

Experimental Studies of the Etiology of Genital Exhibitionism

R. Langevin, Ph.D.,¹ D. Paitich,¹ G. Ramsay,¹ C. Anderson,¹
J. Kamrad,¹ S. Pope,¹ G. Geller,¹ L. Pearl,¹ and S. Newman¹

Several studies are reported which examine the critical stimuli and responses as well as personality factors important in genital exhibitionism. Using penile volume measurement, sex history questionnaires, personality tests, and behavioral observations, it was found that (1) exhibitionists responded most to mature females and were comparable to normals in reactions to children and men; (2) while exhibitionists indicated narcissistic desires in exposing, in a laboratory study they did not differ from controls in reactions to exposing with various reactions of the female, from sexual arousal and admiration to fear and anger; (3) the only strong features distinguishing exhibitionists from controls and other sexually anomalous subjects were peeping associated with orgasm and outdoor solitary masturbation; (4) exhibitionists seemed to be less assertive and less feminine than controls, but results were weak and inconsistent; (5) exhibitionists and controls did not differ in separation and divorce or marital satisfaction; (6) blood testosterone and penile reactivity of exhibitionists were within normal limits. Overall, the results suggest that most major theories of genital exhibitionism are wanting. It is suggested that narcissism and pedophilia be examined further in connection with exhibitionism.

KEY WORDS: exhibitionism; personality; marital relations; sexuality; sex deviation; narcissism; voyeurism.

INTRODUCTION

Genital exhibitionism continues to be one of the major sexual anomalies, and it presents challenging problems for treatment. In the present article a num-

These studies were supported by grants from Ontario Mental Health Foundation (No. 591-76B) and C.I.P. Research Fund.

¹ Clarke Institute of Psychiatry, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5T 1R8.

ber of hypotheses are examined in an attempt to understand the nature of genital exhibitionism, an area of research almost devoid of systematic experimental studies. Clinically derived hypotheses will be discussed under two relevant questions: what are the critical stimuli and what are the critical responses in genital exhibitionism? These questions will include a consideration of personality, exhibiting behavior, and other concurrent sexual behavior.

Critical Stimuli in Exhibiting Behavior

There is disagreement on the class of stimuli to which the exhibitionist responds erotically. The most frequent victim of his acts seems to be the physically mature female, but it is also well known clinically that it is difficult, in practice, to distinguish the pedophile from the exhibitionist (Mohr *et al.*, 1964; Paitich *et al.*, 1977). Mohr *et al.* suggest that the pedophile is interested in physical contact with the child while the exhibitionist only wants to be seen, with no physical contact. Even those exhibitionists who appear to prefer the mature female do act out with the female child. It is an open question whether these exhibitionists respond erotically to the body shape of the female child more than normal males do or to some other facet of the child's behavior.

A number of writers have also postulated that the exhibitionist is basically homosexual, albeit in some cases an "unconscious homosexual" (Karpman, 1957; Rickels, 1950; Christoffel, 1936). Like most psychoanalytic postulates, this hypothesis is difficult to test. The incidence of homosexual behavior and the reaction of exhibitionists to the male body shape have not been extensively reported in the experimental literature. From such hypotheses, one might expect, in some cases at least, that homosexual behavior would be substantial. Interestingly, many males with homoerotic preferences "expose" in public places, albeit to other males, and share with heterosexual exhibitionists the practice of "outdoor masturbation with no one around." We do not know the extent to which normal males engage in outdoor masturbation, but the amount of incidental homosexual behavior in normals is substantial and may not differ from that in exhibitionists. Homosexual males and exhibitionists may both also display autoeroticism.

Krafft-Ebing (*cf.* Hartwich, 1959) discussed autoerotism and presented detailed and extreme cases which he labeled "automonosexualism." He reported one case in which the male involved was totally absorbed in his own body as a sexual outlet. He would stand naked before the mirror, admire his body, kissing his reflection and masturbating or even ejaculating without masturbation. He showed no interest in either males or females and seemed totally sexually satisfied with his own body. Interestingly, some exhibitionists and homosexual patients in therapy report going through a period in which they were very excited by their own body and by being nude. While a link between exhibitionism

and homosexuality has not been systematically studied, it seems that the male is rarely the victim of genital exhibiting. The exhibitionist seems oriented to the female (*cf.* Gebhard *et al.*, 1965).

Critical Responses in Exhibiting Behavior

The obvious question about exhibiting is "What is the person engaging in the act trying to accomplish?" Much theoretical attention has been paid to this question. One theory is that the exhibitionist is totally absorbed in the act of seeing and being seen by a female and that tactile contact is not really desired. Freud (Jones, 1953, p. 288) first noted this in saying that "certain components of the sexual instinct which are normally contributory agencies leading to the final act, are singled out to replace it." The frequent co-occurrence of voyeurism and exhibitionism noted by clinicians supports such an interpretation (*cf.* Smith, 1976; Yalom, 1960).

Freund (1978) has postulated that voyeurism, exhibitionism, toucheurism, and rape are various modes of a common underlying courtship disorder. He conceives of the normal male-female erotic interaction in four phases: searching for a partner, pretactile interaction (mainly a verbal exchange in humans), tactile interaction (the prelude to intercourse), and genital union. The exhibitionist in particular, he postulates, has an exaggerated or distorted pretactile phase of interaction in this sequence and the remaining phases of tactile interaction and genital union are either fully omitted or appear only in a vestigial way. Presumably, the exhibitionist is enacting this sequence when he exposes.

Freund (unpublished data) compared exhibitionists and controls on statements depicting the four phases of courtship as well as neutral statements. Penile reactions were measured and compared by multivariate analysis of variance. In general, the exhibitionists and normals did not differ significantly on the phases of courtship. The only difference was of marginal significance and showed exhibitionists responding more to foreplay than did controls. However, both groups did show a greater penile reaction to intercourse and foreplay than to searching and pretactile interaction, as expected in normals. The hypothesis was not supported. This study represents one of the few attempts at experimentally testing a theory of exhibiting.

More recently, Kolarsky *et al.* (1978) have postulated that female courtship behavior inhibits the exhibitionists sexually, but female noncourtship activity does not. Kolarsky *et al.* consider this opposite to the normal pattern. They have offered pilot data to support this point of view, but more information is needed. One would expect from this theory and Freud's that exhibitionists would react differently to intercourse than controls. One might also expect their marital relations to be adversely influenced. Implicit in Freund's point of view is that a distorted courtship sequence leading to genital union is acted out in exposing.

Freud might argue that it is not. Systematic information is lacking to resolve the question, but the idea that exhibitionists are afraid of women, or intercourse in particular, is commonly held.

In another theoretical approach, Karpman (1957) in his classic compendium suggested that exhibitionism is narcissistic because (1) it has elements of autoeroticism since the exhibitionist derives pleasure from seeing himself in the nude, (2) he sees himself as conferring a service or kindness in exposing, and (3) he wishes to be envied for the possession of his penis. The first point has been discussed above as automonosexuality. The second point is commonly observed in the exhibitionist's desire for the female to "get a kick out of" or "be turned on" by exposing. The third point is embodied in the psychoanalytic theory of the unresolved oedipal conflict of the exhibitionist and its attendant castration anxiety which surfaces as feelings of inferiority about himself.

