WORKING PAPERS ON PORNOGRAPHY AND PROSTITUTION

Report # 15

A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF SEXUALLY EXPLICIT VIDEOS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

by
T.S. Palys

Canada

Department of Justice

WORKING PAPERS ON
PORNOGRAPHY AND PROSTITUTION

A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF
SEXUALLY EXPLICIT VIDEOS
IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

T.S. Palys, Ph.D.
Department of Criminology
Simon Fraser University

June, 1984

Research Report no. 15

CANADA

Department of Justice

WORKING PAPERS ON
PORNOGRAPHY AND PROSTITUTION

CONTENT ANALYSIS OF
SEXUALLY EXPLICIT MATERIALS
IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

T.S. Palys, Ph.D.
Department of Criminology
Simon Fraser University

June, 1984

Research Report no. 15

CANADA

The Research Team

Gloria Baker-Palys, M.A.
Department of Psychology
University of British Columbia

Susan Bluck, B.A.
Department of Psychology
University of British Columbia

Deborah Landy, R.P.N.
Regional Psychiatric Centre
Correctional Services of Canada
Abbotsford, British Columbia

John Olver, B.A.
Department of Criminology
Simon Fraser University

T. S. Palys, Ph.D.
Department of Criminology
Simon Fraser University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction

The video rental/sales industry is a particularly interesting one when considering policy development in the area of pornography and obscenity. It is, first of all, a very new industry. Most outlets in the Vancouver area have been in existence for less than four years. Yet, within that space of time, the industry has burgeoned into a major component of the recreation market. The sheer importance of video as a social phenomenon flags it for empirical scrutiny.

The video industry is further unique in so far as it is less regulated than, for example, the movie theatre industry. While any movies which will be shown in public theatres require preliminary screening by the Film Censor or Classification board of the appropriate province, this is not the case for video cassettes.[1] Consequently, the video industry is a much more "free" market in determining the nature/content of its offerings, as are the consumers of video who, it would appear, are offered a broader range of material for their visual consumption. Nonetheless, it is also true that video outlets must live within the constraints of existing licensing

---

[1] The reason for this is that video cassettes are considered materials for home (ie., private) consumption, and hence lie outside Censor Board mandates. On the other hand, it should be noted that there is some evidence this situation may change somewhat. The Province of Ontario, for example, has proposed legislation which would bring home videos under Film Censor Board control. It is the only province, to date, to have made any concrete moves in this direction.

regulations, obscenity legislation, and a host of other legislative statutes (eg., laws governing unauthorized copying of video materials), as well as with the views of the public who are their clients, and, occasionally, their critics.

Unfortunately, the video industry to date has been the site of much fire, but little light, particularly that element of the video industry which deals with 'pornographic' materials. Thanks to movies like the National Film Board's Not a Love Story , a never ending stream of newspaper articles (eg., Morgan, 1984; Proulx, 1984), the publicity surrounding the occasional trial of a video outlet on obscenity charges, (eg., "B.C. Video firm fined for renting 'snuff' film", 1984), and a strong anti-pornography lobby, many of us "know" the kind of content that exists in video 'pornography': it is graphically sexual, depicts violence against women, encourages rape myths and other anti-female attitudes, and is a repository for "actors" and "models" who lack the necessary skills and attributes to make it in more legitimate media. Further, our beliefs of what is "out there" manifest themselves in action. Members of the video industry in Vancouver who specialize in sexual material have been the object of demonstrations and anti-publicity, firebombings, and licensing regulation designed to curtail the availability of "pornography".

Yet it is often those things we feel we "know" best that deserve the closest scrutiny. The primary purpose of the present research was to shed some preliminary light on the video

2

rental/sales industry, particularly that portion of the industry dealing in "pornographic" materials.

It should be noted that there are many different ways that "pornography" can be defined. One can focus on legal definitions of pornography, ie., the way the term has been defined in the Criminal Code, and the way it has been interpreted in the courts, (eg., see Boyd, 1984; Price, 1979). A second alternative is to assess pornography's social definition, ie., the way people in general use the term. Wilson (1973) has provided such an overview of pornography's etymology. More recently, Palys, Olver & Banks (1984) have addressed the transition in the social definition of pornography that has occured over the last decade, since the entry of feminist theory into the pornography debate. Finally, a third definition might be considered a pragmatic one, ie., what do you get when you go out and look for some? That was the focal question that the current study attempted to address in systematic fashion.

In the course of doing this research, we also attempted to gather some preliminary information about the video industry itself by holding both formal and informal discussions with various individuals within the criminal justice system and the video industry. A special focus was on the proprietors of the video outlets: What were their attitudes toward pornography? Why had they chosen to deal or not deal in "pornographic" videos? What could they tell us of their clientele? What were their feelings regarding current or proposed legislation in the

"obscenity" realm?

