (Granzig, 2006). However, it was replaced by “ego-dystonic homosexuality” in the third edition released in 1980. It was not until 1986 that the diagnosis of any type of homosexuality was completely removed.
from the *DSM* (Herek, n.d.). This change was a recognition by psychologists and physicians alike that homosexuality was not a disease, and therefore, it was not something that could be 'cured'. This view was not held by everyone in the mental health field. Many psychiatrists, specifically psychoanalysts, felt that homosexuality was indeed a pathology and should not be removed from the *DSM*, and that is the most likely reason for the addition of "ego-dystonic homosexuality" in 1980. Eventually that view was overturned, and homosexuality was removed altogether, a decision strongly supported by the American Psychological Association (APA). The APA "has since worked intensively to eradicate the stigma historically associated with a homosexual orientation" (APA, as cited in Herek, n.d.).

Kinsey not only changed views of the general public and the scientific community on homosexuality, but "he was also a major force in encouraging gays and lesbians to organize and to come out of the closet" (Bullough, 2004, p. 277). Such encouragement may have been just what the gay movement needed to get started. And, according to Esther (2005), there is a direction connection between the publication of the male volume and the beginning of the gay movement. So, in a sense, Kinsey's research opened the closet door and allowed for public discussion and acceptance of homosexuality as a way of life.

Kinsey's research had a profound effect on the gay subculture in the United States. However, it also impacted homosexuals in other parts of the world. Activists for homosexual rights in France and West Germany were thrilled by Kinsey's research that showed heterosexual and homosexual behaviors as being on a continuum rather than as a dichotomy between gay and straight. This is due to the fact that in West Germany homosexuality was still illegal and in France it was legal, but socially unacceptable (Herzog, 2006). Hite (as cited in Pastoetter, 2006) states that Kinsey's 'homosexual-heterosexual' scale does not describe people, it describes only
their actions. In essence, Kinsey rejected the concept of labeling people as either heterosexual or homosexual. Gay rights activists also reveled in “[Kinsey’s] rejection of the concepts of normality and abnormality” (Herzog, 2006, p. 42). Without such labels, opponents to gay rights could not call homosexuality ‘deviant’ because there is no ‘norm’ from which to deviate.

The attitude towards sex prior to the publication of Kinsey’s studies was quite negative. “Without Kinsey’s contributions sex would still be considered a loathsome disease, morally offensive, or just plain dirty” (Granzig, 2006, p.102). Moreover, sexual activities were regulated relentlessly by the government and by moral leaders. Because of these regulations, the average person believed that any type of sex other than heterosexual intercourse within a marriage was ‘abnormal’.

At the time that Kinsey’s reports were published, the United States was still under the “Victorian stranglehold” that ruled sexual behavior and morality (Esther, 2005, p. 15). The Victorian view on sex was that it should be heterosexual intercourse only within the frame of marriage, typically in the ‘male-superior’ position (Steinberg, 2005). Such a viewpoint seriously hindered the growth of different sexual cultures due to fear of public humiliation.

Kinsey viewed diversity as being extremely important for gays and women alike. Hite (as cited in Pastoetter, 2006) claims that the female volume encourages diversity “at a time when most forms of sexual activities were considered immoral and declared illegal in the United States” (10). It should also be noted that without the work of Kinsey, Hite’s work would have never been possible. During the 1950s, laws such as ones against sodomy laws were enacted to keep homosexuality from growing and becoming mainstream. However, like Freud’s work in psychoanalysis, after Kinsey’s report “sexology would no longer be bound by religious hypocrisy, legal definitions, and medically unfounded facts regarding the dangers of sex”
His research was essential in repealing many laws regarding sex repealed. It also changed the definition of what is 'normal' and dispelled many untrue myths about sex.

Even though Americans were extremely conservative in what they viewed as normal, they still perceived themselves as romantic. However, the European view of American sexuality at the time of Kinsey's report was drastically different than the American viewpoint. European commentators frequently described it as 'cold', 'frigid', 'lacking eroticism', and even 'superficial.' They believed Americans had lost the romantic aspect of sex (Herzog, 2006).