Krafft-Ebing (Harwich, 1959) describes exhibiting as a substitute act of a *sadistic* kind. This "sadism" need not be the brutal kind envisaged by the layman but rather may be expressed generally as an attempt to exploit, enslave, frustrate, or humiliate another person (*cf.* Glover, 1964). It takes place against the will of the victim and it is "an attack, surprise, assault; a violation." East (1924) said that exhibitionism is motivated by the intent to insult the female, and Allen (1949) said that the emotion is greater in exhibiting if the female is shocked. Rooth (1973) notes that it is not unusual for exhibitionists to commit assaults at some stage.

Finally, East (1924) has suggested that exhibitionists are hypersexual. If this is so, both stimulus generalization and response generalization may be so prominent that the "critical behavior" in exhibiting may be difficult to define. One may deduce that exhibitionists are "hypersexual," that is, have excessive need for sexual outlets, since they act out with children, often engage in other sexual behavior that occurs infrequently in the general population (e.g. peeping and toucheurism), and have an excessive pretactile phase of interaction in exhibiting, according to Freund, which again may represent heightened sexual arousal. A first avenue to investigate for hypersexuality is blood testosterone. However, data on the testosterone blood level of exhibitionists compared to normals are lacking.

Personality and Demographic Factors in Exhibitionism

It has been postulated that the exhibitionist is afraid of intercourse. This stems from his basic character: he is shy and unassertive, and, while he is masculine identified, he cannot act in the normal fashion because of feelings of inferiority. This inferiority focuses on his sexuality and, in particular, on his penis. Witzig (1968) distinguishes exhibitionists who act out with "no genital gratification" (masturbation) from those who do. The ones who masturbate are regres-

sing to an adolescent practice. It proves that they are aggressive and protects them from the fact that they may prove impotent in actual physical involvement with a female. This is why exposing occurs where direct sex contact is not possible. Taylor (1947) notes that those exposing without orgasm are the shy and unassertive ones. This theoretical formulation presents a paradox — the shy, unassertive exhibitionist will show his genitals in a public place to a stranger. This seems assertive enough, and may be construed even as aggressive, but it is perhaps something that the normal male would not do it even if the desire were present.

The clinical literature on personality and exhibitionism has been reviewed elsewhere (McCawley, 1965; McCreary, 1975; Mohr *et al.*, 1964), and the clinical picture of the exhibitionist which emerges is of a passive, shy, dependent, and inhibited individual who is socially introverted and lacks "male assertiveness." However, both McCreary and Mohr *et al.* noted the dearth of controlled studies which compare exhibitionists with normal subjects. Using the MMPI and 16 PF in a recent controlled study, Langevin *et al.* (1978) found that exhibitionists, when compared to heterosexual controls and other sexually anomalous groups, had unremarkable personality profiles but there were tendencies to lower MMPI Mf scores (i.e., exhibitionists are more masculine) and to higher Pd scores, suggesting a nonconforming attitude and/or familial discord. The 16 PF also suggested that the exhibitionists are more masculine than average (factor I), and, in addition, more sober (factor F) and more shy (factor H). Both MMPI and 16 PF showed trends to social introversion, but they were not pronounced. These findings need replication with more sensitive scales, and this has been one goal of the present study. There is some support for the hypothesis that exhibitionists are more masculine than normal males, but further investigation with sound and varied scales is needed.

A lack of assertiveness with females could also be a motivation in the exhibiting behavior. It may be that exhibitionists are unassertive and shy with females only in sexual situations, or it could be that they are generally unassertive and shy with everyone. This will be clarified in the present report.

Finally, one may expect marital difficulties to be common for exhibitionists, but the theoretical literature is divided on this point. Taylor (1947) stated that deprivation of intercourse plays an important part in the etiology of exhibitionism. Mohr *et al.* (1962), on the other hand, noted that exhibitionism is caused by dissatisfaction and anxiety aroused by sex relations rather than by a lack of them. Some writers discuss marriage as a prophylactic against exposing (*cf.* Arieff and Rotman, 1942; Bastani, 1976), but no data are presented. Possibly, regular sexual intercourse reduces the need for exhibiting. Possibly, exhibitionists who marry are a select group with less "need" to expose. If Freud is correct, the exhibiting (scoptophilia) replaces the act of genital union, and one may expect marital, especially sexual, discord in the marriages of exhibitionists. The hypothesis of courtship disorder in exhibitionism might also predict a re-

duction of exhibitionism in married men since they receive genital gratification and presumably they also adequately complete the courtship sequence in the normal way. On the other hand, exhibitionists may have a preference for the "disordered" courtship sequence over the normal sequence. Some of these speculations will also be examined herein. There are few systematic data to support any of the theories described in this introduction, but the present report will explore these theories in several controlled studies.

METHOD

Subjects

Two samples were used. Sample A involved the data bank of 482 subjects used in the reports of Paitich *et al.* (1977), Paitich and Langevin (1976), and Langevin *et al.* (1978). Details may be found in these sources. All males from our data bank who had exposed their genitals in a public place to females ($N = 96$) were included. All but three of these 96 had exposed at least twice. Only 14 were exclusive exhibitionists who engaged in no other reported sexual anomaly. All subjects admitted to their exhibiting behavior. There were 54 normal controls with no psychiatric history or sexual anomaly. From the remainder of the data bank, subjects with multiple sexual anomalies ($N = 141$) were used for different aspects of the study noted later. In this way, if any differences appear among groups, one can determine if such differences are peculiar to exhibitionism or describe sexual anomalies in general.

Sample B consisted of 135 subjects who were exhibitionists ($N = 34$), androphiles ($N = 22$), pedophiles ($N = 22$), multiple and miscellaneous deviants ($N = 35$), and a core group of controls ($N = 22$).² Definitions are the same as for sample A (see Paitich *et al.*, 1977). Subsamples of this group were used to test various hypotheses. An attempt was made to administer to all patients at least the MMPI and Sex History Questionnaire. Because of the large number of hypotheses tested, smaller numbers of exhibitionists were used to test each hypothesis. No particular selection procedure was used, but subjects participated in whatever substudy was ongoing at the time of their admission to our program. Control subjects were screened as in sample A so there was no reported psychiatric history or sexually anomalous behavior.

The exhibitionists in sample A were significantly older than controls but significantly younger than the multiple anomaly group (mean ages 27.56,

²In addition to this core group of controls, others were recruited to participate in phallogometric and blood studies as required. The same selection procedures were used in every case.

24.30, and 31.75, respectively; $F = 14.13$; $p < 0.0001$). However, age differences in sample B were nonsignificant (total sample B Mean age 28.10). Age was covaried wherever appropriate, and it did not influence results. It will therefore not be discussed further.

Apparatus and Materials

The phallometer (Freund *et al.*, 1965) was adapted to the Grass polygraph (*cf.* Langevin and Martin, 1975) and used to assess penile volume reactions of subjects to various movie clips, slides, and audiotaped materials. Each set of stimuli will be described briefly in the context of the hypothesis appropriate to it.

