

Mapping the Boundaries of Courtship Disorder

KURT FREUND, M.D., D.Sc.

and

ROBIN WATSON, B.Sc.

Clarke Institute of Psychiatry

The courtship disorder hypothesis maintains that voyeurism, exhibitionism, toucheurism-frotteurism, and the preferential rape pattern are expressions of the same disorder (courtship disorder). Earlier studies had shown that with the exception of the preferential rape pattern these paraphilias co-occur to a reasonably high degree. The present study (1) demonstrated that the preferential rape pattern co-occurs with the above reasonably well established expressions of courtship disorder to a higher degree than other main paraphilic activity patterns do and (2) supported the conjecture that in addition to an erotic preference for unfamiliarity of target person-or-object (noted by earlier authors), three other paraphilic target-person or object preferences may be connected with courtship disorder, though they are not at all virtually obligatory as is erotic unfamiliarity. These are choosing children and adults alike as target persons of the paraphilic activities, non-gender dysphoric transvestism, and fetishism.

KEY WORDS: courtship disorder, voyeurism, exhibitionism, toucheurism-frotteurism, the preferential rape pattern.

Introduction

The revised third edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-III-R: American Psychiatric Association, 1987) lists the following paraphilias: (1) Exhibitionism, (2) Fetishism, (3) Frotteurism, (4) Pedophilia, (5) Sexual Masochism, (6) Sexual Sadism, (7) Transvestic Fetishism, (8) Voyeurism, and a residual category, "Paraphilia Not Otherwise Specified." The manual further states that "people with a Paraphilia commonly suffer from several varieties: in clinical settings which specialize in the treatment of Paraphilias, people with these disorders have an average of from three to four different Paraphilias" (p. 280). This finding suggests that at

Preparation of this article was supported in part by Ontario Mental Health Foundation Grant 975-87-89 to Dr. Kurt Freund.

All correspondence should be addressed to Kurt Freund, M.D., D.Sc., Clarke Institute of Psychiatry, 250 College Street, Toronto, Canada M5T 1R8.

least some of these paraphilias are connected and raises the question as to what kinds of connections may be expected.

It has been observed that a number of these paraphilias *have a basic feature in common* (Freund, Seeley, Marshall, & Glinfort, 1972, p. 357). This may indicate that they are etiologically related (Freund, Scher, & Hucker, 1983). The main paraphilias in this group are voyeurism, exhibitionism, toucheurism or frotteurism and the preferential rape pattern. The latter is characterized by a clear preference for rape over intercourse with mutual consent, the amount of violence necessary to subdue the target person being near to the minimum (according to the offender's estimates).¹

There are additional paraphilic patterns which are most likely related to the considered group of paraphilias; this includes obscene telephone calling, designated by Hirschfeld (1921), according to Haire (1966, p. 602), as a variant of "verbal exhibitionism," and triolism (also "Candalism" after a Greek historic figure). The latter is a man's erotic preference for viewing (or listening to) his spouse interacting sexually with another man or disrobing where other men might observe her.² It is also likely that an erotic preference for prostitutes as compared to more familiar sexual partners and the inability of some men to sustain an erotic interest in a partner for a reasonable amount of time are also related to the group of paraphilic patterns in question. In the following paragraphs, these patterns will be designated as "related paraphilias."

In an earlier study (Freund & Kolarsky, 1965), a simple reference system was proposed for the description of human erotic or sexual interaction, comprised of four phases: (a) location and first appraisal of a suitable partner; (b) pretactile interaction, consisting mainly of looking, smiling, posturing, and talking to a prospective partner; (c) tactile interaction; and (d) effecting genital union. The paraphilic patterns in question appear to be "rigidified" and "stylized" (Morris, 1957, 1966)

¹Among the many types of rape there appear to be only two which could be classified as expressions of an anomalous erotic preference, namely the preferential rape pattern and sadistic rape-proneness (Freund, 1990). The preferential rape pattern is conjectured as accounting for only a relatively small proportion of all cases of rape-proneness. Rape or attempted rape was divided in the present study into two modalities, one assumed more likely than the other to contain cases of the preferential rape pattern.

²Triolism appears to be a variant of the main patterns in a similar way as a preference for watching humans or animals being maltreated is a variant of sadism proper—the voyeur or rapist not being the patient himself, but a substitute in the person of a strange male.

pathological shortcuts of the richer, more flexible normal succession of sexual interaction. One or another of the four phases of this progression is extremely intensified and distorted such that it may then be seen as a caricature of the normal, whereas the remaining phases are either entirely omitted or are retained only in a vestigial way.

When compared to the normal succession, (a) voyeurism can be seen as an exaggeration and distortion of the first phase of normal sexual interaction—location and first appraisal of a potential erotic partner, with the other phases being only vestigially present or not at all discernable; (b) exhibitionism can be seen analogously as a distortion of the phase of normal pretactile interaction; (c) toucheurism-frotteurism can be seen as a distortion of the phase of normal tactile interaction; (d) the preferential rape pattern can be seen as an erotic preference for genital union (or fellatio) without any preceding erotic interaction.