Despite what the outside world thought about American sexuality, the reports revealed that "the range of behaviors that many of us can tolerate or even freely engage in, reveals just how queer the 'normal' is in human desire and practice" (Pryce, 2006, p. 85). Basically the 'normal' is not normal at all. Kinsey's view on sexual behaviors was that they are all 'natural' which challenged the moral authorities of the time (Pastoetter, 2006). "Commentators in the United States who praised Kinsey tended to emphasize how important it was that the silence covering sexual matters was being broken, and that the gap between norms and behaviors was finally being closed" (Herzog, 2006, p. 40). The research pointed out that people were participating in a variety of different sexual acts, "and they were not all going crazy, committing suicide, getting pregnant, or dying of grossly disfiguring sexually transmitted diseases" as had previously been stated in various myths about sexuality (Steinberg, 2005, p. 19-20). Kinsey's disapproval of many of these common myths about sexuality took away his opponents' arguments against non-heterosexual intercourse. In the end, Kinsey's research made it "painfully clear that what Americans actually did sexually was radically different from what people had thought" (Steinberg, 2005, p. 19).
Kinsey’s studies may have been eye-opening for people living during the 1950s, but not to the extent to which it was once thought. “[His] work was considered far less controversial [than] it is today” (Brottman, 2006, p. 108). This statement rings true given the recent conservative uprising the movie Kinsey created. Critics such as Michael Craven, from the National Coalition for the Protection of Children & Families states that “Kinsey's impact on our culture has been nothing short of devastating” (“Kinsey Film Opens to Protest,” 2004). Another staunch critic of Kinsey’s work is Robert Knight, director of Christian Women for America's Culture & Family Institute who believes that “Alfred Kinsey encouraged pedophiles to molest children, all in the name of science. Instead of being lionized, Kinsey's proper place is with Nazi Dr. Josef Mengele or your average Hollywood horror flick mad scientist” (“Kinsey Film Opens to Protest,” 2004). However, the most outspoken critic of the film, and Dr. Kinsey in general, is Dr. Judith Reisman who believe that Kinsey’s research is to blame for the degradation of today’s society (Reisman, 1990).

Despite the controversy surrounding Kinsey, his research had a drastic effect on American society. One reason for this is “the technological innovation of the safe, effective birth control pill” (Potter, 2006, p. 36). Such advances in contraceptives are what paved the way for the sexual revolution, inspired by Kinsey’s research.

Potter (2006) states that not long after the beginning of the sexual revolution:
The ‘Beat Generation’ and Playboy were on the scene. These represented a movement and products unimaginable on a larger scale prior to World War II when such ideas and products were the providence of only elites. Science had provided the platform from which new claims to moral authority could be launched. (p. 33)

Kinsey’s research had opened the door for new and novel types of sexuality to come through.
Now that the sexual revolution has come and gone, "there is now a loss of faith that sexual freedom in and of itself leads to progressive social and political change. And there is an even more shattering loss of eloquence in defending the value of sexual freedom itself" (Herzog, 2006, p. 44). Recent pushes to make abortion illegal and to add a constitutional amendment making gay marriage illegal show that the conservative backlash against the sexual revolution is gaining ground with far too little opposition. Also, following the sexual revolution prejudice still exists towards people who are different from the perceived 'norm' despite the knowledge that many people in this country do not follow the 'norm'. This societal view has changed little in the aftermath of the sexual revolution. So, the question becomes, what has changed?