Second, the test battery CAPER (Paitich, 1973) was used, which includes the Clarke Sex History Questionnaire (SHQ) and the MMPI. In addition, the following tests were administered to sample B: EPPS (Edwards, 1953), PRF (Jackson, 1974), DPI (Jackson and Messick, 1970), Conflict Resolution Inventory (McFall and Lillesand, 1971), College Self-Expression Scale (Galassi *et al.*, 1974), Rathus Assertiveness Schedule (Rathus, 1973), Personality Schedule (Wolpe and Lazarus, 1966), Interpersonal Disposition Inventory, GI Scale (Freund *et al.*, 1974), and Assertiveness Inventory (Alberti and Emmons, 1970). Two forms of the SHQ were used, the first, here labeled "Old SHQ," reported by Paitich *et al.* (1977) and a revised version, here labeled "New SHQ."

The Old SHQ ascertains frequency of sexual behavior, desire for it, and disgust for it. The behaviors are conventional heterosexual behavior, homosexual behavior, pedophilia, transvestism, frottage, peeping, rape, obscene phone calls, exhibiting, and response patterns such as anal intercourse. The questionnaire has demonstrated reliability and validity for research in this area. This questionnaire was administered to sample A. The New SHQ, administered to sample B, contained 417 items, those of the Old SHQ plus items which ascertained whether orgasm occurred with certain sexual behaviors, e.g., exhibiting, peeping, frottage, and rape. In addition, it sampled sadistic behavior, bestiality, incest, necrophilia, and details of sexual fantasy life.

RESULTS

Phallometric Studies

The dependent measure in each of the studies in this section was penile volume change as measured by the phallometer. Hypotheses 1–3 were tested together:

- Hypothesis 1. Exhibitionists erotically prefer the body shape of the female and, in particular, the mature female.
- Hypothesis 2. Exhibitionists show a greater than average erotic reaction to the body shape of the female child.
- Hypothesis 3. Exhibitionists show greater erotic reactivity to the male body than do normal heterosexual males.

To test the hypotheses, 15 exhibitionists and 22 controls were used. A standard test of erotic preference consisting of 54 movie clips was used as stimulus (*cf.* Freund *et al.*, 1972). This test uses four groups of females ranging in age from 5 years 7 months to 26 years 3 months, and four groups of males ranging in age from 5 years 4 months to 25 years 8 months. Six neutral slides were also included. The 2×9 (group \times stimulus) analysis of variance was significant for the stimulus ($F = 22.65$, $df = 8, 316$, $p < 0.001$) but not for the group \times stimulus interaction ($F < 1$). Neither group responded to the pictures of males of any age more than to neutral slides (mean Z scores -0.30 neutrals, -0.33 males). All subjects responded most to the females, and the reaction was increasingly larger as the stimulus females became more mature (e.g., 9–11 years female mean Z score $+0.15$, mature female Z score $+1.49$). There were no significant differences between the two groups in reactions to female children (mean Z score -0.28). Therefore, only hypothesis 1 was supported.

- Hypothesis 4. Exhibitionists are narcissistic and will respond erotically to their own bodies.

Four exhibitionists were examined on the following stimulus materials: slides of neutral scenes, male nudes, female nudes, and themselves in full clothes, in underwear, and nude. There were two slides in each category, arranged in random order. The use of own nude body as a stimulus was adapted from Freund *et al.* (1974). The 4×6 ANOVA results showed that the only responses significantly greater than those to neutral stimuli were to the nude females ($F = 6.17$, $df = 5, 38$, $p < 0.01$). Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported using this method, and it appears that automonosexual narcissism is not a significant component of the exhibitionist's behavior.

- Hypothesis 5. Exhibitionists are narcissistic and will respond erotically to females attending to the male's genitals.
- Hypothesis 6. The act of exhibiting will be enhanced if the reaction of the female is one of pleasure and admiration.
- Hypothesis 7. The act of exhibiting will be enhanced if the reaction of the female is one of surprise and shock.

Fourteen categories of stimuli were composed from the audiotape procedure described by Abel *et al.* (1975): exposing with the female becoming sexually aroused, exposing with the female admiring him, exposing with the female be-

coming angry and insulted, exposing with the female unreactive, exposing with the female embarrassed and shocked, and finally exposing with the female fearful and in his power. Intercourse was described under three conditions: male initiated, female initiated, and mutually initiated. Other situations involved peeping at a sole female undressing and at intercourse/fellatio, watching a female expose, and violence against a female with no sexual contact. A neutral control statement was also included. The same statements were used for each subject. Each statement consisted of ten parts, each lasting 10 sec. In this way, a particular aspect of the stimulus situation could be examined for its arousal-increasing value for the subjects, after Abel's procedure, e.g., from "exposing with female embarrassed and shocked," "segment 5; She is very close now. You take out your penis and expose to her," "segment 6: She stops and drops her bag. Her face turns white with shock."³

There were two statements in each stimulus category. All were audio-taped by a female speaker in a fixed random order, in two blocks, such that each type of statement appeared in each block. There were two sessions separated at least by 24 hr, one session for each block. The subjects were ten exhibitionists and ten heterosexual controls who volunteered for the study and were paid for their participation. The subjects were prerelaxed for 10 min with a Wolpe-type exercise as in Langevin *et al.* (1975). This procedure was found to enhance subjects' reactivity to their erotically preferred stimuli.

Interestingly, the results of 2×12 MANOVA showed that there were no significant differences in exhibitionists and controls to any statement. Every statement (exhibiting, intercourse, and peeping) was reacted to significantly more than were the neutrals and violence with no sex contact. Table I shows the means and significant differences among means from the Neuman-Keuls test (Winer, 1962). The "female exposing" and "peeping" stimuli produced the largest reactions while exposing with negative reactions (anger and fear) or no reaction produced the smallest of the erotic responses. One can also construe the largest reactions as involving the female initiating sexual overtures. Generally, however, it seems that exposing, intercourse, and peeping are on a par for both normals and exhibitionists as far as sexual arousal is concerned.

Hypothesis 8. Exhibitionists are hypersexual and (a) have higher than average testosterone levels than controls and (b) have a greater penile volume output than controls.

Testosterone. A blood assay was performed ($N = 17$ exhibitionists and 23 controls) using a radioimmunoassay procedure described by Wong *et al.* (1975). Blood was drawn between 8:30 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. A t test comparing the results for the two groups was of borderline significance ($t = 2.01$, $df = 38$, $p <$

³ A complete list of the statements may be obtained from the first author.

Table I. Newman-Keuls Test Results and Mean Penile Volume Change Scores to Exposing, Peeping, Intercourse, Violence, and Neutral Statements for All Subjects^a

Order	Stimulus statement	Ordered mean	Test on all ordered pairs of means						
			Order: 1	2	3	4	5	6-14 ^b	
1	Neutral	1.06							
2	Violence	1.38							
3	Expose – female angry	3.22	*	*					
4	Expose – no reaction	3.44	*	*					
5	Expose – female afraid	3.45	*	*					
6	Expose – female admires	4.12	*	*					
7	Intercourse – male initiated	4.39	*	*					
8	Expose – female embarrassed	4.52	*	*					
9	Intercourse – mutually initiated	4.55	*	*					
10	Expose – female sexually aroused	4.92	*	*					
11	Peep at female alone	5.13	*	*	*				
12	Intercourse – female initiated	5.17	*	*	*				
13	Peep at intercourse/fellatio	5.72	*	*	*	*	*		
14	Female exposing	5.79	*	*	*	*	*		n.s.

^aAn asterisk indicates means which are significantly different. A score of 4.0 = 1 cm³ volume change. n.s., Not significant.