Students of the behavior of birds have used the term courtship for all pre-copulatory reproductive activities (Morris, 1970), and because the above described putative expressions of a shared disturbance are anomalies in precopulatory ideation and behavior, the name "disorder of phasing of courtship behavior" abbreviated as "courtship disorder" was chosen for this putative "underlying" disturbance. The idea, however, of a disturbance in the realm of courtship behavior was previously put forward by Ellis when he referred to exhibitionism as a "symbolic act based on a perversion of courtship" (1933/1978, p. 190).

The conjectured etiological relatedness of the paraphilic patterns in question may manifest itself in a greater frequency of co-occurrence with each other than with other paraphilic patterns. Instances of such co-occurrences had already been reported long before the courtship disorder hypothesis was conceived. Freud (1905/1925) believed that there is a close connection between voyeurism and exhibitionism, while Taylor (1947) noted a combination of exhibitionism and toucheurism; however, he believed this combination to be rare. Yalom (1960) described cases of co-occurrence of voyeurism, exhibitionism and rape. Grassberger (1964) stated that among subjects arrested for indecent exposure, 12% had committed other sexual offenses, rape in particular. According to Gebhard, Gagnon, Pomeroy and Christenson (1965), one in ten (incarcerated) exhibitionists had also raped, and these authors also reported an association between exhibitionism and toucheurism. Macdonald (1973) reported a case of co-occurrence of exhibitionism with voyeuristic activity, toucheuristic activity, and rape.

Five of the paraphilias listed in DSM-III-R do not demonstrate the feature conjectured as being typical of courtship disorder. These are sadism, masochism, pedophilia, transvestism, and fetishism. Exposing of the penis in a sexual context to persons other than intimate erotic partners has, however, been reported by various authors to co-occur frequently also with two of these conditions, namely pedophilia and transvestism. Rooth (1973) demonstrated that a sizable proportion of his sample of 30 "exhibitionists" exposed to children. Paitich, Langevin, Freeman, Mann and Handy (1977) formally investigated this clinical observation using a factor analysis on various scales derived from a sexual history questionnaire. They concluded that there is "a continuity between exhibitionism and heterosexual pedophilia" (p. 421).

Exposing the penis, however, even if performed in a sexual context, in a situation other than intimate or to a person who has not been an erotic partner before or is not physically mature, does not always indicate exhibitionism, just as choosing a child as an erotic target person does not always signify pedophilia. The DSM-III-R acknowledges this differential diagnostic problem in regard to exhibitionism with the statement that "exposure may occur as a *prelude* to sexual activity with a child" (p. 282). The differential diagnosis between these two types of exposing the penis could be made on the basis of information as to whether this pattern would still occur if favorable circumstances for a reasonably well preserved succession of sexual interaction were present. Such information, however, is rarely available.

Rooth observed further that there were 6 cases of transvestism in his sample of 30 "exhibitionists."³ More recently Lang, Langevin, Checkley, and Pugh (1987) reported that 41% of a group of 34 "persistent" exhibitionists had also engaged in transvestite activity and concluded that this invalidates the courtship disorder hypothesis because this rate of co-occurrence is at least as high as or higher than the co-occurrence of exhibitionism with some of the putative expressions of a courtship disorder.

The findings reported above prompted a re-thinking of the courtship disorder hypothesis which led to a more detailed formulation. There

³Rooth (1973) also documented the co-occurrence of exposing and androphilia (an erotic preference for physically mature males). Although the opportunistic occurrences of exposing the penis in a washroom or park as one androphilic male's initiation of more intimate sexual interaction (mutual masturbation or fellatio, etc.) with another whom he also thinks to be androphilic is well known clinically, it is uncertain whether exhibitionism proper may actually occur in androphilic males.

were two points the original courtship disorder hypothesis had neglected: (1) The hypothesis did not specify that the criterion of courtship disorder, namely a "disturbance in phasing . . .," pertains intrinsically to activity preferences and not to paraphilic preferences in regard to target persons or objects, and (2) The hypothesis also did not specify any conditions in regard to the proportion of each of these expressions occurring solely by themselves vs. the proportion of cases of co-occurrence with another such expression.

The authors quoted above focused on the choice of children as target persons and on transvestism. The likelihood that the choosing of adults and children alike as target persons of paraphilic activities may be connected with courtship disorder has been demonstrated earlier (Freund & Blanchard, 1986). The same appears to apply to transvestism. A further such distortion of the normal range of partners (which appears to be typical of courtship disorder) has been known for a long time, namely an erotic preference for strangers, noted by Mohr, Turner, and Jerry (1964) as being typical of exhibitionism.⁴ This latter distortion appears to be virtually obligatory in cases of courtship disorder, whereas the two other distortions of target-person preference do not appear to be frequent (Freund & Blanchard, 1986).