With every revolutionary leader comes a force opposed to him or her. This was true with Kinsey and his team as well. "Faith-based moralism, Kinsey's main opponent, saw Kinsey's work as a leap into an abyss of fire, brimstone, and social decay" (Steinberg, 2005, p. 20). After Kinsey's reports were released "science was perceived by many as no longer used to catalog behavioral 'facts', but as a tool to attack the moral fabric on which 'proper' sexuality was based" (Potter, 2006, p. 31). This is likely due to Kinsey's subtle, yet clear support of 'abnormal' sexual behaviors. Kinsey and his followers not only reported the data they found in their case histories; they also added their own views on morality and "the criminalization of behaviors" by religious doctrines (Potter, 2006, p. 31). Many believe that his work represents a challenge "to the authority of the religious sphere over matters of 'proper' sexual behavior and sexuality" (Potter, 2006, p. 32). It is thought that his dislike of religious authority came from his strict religious upbringing by his father.

One of the main arguments used by Kinsey's opponents was that his statistics were flawed due to a non-random sample. Their conclusion is that his results could not possibly be
representative of the United States' population as a whole because his sample was not diverse enough. While his sample was not as random as it should have been, it does not make all of his data invalid.

Other arguments were less than scientific and more emotional in nature. One such radical argument against Kinsey's work is that he and his staff were akin to child molesters. His opponents' goal "[was] to render [the Reports'] value less than negligible, to make it obscene" (Potter, 2006, p. 35). Another argument "erroneously draws on the Pandora's Box assumption and fear that once knowledge of different practices and desires are voiced, otherness is revealed and given shape. Simply speaking of it will induce the morally vulnerable to be seduced into sin" (Pryce, 2006, p. 78).

Despite the warm reception by some, others in Europe met Kinsey's research with opposition using many of the same arguments that American opponents used. Others worried about the 'deromanticization' of sex (Herzog, 2006). Such worries may not have been ill-founded. In today's society, sex is not viewed with the same romantic notion as it once was. This may be in part due to Kinsey counting the number of orgasms a person had as a measure of sexual satisfaction.

Even today conservatives are still blaming Kinsey for the changes in laws concerning homosexuality and sex education (Potter, 2006). "The similarity and continuity in the religious, political, and public responses between the original report, and half a century later, in the hostile reactions towards the movie" is astounding (Pryce, 2006, p. 64). To date, many conservatives cringe at the mere mention of Kinsey's name. However, some believe that "it is only in recent years, in fact, that Kinsey has been a target of systematic attacks by the Christian right" (Brottman, 2006, p. 108). Regardless of the source of opposition, it is telling that Kinsey's
research has been under attack since the day it was published.

The reasons for the broad scope of this continued opposition are not completely clear. One reason is that "human sexuality and desire represents a huge project of control and order because of its potential to destabilize individuals, communities, and beliefs (Pryce, 2006, p. 69). Religious and conservative leaders believe that they need to control sexual behavior because otherwise people would fall into sin. Also, the lingering restraints of the Victorian era caused many to be worried about Kinsey’s lack of judgment regarding the morality of certain sexual acts (Ren, 2006). This argument is not so much religious as it is cultural. The culture of the 1950s was still clinging to a strict Victorian view of sexuality, which did not allow for ‘abnormal’ behavior.

Alfred Kinsey’s sex research had a profound effect on American culture. His work helped bring about a more favorable view towards female sexuality and homosexuality. His research also altered the face of science forever by bringing ‘pop science’ into American homes for the first time. He opened the door for the sex-laden media that is prevalent today. He stood by his research even in the face of incredible opposition. Most importantly, he showed that there is no such concept as ‘abnormality’. All of these contributions are what made Alfred C. Kinsey a great man with an unforgettable legacy.
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Figure 1. Kinsey’s heterosexual-homosexual rating scale.

0- Exclusively heterosexual with no homosexual
1- Predominantly heterosexual, only incidentally homosexual
2- Predominantly heterosexual, but more than incidentally homosexual
3- Equally heterosexual and homosexual
4- Predominantly homosexual, but more than incidentally heterosexual
5- Predominantly homosexual, only incidentally heterosexual
6- Exclusively homosexual

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Non College</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(in %)</td>
<td>(in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than incidental</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal by approach</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or accidental contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences, but amount unknown</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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