^bValues from 7 to 14 are omitted for space considerations since they are all nonsignificant.

0.10, two tailed). There was, however, a trend for the exhibitionists to have lower than normal levels of testosterone (mean 474.76 ng, SD 288.36 vs. controls' mean 661.48 ng, SD 294.82). Thus one might postulate that exhibitionists are *hyposexual* compared to controls. These results may have been attributable to age since the groups differed significantly in age (exhibitionists' mean 27.35, SD 6.07; controls' mean 22.61, SD 6.02; $t = 2.45$; $df = 3$, $p < 0.002$). Therefore, age was covaried. However, the results were similar. If anything, the blood testosterone levels for the exhibitionists, age corrected, were even lower.

The assays were repeated using another sample of eight exhibitionists and eight *age-matched* normal controls. Results were nonsignificant for testosterone ($t = 0.02$) and age ($t = 0.04$). The mean and SD of blood testosterone were 593.75 ng and 139.94 for the exhibitionists and 592.38 ng and 152.05 for the controls. There were no values below 400 ng. Average ages were 25.88 and 26.00, respectively. The hypothesis was not supported.

Penile Volume Output. The subjects used to test hypothesis 8a were used here. An output index (*cf.* Freund *et al.*, 1972) consisting of the six largest reactions to erotic movies was computed for each subject. Results were nonsignificant for the two groups ($t = 0.005$). It is noteworthy that this output index correlated significantly, albeit weakly, with serum testosterone ($r = +.2651$, $p < 0.05$). However, there was no tendency for exhibitionists to be any more reactive than controls. The hypothesis was not supported.

Sex History Questionnaire Studies

The New and Old SHQ were used. One-way ANOVA and MANOVA were used to compare exhibitionists, controls, and multiple anomalies unless specified otherwise. The following hypotheses were tested together:

- Hypothesis 9. Exhibitionists show a higher incidence of peeping, toucheurism, and rape than other sexually anomalous subjects.
- Hypothesis 10. Exhibitionists show evidence of courtship disorder in dating behavior, foreplay, and intercourse.

While there was considerable variation in behavior within groups, the exhibitionists did peep and touch female strangers significantly more than controls or those with multiple anomalies, offering some support for hypothesis 9 [mean frequency 12.86, 1.41, and 5.83, respectively, for peeping ($F = 8.97, p < 0.001$) and 4.92, 0.36, 2.21, respectively, for touching female strangers ($F = 4.22, p < 0.05$)]. It is noteworthy that 56.2% of the exhibitionists had never peeped compared to 67.9% of controls and 66.1% of those with multiple anomalies. Only 11% of exhibitionists had peeped more than five times, suggesting that the link between peeping and exhibiting is a weak one as measured by these items. Touching a female stranger in a crowd was marginal in significance, and the majority of subjects had no experience at it. Among controls, 92.6% had no such experience compared to 71.3% of exhibitionists and 86.0% of those with multiple anomalies. Only 6.9% of exhibitionists had done it more than five times, compared to 3.7% of controls and 2.2% of those with multiple anomalies.

There was no significant difference in frequency of, desire for, or disgust for homosexual behavior or typical heterosexual behavior for the exhibitionists vs. controls; therefore, hypotheses 3 and 10 were rejected. Masturbation outdoors with no one around (solitary) was significant [mean frequencies 21.16, 0.54, and 6.76, respectively for exhibitionists, controls, and those with multiple anomalies ($F = 33.27, p < 0.001$)] and offers a strong difference between exhibitionists and the other two groups since 69.6% of exhibitionists had done it compared to 20.4% of controls and 38.5% of those with multiple anomalies. No other behavioral differences appeared on the Old SHQ.

The results with sample B generally support those with sample A. The exhibitionists were significantly different from the other groups not only in exposing, of course, but also in peeping [mean frequencies 8.76, 0.89, and 0.34, respectively, for exhibitionists, controls, and those with multiple anomalies ($F = 5.64, p < 0.001$)] and again they lacked interest in homosexual outlet and showed normal heterosexual experience. However, there were no significant differences in frequencies of toucheurism or frottage or in rape among the three groups. Of special interest is that exhibitionists masturbated outdoors with no one around more than heterosexual controls but the homosexual controls actual-

ly engaged in this practice more than exhibitionists (mean for the former 12.84 vs. 8.76, $F = 5.72$, $p < 0.001$). Also, when one examines peeping, one cannot separate out controls so well with the mere act of peeping since 23% of the controls had done it and 47% of the exhibitionists vs. 38% of those with miscellaneous anomalies and 20% of heterosexual pedophiles. However, none of the controls had peeped to orgasm while 30% of the exhibitionists had done this vs. 12% of those with miscellaneous anomalies and 13% of heterosexual pedophiles ($F = 2.94$, $p < 0.05$). In sum, the results suggest that homosexuality, frottage, and rape are unrelated to exhibitionism, but peeping is related, albeit weakly, in an orgasmic way to exposing. The groups also did not differ significantly on incidence and type of foreplay, dating, intercourse, or number of mature female sex partners.

Table II. Description of Exhibiting Act: Sample A^a

Item	Frequencies (%)				
	Never	Once only	2-10	11-40	Over 40
Outdoor masturbation when no one around	16.8	4.2	38.9	23.2	16.9
Total exposing to females	0.0	3.1	39.6	35.5	21.9
Exposing to females 12 or younger	49.5	9.5	27.4	9.5	4.2
Exposing to females 13-15 years old	40.6	6.3	35.4	12.6	5.2
Exposing to females 16-20 years old	20.8	3.1	50.1	14.6	11.5
Exposing to females 21-30 years old	29.2	7.3	37.4	19.8	6.2
Exposing to females 31-40 years old	61.1	3.2	23.2	10.5	2.1
Exposing to females over 40	80.2	2.1	15.7	1.0	1.0
Use of vulgar language when exposing	78.0	3.3	14.3	2.2	2.2
	5-point scale (%)				
	Never	Sometimes	Often	Almost always	Always
Have erection when exposed	10.5	31.6	6.3	26.3	25.3
Masturbate when exposed	18.1	33.0	11.7	25.5	11.7
Hope females will enjoy seeing exposed penis	11.8	25.8	5.4	16.1	40.9
Hope females will be impressed by exposed penis size	29.5	37.9	9.5	3.2	20.0
Exposure happens suddenly	11.7	38.3	22.3	16.0	11.7
"In a fog," things "unreal" when exposing	26.6	25.5	13.8	12.8	21.3
	Dichotomous items (%)				
	Yes	No			
Desire to expose to female	94.5	5.5			
Desire sex relations in exposing	55.9	44.1			
Tried sex relations in exposing	13.0	87.0			
If female receptive to sex relations when exposing, he would do it	31.7	68.3			

^a Values may not add to exactly 100% because of rounding error. $N = 96$ subjects who have exposed *ever*.

Hypothesis 11. Exhibitionists desire intercourse as the outcome of exposing.