The view that transvestism can be understood as a distortion of erotic target-person preference is consistent with Blanchard's (1989, p. 323) extension of Hirschfeld's (1948) concept of auto-mono-sexualism. According to Blanchard: "All gender dysphoric males who are not sexually oriented toward men are instead sexually oriented toward the thought or image of themselves as women." There is also enough clinical evidence of such to suggest at least a partial shift of target-object preference in non-gender dysphoric transvestism (with respect to "gender dysphoria," see "Method" below).

The lack of specification with respect to proportions of occurrence of a putative expression of courtship disorder solely by itself vs. its co-occurrence with at least one other paraphilic pattern is also an obvious problem. In earlier studies (Freund & Blanchard, 1986), there was always a relatively high proportion of cases in which there was no information available about accompanying anomalies. The encountered putative expressions of courtship disorder either really occurred by

⁴The preference for unfamiliar target persons seems to express a pathologically exaggerated value of partner-novelty. In the case of triolism, the strangeness is enacted by introducing a strange or at least illegitimate quasi-partner of the paraphilic male's spouse.

themselves, unaccompanied by any other such expression, or this was an artifact caused by insufficient information. For example, some of the putative expressions of a courtship disorder may be connected with another paraphilic *activity* preference, such as sadism. Cases of an apparent combination of voyeurism and sadism (Yalom, 1960) and of exhibitionism and sadism have been reported. The latter has led some authors to believe that exhibitionism is always an expression of sadism (Glover, 1964; Grassberger, 1964; Hackett, 1971; Hartwich, 1959; Karpman, 1964; Rooth, 1973).

The present study investigates the closeness of connections between the "better established" putative expressions of courtship disorder, namely voyeurism, exhibitionism, toucheurism-frotteurism and the "related paraphilic patterns" with (1) other paraphilic activity preferences: non-sadistic rape-proneness (conjectured to contain the preferential rape pattern), sadism, and non-sadistic masochism, (2) with the paraphilic target person or object preferences discussed above: (a) pedophilia, represented by at least one child and no adult chosen as target persons of paraphilic activity, contrasted with (b) choosing both children and adults as target persons, (c) non-transvestite fetishism, and (d) non-gender-dysphoric transvestism contrasted with (e) gender dysphoric transvestism, which was not conjectured to be closely related to courtship disorder.

Method

Subjects

This investigation includes data of 1,572 heterosexual males of age 18 or over seen during a certain period at the sexology department of a psychiatric teaching hospital because of one of the paraphilic patterns listed above (mean age 32.69 years, $SD = 10.54$ years; median educational level: more than 8 but less than 12 grades completed). There were 1,198 sex offenders and 374 individuals who had no charges against them at the time they were seen, but who (more or less) spontaneously requested counselling or "cure" because of an anomalous erotic preference.⁵ Of the 1,421 men whose marital history was known,

⁵A majority of the offenders were referred to us by the Forensic Department of the aforementioned hospital; the remainder was referred mainly by psychiatrists in private practice who were assessing these men for the courts, for lawyers, or who had been approached by these patients because they were concerned with their paraphilic behavior or fantasies.

1,001 (70.4%) were or had been married. Of all the individuals in the investigated group, one hundred were selected at random for assessment of the Hollingshead-Redlich index (1958, pp. 390-391) of occupation. The median of the index for these selected cases was H.R.I. = 6 (semi-skilled workers).

Procedures

The senior author interviewed each of these patients and completed Section One of an "Erotic Preferences Examination Scheme" (hereafter EPES—unpublished) which is routinely used with all patients seen in this department. Section One of the EPES covers all the major paraphilic patterns investigated in the present study. Each pattern is covered in two ways: (1) by an entry for number of target persons and observed paraphilic activities in charges or accusations (which may or may not have ensued in charges), and (2) by an entry indicating whether the patient admitted to having practiced this paraphilic behavior at least once. Each of these paraphilic patterns was treated as a dichotomous variable indicating its presence or absence. It did not make any difference whether the information was obtained from documents on charges or accusations or from the interviewed individual's own admission. There was only one exception to this rule—when charges or accusations indicated target persons not older than 15 years, and the interviewed individual admitted that there were also physically mature target persons. In this case, the offender's admission was not taken into account.