In sum, two studies were completed for the purposes of this report. The primary one involved a systematic content analysis of sexually explicit video cassettes available in Vancouver, British Columbia, and environs. The secondary research focus was on the video industry itself, and involved observation of procedures within video outlets, as well as formal and informal interviews with the clerks and proprietors of the video outlets we sampled. The current report is structured around the first study. Chapter Two details the procedures that were followed in gathering and coding material, while Chapter Three presents the results of this analysis. A summary of these results and a discussion of some of their implications are included in Chapters Four and Five. Rather than present the results of the second study separately, the decision was made to use this material wherever it would provide useful contextual information or help to explain the results of the content study.

II. Procedures

1. The Research Site

The research was performed in the Greater Vancouver area of British Columbia. This area has earned the dubious distinction of being the "pornography capital of Canada" (eg., see Barlow, 1983; Morgan, 1984) due to the broad availability of 'pornographic' materials in the area, and Vancouver's apparent centrality as a point for video materials coming from the United States for subsequent distribution to the rest of Canada. In this sense, the Vancouver area seemed an ideal location in which to assess the content of video pornography.

Video outlets, by and large, tend to serve a very local, neighbourhood clientele. Most of the video proprietors with whom we spoke indicated that the majority of their customers lived within a 1-2 mile radius of the outlet. Consequently, the decision was made to select several different types of communities or areas in order to represent a cross-section of outlets and markets. Four areas were chosen: (1) The 'West End' area of Vancouver -- this is a high density, urban area, where the residents are primarily younger, single, and more transient, but where considerable heterogeneity exists regarding wealth, education, and social position; (2) A portion of Vancouver's

5

'West Side' area, specifically Kitsilano and Kerrisdale -- these communities comprise more residential, urban neighbourhoods, where either gentrification or continued opulence have occured, and where residents tend to be fairly well-educated, middle or upper-middle class, and largely in professional occupations; (3) The northern portion of Vancouver's 'East Side' -- this area represented a second residential urban neighbourhood, and is ethnically heterogeneous and primarily "blue-collar" or "working" class; and (4) a large suburban area that actually comprised four separate and diverse communities -Port Moody, Coquitlam, Port Coquitlam, and New Westminster -- which, collectively, contained all the heterogeneity of the three Vancouver areas.

2. The Video Outlets

Within each area, an exhaustive inventory was first made of all outlets which rented video movie cassettes.[1] The list was initiated from entries from the yellow pages of the relevant telephone directories, and then supplemented and updated by driving around the areas in question. Sampling then proceeded within each area depending on the number of outlets in that

----
[1] It should be noted that the VHS format cassettes dominate the Vancouver market. Many outlets we sampled had their offerings in both VHS and Beta format, while many were VHS-only, but none of the outlets in our sample areas was Beta-only. Consequently, the decision was made to focus on video cassettes in VHS format in this study, since it offered the opportunities for the most comprehensive assessment.

area. Areas 1,2, and 3 were found to have 5,9 and 11 outlets, respectively, and all of these outlets were included in the study. The suburban area (Area 4) was found to have a total of 32 outlets, of which 18 were ultimately included in the study. The 43 sample outlets included independent operations, as well as those which were part of local, provincial, national, and international chains. The sample also included both "sex specialist" outlets (ie., where the vast majority of business in the outlet came from making available and renting sexually explicit tapes), and "general purpose" outlets (ie., where the outlet's main business came from renting the regular visual fare one might otherwise see at the local movie theatre).

3. Video Tapes Sampled

The principal objective in this research was to ascertain the content of 'pornographic' video materials available to residents of Vancouver and environs. Consequently, the study was conducted in a manner consistent with those objectives, ie., by approaching outlets in the role of consumer, and renting videos which met the criteria (described below) for inclusion in the study. As this implies, video outlets were never made aware that their video stock was being scrutinized for research purposes, since it was felt that notifying proprietors of this fact ahead of time might influence the type of materials made available. Rather, movies were rented (typically two at a time), coded, and

returned to the outlet within a one day rental period.

Two categories of tapes were sampled for this research. The first are known as "adult" or "restricted" or "X-rated" tapes. While these tapes have sexual content, their "single-X" rating is typically due to the fact that no 'real' sexual activity is depicted. One typically sees full or partial nudity, ambiguous sexual activity, or, quasi-explicit sexual activities where camera angles and distances are carefully chosen so as to clearly convey the nature of the activity taking place, but to not actually depict it in graphic terms. In other words, in "X-rated", "adult" material, even at its most graphic, one could not tell for certain whether the act was 'really' occuring or merely being simulated. These movies are produced and distributed both by major studios as well as those who produce/distribute 'pornography', and are 'legal', at least with respect to The Copyright Act, in every sense of the term: they are virtually all 'original' copies distributed by the production studios, they cross the border legally, and they are available in virtually every video outlet into which you might walk. In "general purpose" outlets, these videos may be sectioned apart from other offerings and placed under an 'adult' heading, and video proprietors frequently place videos with more suggestive titles or cover photos on higher shelves out of the sight and reach of smaller children. These precautions are typically not seen in "sex specialist" outlets, however, since one must normally be over the age of majority to even enter the

outlet.