Tables II and III describe some of the factors involved in exhibiting. The most frequent target of exposing was the female in the 16–30 age range in both samples A and B, but the victims ranged in age from under 12 to over 40. The use of vulgar language was relatively infrequent, with 78% of sample A and 93% of sample B “never” using it. Surprisingly, only about half of each sample reported having erections “always” or “almost always” when exposed and less than half masturbated to the same extent when exposing. A substantial number of the men wanted the females to whom they expose to be impressed by the size of their penis and to receive enjoyment from the exposing. The desire for sex relations seemed relatively less frequent. In fact, if the female was willing, only 31.7% of sample A would go with her for sex and only 16.3% of sample B would “always” or “almost always” want to go with her. This suggests that the pleasure of the female and/or some other motive are more prominent in exposing behavior than the desire for sexual intercourse. To test this hypothesis, a stepwise regression analysis was used for the exhibitionist subjects only. The

Table III. Description of Exhibiting Act: Sample B^a

Item	Frequencies (%)				
	Never	Once only	2–10	11–35	36 or more
Outdoor masturbation when no one around	27.8	0.0	36.1	25.0	11.1
Total exposing to females	0.0	0.0	30.6	22.2	47.2
Exposing to females 12 or younger	56.8	13.5	13.5	5.4	10.8
Exposing to females 13–15 years old	40.5	10.8	27.0	10.8	10.8
Exposing to females 16–20 years old	10.8	10.8	35.1	18.9	24.3
Exposing to females 21 and over	8.1	10.8	37.8	16.2	27.0
	5-point scale (%)				
	Never	Sometimes	Often	Almost always	Always
Use of vulgar language when exposing	93.0	2.3	2.3	2.3	0.0
Have erection when exposed	30.2	16.3	11.6	18.6	23.3
Masturbate when exposed	30.2	18.6	11.6	30.2	9.3
Hope females will enjoy seeing exposed penis	30.2	11.6	7.0	14.0	37.2
Hope females will be impressed by exposed penis size	41.9	14.0	7.0	11.6	25.6
Exposure happens suddenly	23.3	37.2	16.3	11.6	11.6
“In a fog,” things “unreal” when exposing	51.2	23.3	11.6	4.7	9.3
Desire sex relations in exposing	48.8	34.9	9.3	4.7	2.3
Tried sex relations in exposing	69.8	27.9	2.3	0.0	0.0
If female receptive to sex relations when exposing, he would do it	44.2	16.3	23.3	2.3	14.0

^a Values may not add to exactly 100% because of rounding error. *N* = 43 subjects who exposed two or more times.

criterion variables were total exposures, erection when exposed, and masturbation when exposed.

The predictor variables were SHQ items listed in Table IV. In four of the six cases, the "hope that the female will enjoy seeing the exposed penis" is the best predictor and in two other cases "hoping she will be impressed by its size" and "tried to have sex" were best. When all the significant predictor variables are added into the regression equation, the multiple correlations in Table IV change little in value over the best simple correlation in each case. Therefore, using all predictor variables is of limited value.

There was quite a contrast in the two samples in the sizes of the correlations in Table IV, those in sample A being much smaller generally. Several factors may be responsible, including the questionnaire itself, the sample selection, or the fact that sample B subjects were more experienced and may have been a "purer" strain of exhibitionists.

It is noteworthy that exhibitionists differed significantly from controls in having more fantasies of exposing while being watched and admired by a female but they did not differ significantly in fantasies of intercourse (means 4.54 and 3.86 for exhibitionists and controls, respectively, on a 5-point scale). If intercourse is their aim in exposing, one wonders why exposing is necessary in fantasies. Unfortunately, we did not ascertain the co-occurrence of intercourse and exposing fantasies, but the two separate items correlated only 0.31 in the total sample B and 0.15 in the exhibitionist group of sample B.

Table IV. Stepwise Regression Analysis Correlations of Frequency of Exposing, Erection, and Masturbation When Exposed in Samples A and B^a

Item/sample	Erection exposed		Masturbate exposed		Total exposures	
	A	B	A	B	A	B
Hope female enjoys seeing penis	14	66 ^b	17	67 ^b	18	74 ^b
Hope female impressed by penis size	-04	58 ^b	13	53 ^b	23 ^c	54 ^b
Urge for sex relations in exposing	00	18	-12	17	-07	48 ^b
Tried to have sex relation in exposing	22 ^c	14	00	36 ^c	-17	37 ^c
If female receptive to sex relations, he would go	03	22	-13	30 ^c	-03	42 ^b
Maximum change in multiple correlation	28	68	26	72	33	80

^aData are log transformed.

^b $p < 0.01$ two-tailed set.

^c $p < 0.05$.

In sample B, there were no significant correlations within the exhibitionist group on the SHQ above 0.30 relating erection, masturbation, and total exposures to sadistic behavior in the following items: Have you had orgasm or experienced sexual arousal to (1) physically hurting or humiliating or embarrassing someone, (2) having this done to you, (3) threatening or frightening someone, (4) having this done to you, (5) beating someone, (6) being beaten, or (7) someone being unconscious or unable to move. Thus, at least in sample B, it seems that narcissism was a prominent motive and the desire for sexual intercourse was secondary in exposing. Sadistic behavior, broadly defined, was not related to exposing.

Studies of Personality and Demographic Factors in Exhibitionism

The following hypotheses were tested together:

Hypothesis 12. Exhibitionists show higher than average scores on masculinity.

Hypothesis 13. Exhibitionists are shy, unassertive, passive, and socially introverted.

Personality Questionnaires. Hypotheses 12 and 13 have found some support in sample A for *pure* exhibitionists and are reported elsewhere (Langevin *et al.*, 1978). In the present study, an attempt was made to replicate the weak findings and to extend them by using other measures on sample B. Because of the large number of tests, not all subjects were administered all tests. A minimum of 16 exhibitionists and 16 heterosexual controls was used for any one test.

For hypothesis 12, the Mf (or androgyny) scales from the following tests were dependent variables in one-way MANOVA and ANOVA: MMPI, EPPS, BEM Scale, and FGI Scale. There were no significant differences in masculinity-femininity or any other questionnaire measures for that matter.

For hypothesis 13, the following were examined using the same analyses as in hypothesis 12: MMPI, DPI, PRF, EPPS, and, in particular for assertiveness, Conflict Resolution Inventory, College Self-Expression Scale, Rathus Assertiveness Inventory, Personality Schedule, and Interpersonal Disposition Inventory. All results were nonsignificant, and the exhibitionists were as assertive as controls. It is noteworthy that a PRF Scale "need exhibition" was also nonsignificant, and our earlier weak MMPI findings on social introversion were not confirmed. All of the relatively new assertiveness inventories showed adequate internal reliability ($\alpha > 0.60$).

Behavioral Observation Studies Two behavioral observation studies were also executed, the first dealing with assertiveness. The stimulus materials were adapted from Galassi and Galassi (1976) for live presentation. There are 32 stimulus situations forming a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ matrix – male vs. female stimulus person, familiar vs. unfamiliar person, and positive vs. negative situations. In addition to the 32

statements, 16 courtship/friendship statements were composed. The session lasted approximately 1 hr and was videotaped for scoring. The dependent variables were assertive score categories derived from Eisler *et al.* (1974), and they included eye contact, duration of response, latency of response, loudness of speech, fluency of speech, compliance content, content requesting new behavior, and overall assertiveness ratings. Three categories, "Expressing Positive Affect," "Aggression," and "Body Movement," were added. The first was "acting appropriately to praise or reward by a positive response, i.e., thank you, etc." Aggression was "expression of one's personal feelings and opinions but violating another's rights or offending in some way." Body Movement was "changing position, fidgeting, etc." A male and a female judge rated all the materials for the 32 subjects, half exhibitionists, half controls.