All other sections of the EPES are in multiple-choice format and are completed by the patient himself. The limitation of the study to only heterosexual males was accomplished by excluding all individuals who (a) had a sex offense against a male or who indicated having had sexual interaction with males after age 16, or (b) whose Andro-Gyne Index (hereafter A-G) was positive. This index is the resultant of two scales, one (the "Gyne" scale) indicating erotic attraction to physically mature females, the other (the "Andro" scale) indicating attraction to physically mature males. The A-G index is calculated by subtracting the Gyne scale z -score from the Andro scale z -score.⁶

For the purpose of differentiating between gender dysphoric and

⁶The Gyne scale has 9 items and was validated on 605 males (alpha reliability index: 0.85). The Andro scale has 13 items and was validated on 437 males (alpha reliability index: 0.93).

non-dysphoric cases of transvestism, the following questions were used: (a) *Have you ever felt like a woman?* (1)—only when sexually aroused, (2)—when sexually aroused and at other times as well, (3)—at all times and for at least one year, (4)—never felt like a woman, and (b) *Have you ever felt like a woman?* (1)—only when you were wearing at least one piece of underwear or clothing, (2)—while wearing at least one piece of underwear or clothing and only occasionally at other times as well, (3)—at all times and for at least one year, (4)—never felt like a woman. Transvestites who endorsed options (2) and (3) of either one of the two questions were labelled as gender dysphoric. If an individual could not read, did not know enough English, or if he neglected any of the relevant questions, the necessary information was obtained by interview.

Results

Table 1 is an overview of co-occurrences of the relevant variables and includes, with exception of the last row, only individuals who had expressed two or more of the variables under consideration. This reflects the present reformulation of the courtship disorder hypothesis. Choosing children and physically mature persons (hereafter "adults") alike as target persons of paraphilic activities without specification of these activities is, however, evaluated as one and not two paraphilic patterns.

The upper left segment of Table 1 demonstrates the frequent co-occurrence among the better established putative expressions of courtship disorder (voyeurism, exhibitionism, toucheurism-frotteurism and related paraphilias). The remaining part of the table depicts their co-occurrence with (a) an as yet insufficiently established putative expression of courtship disorder—the *preferential rape pattern*, supposedly occurring within a subgroup of individuals who committed non-sadistic rape; (b) two paraphilic activity preferences not conjectured to be closely related to courtship disorder, namely sadism and non-sadistic masochism; (c) three typical paraphilic target person preferences conjectured as being related to courtship disorder—choosing children as well as adults as target persons of paraphilic activities, non-dysphoric transvestism, and non-transvestite fetishism, and (d) two paraphilic target person preferences not conjectured as being related to courtship disorder—pedophilia and gender dysphoric transvestism.

There were large differences between the considered paraphilic

Table 1

Co-occurrences of Paraphilic Activities (where at least two are present together)

	Voy	Exhib	Touch	Rel Par	R no S	Sad
N	125	258	119	24	72	104
Voy	—	39.9%	42.0%	58.3%	30.6%	5.8%
Exhib	82.4%	—	73.1%	79.2%	52.8%	16.3%
Touch	40.0%	33.7%	—	25.0%	34.7%	12.5%
Rel Par	11.2%	7.4%	5.0%	—	8.3%	2.9%
R no S	17.6%	14.7%	21.0%	20.7%	—	—
Sad	4.8%	6.6%	10.9%	12.5%	—	—
M no S	3.2%	3.9%	3.4%	8.3%	1.4%	—
C no A	7.2%	24.4%	5.0%	4.2%	9.7%	22.1%
C + A	13.6%	15.9%	14.3%	8.3%	18.1%	4.8%
Non-Dys TV	8.8%	6.6%	10.1%	4.2%	5.6%	6.7%
Dys TV	4.0%	2.3%	3.4%	4.2%	2.8%	7.7%
F no TV	5.6%	4.7%	3.4%	4.2%	5.6%	8.7%
Alone	10.1%	25.0%	16.8%	31.4%	62.5%	38.1%

(continued on next page)

patterns in regard to the proportions of individuals who expressed additionally any of the other anomalous patterns considered in the study (Table 1, last row). Three of the considered anomalous patterns which occurred particularly often without being accompanied by any other paraphilia were non-sadistic rape (62.5%), choosing children and not adults as target persons (85.4%), and gender dysphoric transvestism (71.1%).

From the individuals in whom paraphilic patterns were present other than those better established as expressions of courtship disorder, two triads and one dyad of non-overlapping groups were formed. One triad consisted of the following groups of individuals: (a) those who had committed non-sadistic rape, (b) sadists, and (c) non-sadistic masochists; the second triad consisted of (a) non-transvestite fetishists, (b) non-gender-dysphoric transvestites, and (c) gender dysphoric transvestites; and the dyad consisted of (a) individuals who chose children and not adults as target persons of their paraphilic activities, and (b) those who chose children as well as adults.

The groups within each triad, as well as within the dyad, were then compared with regard to frequencies of co-occurrence with other paraphilic patterns. The comparisons were by chi-square and (two-tailed) *t*-tests of proportions with correction for small samples, and the significance level chosen was $p < .01$. Comparisons, involving the "related paraphilias" separately did not yield significant differences and will therefore not be reported.