For general assertiveness situations, only two of the dependent variables were reliable and significant in ANOVA, number of smiles and duration of eye contact. The controls smiled more at the female in a positive situation than did exhibitionists ($F = 4.39, p < 0.01$). Controls maintained eye contact longer to the male ($F = 5.71, p < 0.05$) and in negative situations ($F = 12.41, p < 0.001$) than did exhibitionists, but there were no other significant differences.

In the courtship/friendship situations, there were again two significant differences, body movements ($F = 4.32, p < 0.05$) and fluency of speech ($F = 4.90, p < 0.05$). The controls moved about more in the presence of the female than the exhibitionists, i.e., were more tense and less assertive, but there were no other significant differences. In contrast, the control subjects' speech was more fluent in positive situations than exhibitionists' speech, but there were no other significant differences. Overall, the results were weak and generally did not support the hypothesis.

A second study relied on intersubject ratings as dependent variables. Four trios of age-matched persons were placed together in pairs and asked to "get to know each other" for a 10-min period which was videotaped. There were an exhibitionist, a control male, and a control female in each trio. Each subject answered the BEM Scale for him/herself and the two other persons. The order for exhibitionist vs. control was counterbalanced. The BEM Scale was extended to include the following items: masculine (feminine) in gestures, masculine (feminine) in appearance, confident, commanding, influential, interesting, and physically attractive.

When *self* ratings were compared by one-way ANOVA, there were no differences between the exhibitionist and control males.

When the *female's* ratings of the two males were compared, there was a significant difference in androgyny score ($F = 6.84, p < 0.05$) which was attributable to a significant difference in femininity ($F = 7.32, p < 0.05$). Masculinity differences were nonsignificant ($F = 1.04, p > 0.05$). The controls were seen as more feminine than exhibitionists. A breakdown of the test scores showed the following items to be significant: the controls were more yielding, reliable, com-

passionate, softspoken, likable, and warm, and defended their own beliefs less than exhibitionists. Interestingly, there were no significant differences in the terms "assertive," "dominant," "masculine," or "feminine." The results supported hypothesis 12 in one way: the exhibitionists were not more masculine than controls but they were less feminine.

Hypothesis 14. Exhibitionists who expose without genital gratification are more likely to be shy and unassertive than exhibitionists who do have genital gratification.

To test hypothesis 14, personality traits of the MMPI and 16 PF were correlated in sample A and the MMPI in sample B with the SHQ items "erection when exposing" and "masturbate when exposing." In sample A, only one correlation exceeded 0.30 (9% of the variance explained): erection when exposed and MMPI Mania $r = -0.30$. No correlation with the 16 PF was significant. In sample B, erection when exposed correlated with MMPI Masculinity-Femininity 0.33 and Psychasthenia 0.36, suggesting that the more often an exhibitionist has erections when exposed, the more "feminine" he is and the more likely he is to be a worrier. "Masturbation when exposed" unfortunately correlated with "?" scale -0.35 and with the Lie scale -0.36 as well as with Masculinity-Femininity 0.52 and Schizophrenia 0.33. The clinical usefulness of these scales in identifying characteristics of expositors with and without genital gratification seems therefore rather limited. Moreover, hypothesis 14 was not supported.

Body Image

Hypothesis 15. Exhibitionists have feelings of inadequacy about their bodies, especially about their penises.

The hypothesis was tested in two ways: (1) by examining the objective data to see if there was an obvious physical reason for feelings of inferiority (e.g., height, weight, and/or penis dimensions, and problems of impotence and premature ejaculation); (2) by examining the reported feelings of subjects about their bodies and comparing their reactions to other sexually anomalous individuals and control subjects.

Twenty exhibitionists and 27 controls were compared on reported weight and height. The t test for height was nonsignificant ($t = 0.72$, n.s.) but there was a significant finding for weight ($t = 2.60$, $p < 0.01$). The average heights were 70.25 inches for exhibitionists and 69.70 for controls, while weight was 167.95 and 150.33 lb, respectively. Since more of these exhibitionists were somewhat older and/or married, results in weight may be attributable to these factors. However, the exhibitionists were on the tall and heavy side but by no means obese. It would seem there was little support for a general dynamic relating these objective body parameters to exhibitionism. Results were similar for penis size.

Seven exhibitionists and nine controls who underwent phallometric testing were compared on a penis size scale as follows: 1–2 inches = 1, 2–4 inches = 2, 4–6 inches = 3, 6–8 inches = 4, and over 8 inches = 5. The *t* test was nonsignificant ($t = 0.27$, $df = 14$). Means and standard deviations were 2.71 and 0.76 for exhibitionists and 2.56 and 0.73, respectively, for controls. The incidence of reported impotence was examined in sample B, and only 6% reported such a problem while 12% were not applicable because of inexperience and 82% reported no such problem.

Ninety-three exhibitionists, 53 controls, and 141 subjects with multiple anomalies from sample A were compared on certain body image items from the CAPER battery in one-way ANOVA. The following questions were asked:

1. Have you ever been ashamed to appear in a bathing suit?
2. Have you ever felt you would like to change your physical appearance in some way?
3. Have you ever felt you would like to be taller?
4. More muscular?
5. Stronger?
6. Heavier?
7. Have a more athletic build?
8. Be more athletic?
9. Do you think that you are reasonably attractive to the opposite sex?
10. Have you ever been ashamed to appear in the nude with persons of your own sex around?
11. Have you ever wished you had a larger penis?
12. Do you think that your penis is smaller than average?
13. Have you ever been afraid that something was wrong with your private parts?
14. Were you ever thought of as a sissy or weakling?
15. Have you ever felt you would like to be more forceful than you are?
16. Have you ever felt that you would like to be better looking?
17. Do you think you are more feminine or more masculine in your appearance?
18. Do you think you are more feminine in your personality or more masculine in your personality?
19. Have you ever felt inferior because of your build or shape for any reason?
20. Was your mother concerned about your private part that you should keep it clean and take care of it?
21. Was father?
22. Do you remember that your mother used to wash it for you with her hand?
23. Did father?

24. Can you remember your mother handling your privates with her hand in a sexual way?

The exhibitionists differed from controls on only six items. If one examined only the exhibitionists and the controls, it could be concluded that there were some feelings of inferiority about the body in exhibitionists. They would like to be more athletic, have a more athletic build, have a larger penis, and be better looking. They more often than controls felt that there was something wrong with their penis and their father was concerned that they take care of it and keep it clean. However, when the other subjects with sexual anomalies are included, they also differed from controls in the same way except for two items: the exhibitionists differed from both the controls and other patients in wanting to have a more athletic build ($F = 4.08, p < 0.05$) and to be more athletic ($F = 7.11, p < 0.01$). Thus if there were feelings of inferiority about the body in the patient sample, they were not specific to exhibitionism. The hypothesis can be considered only partially supported. The hypothesis could be restated: Males with sexually anomalous behavior are more likely than controls to report some feelings of inferiority about their bodies.

Marital Status Data

Hypothesis 16. Exhibitionists have higher than average divorce rates and marital discord.