Table 1—Continued

Co-occurrences of Paraphilic Activities (where at least two are present together)

	M no S	C no A	C + A	Non-Dys TV	Dys TV	F no TV
N	37	99	60	43	55	29
Voy	10.8%	9.1%	28.3%	25.6%	9.1%	24.1%
Exhib	27.0%	63.6%	68.3%	39.5%	10.9%	41.4%
Touch	10.8%	6.1%	28.3%	27.9%	7.3%	13.8%
Rel Par	6.1%	1.0%	3.3%	2.3%	1.8%	3.4%
R no S	0.0%	7.1%	21.7%	9.3%	3.6%	13.8%
Sad	—	23.2%	8.3%	16.3%	14.5%	31.0%
M no S	—	3.0%	1.7%	23.3%	25.5%	20.7%
C no A	8.1%	—	—	2.3%	3.6%	10.3%
C + A	2.7%	—	—	14.0%	5.5%	3.4%
Non-Dys TV	27.0%	1.0%	10.0%	—	—	—
Dys TV	37.8%	2.0%	5.0%	—	—	—
F no TV	16.2%	3.0%	1.7%	—	—	—
Alone	19.6%	85.4%	17.8%	39.4%	71.1%	43.1%

Note: The above illustrates, in percentages, how often an individual expressing one of the paraphilic patterns listed in the column headings also expresses a particular paraphilic pattern listed in the row headings, when each subject expresses at least two of the paraphilic patterns listed. Voy = voyeurism, Exhib = exhibitionism, Touch = toucheurism/frotteurism, Rel Par = other courtship disorder-related paraphilias (i.e., triolism, obscene phone calling), R no S = rape offense(s) without sadistic activity, Sad = sadism, M no S = masochism without sadistic activity, C no A = offense(s) against female child(ren) without any offense against an adult female, C + A = offenses against at least one female child and at least one female adult, Non-Dys TV = non-gender dysphoric heterosexual transvestism, Dys TV = gender dysphoric heterosexual transvestism, F no TV = fetishism without transvestism, Alone = expresses how often that pattern exists alone without any of the others listed.

The statistical analysis of co-occurrences consisted of two different operations. (1) Each of the paraphilic patterns, from which the dyad or either triad were formed, was compared with the other member(s) of the same dyad or triad in regard to co-occurrence of any of the other paraphilic patterns vs. its occurrence by itself only, unaccompanied by any other of the considered paraphilic patterns.

(2) In a second comparison, only those individuals were included in whom there was co-occurrence of at least two of the considered paraphilic patterns. This second operation compared the members of the same dyad or triad with each other with respect to proportions of individuals in whom at least one of the better established putative expressions of courtship disorder was present. Throughout the "Results" section, these two types of comparisons within the two triads and within the dyad will be assigned a "(1)" or "(2)" according

to the above. The results of these comparisons will be presented in tables 2 to 4.

Table 2

Co-occurrences in "R no S," "Sad," and "M no S"

	Chi-Square*	R no S	Sad	M no S
Co-occurrence of any paraphilia				
N	37.67	192 37.5%	168 61.9% _a	46 80.4% _a
Co-occurrence of courtship disorder				
N		72	104	37
Voy	21.10	30.6% _a	5.8% _{b, c}	10.8% _{a, b, c}
Exhib	26.89	52.8% _a	16.3% _{b, c}	27.0% _{a, b, c}
Touch	15.52	34.7% _a	12.5% _{b, c}	10.8% _{a, b, c}
Any	41.03	73.6%	27.9% _{a, c}	27.0% _{a, c}

*All chi-square comparisons are significant at the $p < .001$ level.
 Note: Any pair of percentages which share a subscript "a" or "b" are not different at the $p < .01$ level and any pair of percentages which share the subscript "c" are not different at the $p < .05$ significance level (two-tailed t test of proportions). R no S = non-sadistic rape, Sad = sadism, M no S = masochism without sadism, Voy = voyeurism, Exhib = exhibitionism, Touch = frotteurism/toucheurism, Any = any of the better established expressions of courtship disorder.

(1) A simultaneous comparison of the triad of the groups of *non-sadistic rapists, sadists and non-sadistic masochists* (Table 2) with respect to proportions of co-occurrence with any of the paraphilic patterns considered in the study indicated a highly significant difference. Separate comparisons of the contrasted groups showed two highly significant differences: Sadism and non-sadistic masochism were significantly more often accompanied by any of the other paraphilic patterns considered than non-sadistic rape. This most likely reflects the high proportion of cases of non-sadistic rape as a surrogate activity occurring in males who would prefer consenting intercourse. The difference between sadism and non-sadistic masochism in regard to occurrence alone and co-occurrence with any other of the considered paraphilias was significant only at the $p < .05$ level, which may be evaluated as possible trend of masochism to be more often than sadism accompanied by any of the considered paraphilias.

(2) A simultaneous comparison of the proportion of individuals with any (unspecified) of the *better established expressions of courtship disorder* among the members of the three subject groups indicated a

highly significant difference. Separate comparisons showed that there was a significantly higher proportion of such individuals among the non-sadistic rapists than among the sadists or non-sadistic masochists. The difference in this regard between the non-sadistic masochists and sadists did not reach even the $p < .05$ significance level.

Further comparisons of the three subject groups were performed with respect to voyeurism, exhibitionism, and toucheurism-frotteurism separately. A simultaneous comparison of proportions of individuals who practiced *voyeurism* among the members of the three groups indicated a highly significant difference due to the difference between non-sadistic rape and sadism and a trend in the same direction in the comparison of non-sadistic rape with non-sadistic masochists. The difference between sadism and non-sadistic masochism did not reach even the $p < .05$ significance level.

A comparison of the proportions of the individuals who practiced *exhibitionism* among the members of the three contrasted subject groups indicated a highly significant difference. Separate comparisons showed that the proportion of exhibitionists among the non-sadistic rapists was significantly higher than the proportions of exhibitionists in the sadist group and almost ($p < .02$) significantly higher than the analogous proportion of the non-sadistic masochists group. The difference in this regard between sadist and non-sadistic masochists did not reach even a significance level of $p < .05$.

A simultaneous comparison of the proportions of individuals who practiced *frotteurism-toucheurism* among the three subject groups also indicated a highly significant difference. Separate comparisons of the three subject groups with each other showed that frotteurism-toucheurism occurred significantly more often with non-sadistic rape than with sadism or non-sadistic masochism, the latter difference being only nearly significant ($p < .02$).

(1) A simultaneous comparison of the triad of *non-transvestite fetishists*, *non-gender dysphoric transvestites*, and *gender dysphoric transvestites* (Table 3) with respect to the proportions of their occurrence alone vs. their co-occurrence with any of the paraphilic patterns considered in the study indicated a highly significant difference. Non-transvestite fetishism and non-gender-dysphoric transvestism were significantly more often accompanied by any of the other paraphilic patterns considered in the study than gender dysphoric fetishism. The difference between non-transvestite fetishism and non-gender-

Table 3

Co-occurrences in "Non-Dys TV," "Dys TV," and "F no TV"

	Chi-Square*	Non-dys TV	Dys TV	F no TV
Co-occurrence of any paraphilia				
N		71	194	51
	28.42***	60.6%	28.4% _a	56.9% _a
Co-occurrence of courtship disorder				
N		43	55	29
Voy	5.35	25.6% _a	9.1% _{a, b, c}	24.1% _{b, c}
Exhib	13.50**	39.5% _{a, c}	10.9%	41.4% _{a, c}
Touch	7.85*	27.9% _{a, c}	7.3% _{b, d}	13.8% _{a, b, c, d}
Any	7.93*	48.8% _{a, c}	25.5% _a	51.7% _{a, c}

* = $p < .02$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$.

Note: Any pair of percentages which share a subscript "a" or "b" are not different at the $p < .01$ significance level and any pair of percentages which share the subscript "c" or "d" are not different at the $p < .05$ significance level (two-tailed t test of proportions). Non-dys TV = non-gender dysphoric transvestism, Dys TV = gender dysphoric transvestism, F no TV = fetishism without transvestism, Voy = voyeurism, Exhib = exhibitionism, Touch = frotteurism/toucheurism, Any = any of the better established expressions of courtship disorder.

dysphoric transvestism did not reach even the $p < .05$ level of significance.

(2) A simultaneous comparison of the proportions of individuals in each of the three contrasted groups who practiced *any* (unspecified) of the better established putative expressions of courtship disorder indicated a nearly significant difference ($p < .02$). Comparisons of the three contrasted groups each with each other showed a trend towards higher proportions of individuals with *any* of the better established expressions of courtship disorder among the non-transvestite fetishists and among the non-gender-dysphoric transvestites.

A simultaneous comparison of proportions of individuals who practiced *voyeurism* among the members of the three contrasted groups did not show a difference reaching even the $p < .05$ significance level; however, there was a tendency for voyeurism to co-occur more often with non-gender-dysphoric than with gender-dysphoric transvestism. In regard to voyeurism, there were no further differences among the three contrasted groups reaching even the $p < .05$ significance level.

A simultaneous comparison of the three contrasted groups in regard to proportions of individuals who practiced *exhibitionism* indicated a

significant difference. Separate comparisons of the three groups each with each other showed that the proportions of exhibitionists among the non-transvestite fetishists and non-gender-dysphoric transvestites were significantly larger than among the gender dysphoric transvestites. The difference in this regard between non-transvestite fetishists and non-gender-dysphoric transvestites did not reach even the $p < .05$ significance level.

A simultaneous comparison of the three contrasted groups with respect to *frotteurism-toucheurism* indicated a nearly significant difference ($p < .02$). Comparisons of the three groups each with each other showed that the proportions of individuals who practiced *frotteurism-toucheurism* among the non-gender-dysphoric transvestites was significantly larger than that among the gender dysphoric transvestites. The difference between the non-transvestite fetishists and the two above paraphilic patterns did not even reach the $p < .05$ significance level.