The clinical files of samples A and B were examined to determine the number of exhibitionists and controls who were divorced or separated. The results appear in Table V. A χ^2 test compared the three groups of divorced/separated vs. other categories combined and omitting single subjects. Results were non-significant for sample A ($\chi^2 = 5.33, df = 2, p < 0.05$) and sample B ($\chi^2 = 3.96, df = 2, p > 0.05$). The six scales of the Marital Relations Questionnaire in CAPER were also compared on nine exhibitionists and eight controls in sample B. These scales were overall marital adjustment, willingness to compromise, marriage satisfaction, affectional compatibility, common interests, and strength of marital bond. There were no significant differences in "marital adjustment" on any scale. The hypothesis, therefore, was not supported.

Hypothesis 17. Marriage is a "prophylactic" against exhibiting. Married exhibitionists expose less than single ones.

Of the subjects in sample A, 33 were single exhibitionists and 45 were currently married. Other subjects were omitted from this analysis. The two groups were compared on all items of the SHQ by F test. Since the married subjects were significantly older than single subjects ($t = 4.78, p < .001$; singles mean 22.27; married mean 29.20), age was covaried as well in a second analysis of

Table V. Comparison of the Marital Status of Exhibitionists and Control Subjects

Marital status	Sample A			Sample B		
	Exhibitionists (%) (N = 96)	Controls (%) (N = 53)	Others (%) (N = 311)	Exhibitionists (%) (N = 42)	Controls (%) (N = 22)	Others (%) (N = 70)
Single	36	87	62	50	64	67
Married	45	7	22	33	23	19
Divorced/ separated	10	2	13	5	9	11
Commonlaw	7	4	1	12	4	3
Widowed	1	0	2	0	0	0

the data. The significant results show that married subjects exposed more, had an erect penis more, and masturbated more often than single subjects. Moreover, there was no significant difference in the recency with which the two groups exposed. Covarying age did not change these results. Married subjects have had more intercourse, cunnilingus, and anal digitation, and are less inclined to desire additional sex partners or greater frequency of intercourse. However, they also paid prostitutes more often than single men and masturbated outdoors more often. Covarying age reduced six items' results to nonsignificance, suggesting that with time and experience some differences would disappear.

The subjects in sample B averaged 3 years older than those in sample A, and, again, married subjects were significantly older than single subjects (married mean 32.14, SD 13.63, $N = 14$; single mean 25.25, SD 6.04, $N = 23$; $F = 4.65$; $p < 0.05$). There were no significant differences in exposing frequency or recency. More married than single men, however, did want the female to enjoy their exposing. This item was nonsignificant when age was covaried. In this sample, there was more sexual involvement with female minors on the part of married subjects and a greater use of sex materials (magazines, etc.) to stimulate them. The married subjects had greater disgust than single subjects for pain associated with sex. In general, the hypothesis was not supported.

DISCUSSION

The results provide more information on what the exhibitionist is *not* than what he *is*. It seems that the subjects used in this study are similar to normals in many respects; both exhibitionists and controls respond most to the mature female's body shape and secondarily to the immature female. Neither respond erotically to males' body shape or to any appreciable extent in their behavior to homosexual outlets. Exhibitionists do not react erotically to their own body. They do not appear to be hypersexual. Surprisingly, exhibitionists do not appear to react differently than normal controls to statements of genital exhibitionism, peeping, intercourse, and courtship. In exposing, the patients do not appear to want intercourse as much as one might expect. On the other hand, they do not appear to be afraid of it, either. Rather, the females' admiration and sexual arousal are more important in exposing, although the desire for sex relations does play a secondary part. If one postulates that the exhibitionist is aroused by both narcissistic stimuli and the normal courtship stimuli, the context in which he exposes may present a situation which arouses both sets of desires. It seems that such arousal is present in normals as well, and it may be just a matter of degree of narcissism that separates the exhibitionist from the normal.

The results make it difficult to maintain that the exhibitionist is afraid of women and/or intercourse. A sizable proportion marry and seemingly have satis-

factory marriages. Their dating and heterosexual experience are within range of typical practices. Possibly they expose, even when intercourse is available in their marriage, because it offers a greater opportunity to satisfy narcissistic needs. A wife can look at and admire the exhibitionist's penis only for so long; mutual stimulation and ultimately intercourse become prominent. By analogy, the exhibitionist may be like an actor on the stage who wants an audience but does not want it to participate in his act.

There is little support for the sadism theory of exhibitionism. Both normals and exhibitionists react erotically to statements of exposing in a sadistic way, but in terms of the actual frequencies this behavior is virtually absent.

Support for the theory that peeping and exposing are linked was obtained; orgasm is associated with peeping in the exhibiting group more than in the other control groups. However, this appears to be the only anomalous behavior consistently linked to exhibiting in our data, and it is a weak relationship. It should be noted that exhibitionists do not differ from controls in terms of frequency of intercourse or number of partners. About 41% of our exhibitionist subjects were married.

One may wonder then why the exhibitionists peep with masturbatory orgasm more than control subjects do. One may also ask why they expose to female children when they are most erotically attracted to mature females' bodies. We know from previous studies and from the present one that normals react erotically to female children and are aroused by peeping. It may be that the exhibitionist and many other multiple deviants have a greater openness to sexual exploratory activity. They are more willing to try something out to see if they like it. Alternatively, one may consider this a lack of impulse control. Exhibitionists are not really different from those with multiple anomalies in general in sexually approaching children. One may therefore consider the connection between exhibiting and an interest in children tenuous. However, this certainly isn't the whole answer. Reports of our research subjects suggest at least two other factors: (1) getting caught and (2) getting the reaction that they want from the victim. Female children and adolescents are less likely to report an incident to the police, so the patient feels safer in such a choice of victim. Peeping is also safer, because one is less likely to attract attention than when exposed. As one research subject said, "You can take your time and go all the way." They may also identify with the "exhibiting" female in the peeping situation. Interestingly in this respect, some male exhibitionists perceive nude females in sex magazines as "exposing" and appear to particularly enjoy that facet of the photos. As far as the child is concerned, she is less likely to know how to react to exposing and will show interest or surprise reactions which may satisfy narcissistic needs. Older females may be unreactive or disdainful.

The exhibitionist is not peculiar in his personality makeup or in feelings of adequacy about his body. If there are peculiarities, they are too subtle and elu-

sive to measure with the usual psychological techniques. One has to wonder why so many different hypotheses have been developed about exhibitionism that find so little support when two fair-sized samples are examined systematically. Perhaps an answer lies in the fact that the majority of sexual anomalies are multiple deviations as we class them now. It is easy to dynamically link sexually anomalous behaviors. Better criteria applied to sexual behavior could lead to improved understanding. Two criteria emerge from the present study. First, the anomalous behavior may be compared to normative data to ascertain if it is a "sexual exploration" or a true erotic preference. Use of normal and sexually anomalous control groups in this report has shown that many hypothesized behaviors are not peculiar to exhibitionists. Second, the use of *orgastic* outlet (see Pratt, 1972, for a model of behavior) clearly distinguishes exhibitionists from others in the act of peeping.

One may also entertain the theory that exhibitionism is basically a non-sexual act. Almost half the individuals studied here usually exposed without apparent genital gratification. This may be the sort of sexual display behavior of human females which has no clear orgastic component to it, e.g., wearing a dress with a plunging neckline, but which attracts attention from the opposite sex.