(1) The large difference between choosing children as well as adults as target persons of paraphilic activities vs. choosing children and not adults with respect to proportions of co-occurrence vs. no co-occurrence with any other of the paraphilic patterns considered suggests

Table 4

Co-occurrences in "C no A," and "C + A"

	C no A	C + A
Co-occurrence of any paraphilia		
N	73 14.6%	680 82.2%
Co-occurrence of courtship disorder		
N	99	60
Voy	9.1%	28.3%
Exhib	63.6% _{a, c}	68.3% _{a, c}
Touch	6.1%	28.3%
Any	67.7% _{a, c}	78.3% _{a, c}

Note: Any pair of percentages which share a subscript "a" are not different at the $p < .01$ significance level and any pair of percentages which share the subscript "c" are not different at the $p < .05$ significance level (two-tailed t test of proportions). C no A = offense(s) against children without offense(s) against adults, C + A = offenses against both children and adults, Voy = voyeurism, Exhib = exhibitionism, Touch = *frotteurism-toucheurism*, Any = any of the better established expressions of courtship disorder.

that pedophilia proper as a whole is not closely related to any of the other paraphilias (Table 4).

(2) The proportions of *voyeurs* as well as of *frotteurs-toucheurs*⁷ among those individuals who chose children as well as adults as target persons of paraphilic activities were significantly higher than among those who chose children and no adults as target persons. There were no further significant differences between the two contrasted groups, not even in regard to co-occurrence of “*any*” (unspecified) of the better established putative expressions of courtship disorder. This suggests that the relatively frequent co-occurrence of the non-differentiating pattern of exposing in *both* compared subject groups overshadows the differences between these two groups with respect to voyeurism and toucheurism.

Summary and Discussion

The courtship disorder hypothesis specifies a group of paraphilic activity patterns supposed to have (according to the hypothesis) closer relationships among each other than with other paraphilic patterns. However, our earlier attempts to demonstrate the validity of this conjecture did not separate the two types of necessary comparisons—(a) in regard to closeness of relationships between the paraphilic patterns conjectured to be expressions of a courtship disorder on the one hand and relevant paraphilic patterns not conjectured to be expressions of a courtship disorder on the other hand, and (b) comparisons of the studied paraphilic patterns in regard to proportions of their occurrence by themselves only vs. their co-occurrence with other paraphilic patterns. Furthermore, the original version of the hypothesis did not include any specification of paraphilic target person preferences, although some were already known. The present study corrected these two shortcomings.

This study showed that the bulk of non-sadistic rape cases, of pedophilia proper, and of gender dysphoric transvestism are usually not accompanied by the paraphilic activity patterns. This is in agreement with our conjecture that (1) the bulk of non-sadistic rape cases have causes other than a paraphilia, and (2) those instances of non-sadistic rape which are accompanied by other paraphilic patterns are more often accompanied by one or more of the patterns conjectured to indicate a courtship disorder than by any other paraphilic pattern. The

⁷Both directed not towards children but mainly towards pubescent girls.

analysis also showed that in addition to a preference for unfamiliar target persons, there exist three paraphilic target-person preferences which are related to courtship disorder, though this relationship is much weaker than the connection between courtship disorder and the preference of unfamiliarity of target persons of paraphilic activity.

The validity of the results of the present study is limited by two factors: (a) It is most likely that various types of patients have differential access to our unit. For instance, the majority of men who have repeatedly raped or sadists who have committed a murder are probably in federal prisons and are therefore rarely available to us; (b) the amount of relevant information on the various anomalous activities varies greatly. For the different offender or patient groups the demand characteristics (Orne, 1962) of the situation which brought them to our attention differs widely and with this variation the distortions in communicated history, including their sexual history, may vary. A voyeur, exhibitionist or toucheur can be expected only exceptionally to reveal an instance of attempting or committing rape without this having been previously detected. Similarly, the majority of men charged for rape claim that this happened only because they were drunk, and that their sexual fantasies are exclusively about *normal* sexual interaction. It is unlikely that such an offender would reveal instances of exposing, voyeuristic or toucheuristic activity. For the above reasons, replication of this study under different conditions is necessary. An example of how this might be accomplished is the condition of assured confidentiality under which Abel, Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, Mittelman, and Rouleau (1988) have been working.

A further reason why the results of the present analysis are to be viewed with caution is the large number of statistical comparisons. This may have caused a number of spurious results. We presumed a significance level of $p < .01$ to be sufficient. However, taking into account the relatively large number of comparisons, perhaps a significance level of $p < .001$ would be more reasonable, whereas differences whose significance levels are smaller may be considered trends only. On the other hand, it may be argued that because all the statistical results were uniformly compatible with the tested hypothesis, and because of the large number of individuals in the study, a significance level of $p < .01$ should be sufficient. A reader, however, who wishes to apply the more rigorous standard will still find reasonably strong support for the hypothesized construct.