Finally, the present studies have served to illustrate that exhibiting and peeping are well within the continuum of normal sexual arousal. Stimuli which are considered deviant, e.g., exposing in a public place and shocking a stranger, failed to distinguish exhibitionists and controls, in the laboratory. It seems that the context of public exhibiting and the unwilling female stranger are both features that make the act unusual and antisocial. This again suggests that impulse control may be a major element in exhibitionism. However, the element of narcissism in exhibitionism may be especially important, and it needs further investigation. The same is true of those characteristics of the child which may prove effective in linking and differentiating exhibitionism and pedophilia.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Ms. M. Ongtengco, Ms. L. Handy, and Mr. C. Riegel for their assistance.

REFERENCES

- Abel, G. G., Blanchard, E. B., Barlow, D. H., and Mavissakalian, M. (1975). Identifying specific erotic cues in sexual deviations by audiotaped descriptions. *J. Appl. Behav. Anal.* 8: 244-260.
- Alberti, R., and Emmons, M. L. (1970). *Your Perfect Right: A Guide to Assertive Behavior*, Impact Press, San Luis Obispo, Calif.

- Allen, C. (1949). *Sexual Perversions and Abnormalities*, Oxford University Press, London.
- Arief, A. J., and Rotman, D. B. (1942). One hundred cases of indecent exposure. *J. Nerv. Ment. Dis.* 96: 523-538.
- Bastani, J. B. (1976). Treatment of male genital exhibitionism. *Comp. Psychiat.* 17: 769-774.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* 42: 155-162.
- Christoffel, H. (1936). Exhibitionism and exhibitionists. *Int. J. Psychoanal.* 17: 321-345.
- East, W. N. (1924). Observations on exhibitionism. *Lancet* 2: 370-375.
- Edwards, A. L. (1953). *Edwards Personal Preference Schedule*, Psychological Corp., New York.
- Eisler, R. M., Hersen, M., and Miller, P. M. (1974). Shaping components of assertive behavior with instructions and feedback. *Am. J. Psychiat.* 131: 1344-1347.
- Freund, K. (1978). Analysis of disorders of courtship phases. Unpublished manuscript, Clarke Institute of Psychiatry, Toronto.
- Freund, K., Sedlacek, F., and Knob, K. (1965). A simple transducer for mechanical plethysmography of the male genital. *J. Exp. Anal. Behav.* 8: 169-170.
- Freund, K., McKnight, C. K., Langevin, R., and Cibiri, S. (1972). The female child as a surrogate object. *Arch. Sex. Behav.* 2: 119-133.
- Freund, K., Langevin, R., Zajac, Y., Steiner, B., and Zajac, A. (1974). The transsexual syndrome in homosexual males. *J. Nerv. Ment. Dis.* 158: 145-153.
- Galassi, J. P., Delo, J. S., Galassi, M. D., and Bastani, S. (1974). The college self expression scale: A measure of assertiveness. *Behav. Ther.* 5: 165-171.
- Galassi, M. D., and Galassi, J. P. (1976). The effects of role playing variations on the assessment of assertive behavior. *Behav. Ther.* 7: 343-347.
- Gebhard, P., Gagnon, J., Pomeroy, W., and Christenson, C. (1965). *Sex Offenders*, Harper and Row, New York.
- Glover, E. (1964). Aggression and sadomasochism. In Rosen, I. (ed.), *The Pathology and Treatment of Sexual Deviation*, Oxford University Press, London, pp. 146-162.
- Hartwich, A. (1959). *Aberrations of Sexual Life: After the Psychopathia Sexualis of Dr. R. v. Krafft-Ebing*, Staples Press, London.
- Jackson, D. N. (1974). *PRF-Form E*, Research Psychologist Press, New York.
- Jackson, D. N., and Messick, S. (1970). *Differential Personality Inventory*, Research Psychologist Press, New York.
- Jones, E. (1953). *Sigmund Freud: Life and Work*, Hogarth Press, London.
- Karpman, B. (1957). *The Sexual Offender and His Offences*, Julian Press, New York.
- Kolarsky, A., Madlafousek, J., and Novotna, V. (1978). Stimuli eliciting sexual arousal in males who offend adult women: An experimental study. *Arch. Sex. Behav.* 7: 79-87.
- Langevin, R., and Martin, M. (1975). Can erotic responses be classically conditioned? *Behav. Ther.* 6: 350-355.
- Langevin, R., Stanford, A., and Block, R. (1975). The effect of relaxation instruction on erotic arousal in homosexual and heterosexual males. *Behav. Ther.* 6: 453-458.
- Langevin, R., Paitich, D., Freeman, R., Mann, K., and Handy, L. (1978). Personality characteristics and sexual anomalies in males. *Can. J. Behav. Sci.* 10: 222-238.
- McCawley, A. (1965). Exhibitionism and acting out. *Comp. Psychiat.* 6: 396-409.
- McCreary, C. P. (1975). Personality profiles of persons convicted of indecent exposure. *J. Clin. Psychol.* 31: 260-262.
- McFall, R. M., and Lillesand, D. B. (1971). Behavior rehearsal with modeling and coaching in assertion training. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* 77: 313-323.
- Mohr, J., Turner, R., and Ball, R. (1962). Exhibitionism and pedophilia. *Correct. Psychiat. J. Soc. Ther.* 8: 172-186.
- Mohr, J. W., Turner, R. E., and Jerry, M. B. (1964). *Pedophilia and Exhibitionism*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Paitich, D. (1973). A comprehensive psychological examination and report (CAPER). *Behav. Sci.* 18: 131-136.
- Paitich, D., and Langevin, R. (1976). The Clarke parent-child relations questionnaire: A clinically useful test for adults. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* 44: 428-436.

- Paitich, D., Langevin, R., Freeman, R., Mann, K., and Handy, L. (1977). The Clarke SHQ: A clinical sex history questionnaire for males. *Arch. Sex. Behav.* 6: 421-436.
- Pratt, V. (1972). Biological classification. *Br. J. Psychol. Sci.* 23: 305-327.
- Rathus, S. A. (1973). A 30-item schedule for assessing assertive behavior. *Behav. Ther.* 4: 398-406.
- Rickles, N. (1950). *Exhibitionism*, Lippincott, Philadelphia.
- Rooth, G. (1973). Exhibitionism, sexual violence and pedophilia. *Br. J. Psychiat.* 122: 705-710.
- Smith, R. S. (1976). Voyeurism: A review of the literature. *Arch. Sex. Behav.* 5: 585-608.
- Taylor, F. H. (1947). Observations on some cases of exhibitionism. *J. Ment. Sci.* 93: 631-638.
- Winer, B. J. (1962). *Statistical Principles of Experimental Design*, 3rd ed., McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Witzig, J. S. (1968). The group treatment of male exhibitionists. *Am. J. Psychiat.* 125: 179-185.
- Wolpe, J., and Lazarus, A. A. (1966). *Behavior Therapy Techniques*, Pergamon Press, New York.
- Wong, P. Y., Wood, D. E., and Johnson, T. (1975). Routine radioimmunoassay of plasma testosterone and results for various endocrine disorders. *Clin. Chem.* 21: 206-210.
- Yalom, I. D. (1960). Aggression and forbiddenness in voyeurism. *Arch. Gen. Psychiat.* 3: 305-319.