References

- ABEL, G. G., BECKER, J. V., CUNNINGHAM-RATHNER, J., MITTELMAN, M., & ROULEAU, J. L. (1988). Multiple paraphilic diagnoses among sex offenders. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 16, 153-168.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1987). *Diagnostic and statistical manual for mental disorders* (3rd ed. revised). Washington, DC: Author.
- BLANCHARD, R. (1989). The classification and labelling of nonhomosexual gender dysphorias. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 18, 315-334.
- ELLIS, H. (1978). *Psychology of sex*. New York/London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. (Original work published in 1933).
- FREUD, S. (1925). *Drei abhandlungen zur sexualtheorie [Three essays on the theory of sexuality]*. Leipzig/Wein: Psychoanalytischer Verlag. (Original work published 1905).
- FREUND, K. (1990). Courtship disorders. In W. L. Marshall, D. R. Laws, & G. E. Barbaree (Eds.), *The handbook of sexual assault: Issues, theories and treatment of the offender*. New York: Plenum Publishing, pp. 195-207.
- FREUND, K., & BLANCHARD, R. (1986). The concept of courtship disorder. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 12, 79-92.
- FREUND, K., & KOLARSKY, A. (1965). Grundzuege eines einfachen Bezugssystems fuer die Analyse sexueller Deviationen [Basic features of a reference system for the analysis of sexual deviation]. *Psychiatrie, Neurologie, Medizinische Psychologie*, 17, 221-225.
- FREUND, K., SCHER, H., & HUCKER, S. (1983). The courtship disorders. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 12, 369-379.
- FREUND, K., SEELEY, H., MARSHALL, W. E., & GLINFORT, K. (1972). Sexual offenders needing special assessment and/or therapy. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections*, 14, 345-365.
- GEBHARD, P. H., GAGNON, J. H., POMEROY, W. B., & CHRISTENSON, C. V. (1965). *Sex offenders*. New York: Harper & Row.
- GLOVER, E. (1964). Aggression and sado-masochism. In I. Rosen (Ed.), *The pathology and treatment of sexual deviation* (pp. 146-162). London: Oxford University Press.
- GRASSBERGER, R. (1964). Der exhibitionismus [Exhibitionism]. *Kriminalistik in Osterreich*, 18, 557-562.
- HACKETT, T. P. (1971). The psychotherapy of exhibitionists in a court clinic setting. *Seminars in Psychiatry*, 3, 297-306.
- HAIRE, N. (Ed.) (1966). *Sexual anomalies and perversions: Physical and psychological development and treatment—A summary of the works of the late Professor Magnus Hirschfeld*. London: Encyclopaedic Press. (Original work published 1938).
- HARTWICH, A. (1959). *Aberrations of sexual life—After the Psychopathia Sexualis of Dr. R. v. Krafft-Ebing*. London: Staples Press.
- HIRSCHFELD, M. (1921). *Sexualpathologie*. Bonn: A. Marcus & E. Weber.
- HIRSCHFELD, M. (1948). *Sexual anomalies: The origins, nature, and treatment of sexual disorders*. New York: Emerson Books.
- HOLLINGSHEAD, A. B., & REDLICH, F. C. (1958). *Social class and mental illness: A community study*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- KARPMAN, B. (1964). *The sexual offender and his offenses* (9th ed.). New York: Julian Press.
- LANG, R. A., LANGEVIN, R., CHECKLEY, K. L., & PUGH, G. (1987). Genital exhibitionism: Courtship disorder or narcissism? *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 19, 216-232.

- MACDONALD, J. M. (1973). *Indecent exposure*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- MOHR, J. W., TURNER, R. E., & JERRY, M. B. (1964). *Pedophilia and exhibitionism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- MORRIS, D. (1957). "Typical intensity" and its relationship to the problem of ritualization. In D. Morris (Ed.), *Patterns of reproductive behaviour: Collected papers by Desmond Morris* (pp. 187-197). London: Jonathan Cape, 1970.
- MORRIS, D. (1966). The rigidification of behaviour. In D. Morris (Ed.), *Patterns of reproductive behaviour: Collected papers by Desmond Morris* (pp. 512-519). London: Jonathan Cape, 1970.
- MORRIS, D. (1970). *Patterns of reproductive behaviour: Collected papers by Desmond Morris*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- ORNE, M. (1962). On the social psychology of the psychological experiment: With particular reference to demand characteristics and their implications. *American Psychologist*, 17, 776-783.
- PAITICH, D., LANGEVIN, R., FREEMAN, R., MANN, K., & HANDY, L. (1977). The Clarke SHQ: A clinical sex history questionnaire for males. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 6, 421-436.
- ROOTH, G. (1973). Exhibitionism, sexual violence and paedophilia. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 122, 705-710.
- TAYLOR, F. H. (1947). Observations on some cases of exhibitionism. *Journal of Mental Science*, 93, 631-638.
- YALOM, I. D. (1960). Aggression and forbiddenness in voyeurism. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 3, 305-319.