The second type of videos are known as "Triple-X" videos, and acquire their status by depicting sexual activity in very graphic fashion. Camera angles and distances are carefully chosen in such a way as to make it obvious that the activity is <u>not</u> being simulated. Single copies of triple-X originals are apparently brought across the Canada/U.S. border illegally, and multiple 'pirate' copies are then made for further distribution in the Greater Vancouver area and the rest of the country.[2] The originals themselves are illegal, since they were smuggled across the border, but the copies made from them are not, because they have been generated in Canada, where no copyright law protects them from such unauthorized copying.[3] In some instances, local 'piraters' are reputed to pay voluntary royalties to the American distributors; in other instances, they do not.

Unlike the "X-rated" videos, "Triple-X" videos were not available in all outlets we contacted. Certainly all "sex

----

[2]Although there are apparently numerous individuals who 'pirate' and distribute triple-X material, most of these are small-time operators who make relatively few copies and sell out of the trunks of their automobiles. Only two major distribution sources exist in this area, to my knowledge. Both distribute locally, as well as by mail to the rest of the country, although one seems to dominate the local market, while the other seems more involved in the mail-order trade.

[3]As a point of clarification, it should be noted that the 'legality' referred to in this section refers solely to the legal status of these tapes vis-a-vis copyright legislation. The status of both adult and triple-X videos with respect to other statutes, eg., obscenity provisions, is another matter.

specialist" outlets stocked them, since these are their raison d'etre. These outlets would have signs on their exteriors indicating that only those over the age of majority could enter, and would post messages in the outlet, on the video cassettes, and even on the video image itself to the effect that the video contained uncut sexually explicit images, and that those who might be offended should not watch. An outlet of this type might have up to 1000 different triple-X titles available, and the general content of any given video could be ascertained by asking the clerk or checking with any of several 'trade' magazines typically available in the outlet.

"General purpose" outlets who carried triple-X stock (and most of them did), on the other hand, were more variable in their representation of this material. All tended to separate them from the rest of their stock in some fashion. Some displayed them openly, in the sense that the stack of videos, with titles showing, might be kept in a glass case or on a side counter.* More frequently, however, proprietors of these "general purpose" outlets would keep these titles "under the counter" or in some other unseen location, such that (a) one had to know that such material exists; and (b) one must actually ask to see the list of titles. Customers to whom neither (a) nor (b) applied might deal at length with the outlet, and never even realize that movies of this sort were available. Finally,

---

*Note that the original video boxes were never on display in these outlets, since the triple-X videos were always 'pirate' copies, and hence no boxes were available.

several outlets also added the additional requirement that only "members" could rent triple-X material.[5]

Our intent was to sample 'adult' and 'triple-X' movies. Upon initially approaching an outlet, some time would first be devoted to looking around the outlet and talking to the clerk on duty in order to ascertain the existence and location of sexually-oriented video stock. Once located, two titles would be randomly chosen (using a list of random numbers) and rented. If the outlet dealt in both adult and triple-X titles, then one would be chosen randomly from each set. If the outlet dealt in only one type of material, then both selections would come from that list. This process continued until 125 movies were chosen and coded. Some outlets were sampled only once, while others were sampled on several occasions.

A further 25 movies were chosen on a more intentional basis, and were motivated by efforts to discover the 'worst' pornography available. This was guided by several strategies. First, a list was obtained of videos that had been charged in Ontario and British Columbia with violations under the obscenity section (159) of the Criminal Code, and we monitored all outlets for the appearance of these titles. Second, a number of trade magazines were perused for information concerning titles which

----

[5] Memberships were free of charge at some outlets, but might cost up to $25.00 at others. In either case, one had to produce identification -- usually a driver's license and major credit card -- which conveyed to the proprietor (1) one's age; (2) one's address; and (3) that one had an established credit rating.

included violence and/or sexual violence, and all outlets were again monitored for these titles. Third, on the assumption that the titles themselves might convey information to those with an appetite for more coercive sexual fare, we paid particular attention to videos whose titles contained words like "nasty", "wicked", "captive", and "prisoner", or which implied young participants. And finally, two of the coders also frequented several video establishments that were considered most likely to rent questionable material. This was done on the assumption that demonstrating oneself to be a regular consumer of explicit material might open doors to other material not available to most renters.[6]

In sum, a total of 150 videos were sampled for this research. Fifty-eight of these were classified "adult", while 92 were labelled "triple-X". And while most were merely randomly sampled, efforts were also made to secure the most damaging evidence we could find concerning the content of video pornography.[7]

----

[6]In his summation prior to sentencing a suburban video outlet for possession and distribution of obscene material, the judge alluded to the testimony of the undercover operator who rented the movies against which charges had been laid. It revealed that the operator first established himself as a consumer of explicit material, and then requested and was given access to two 'snuff' movies. We, on the other hand, never saw such material. While this may be a commentary on the inadequacy of our procedures, rather than on the lack of availability of such material, it nonetheless suggests that such material is at least not immediately available to the average Vancouver area resident who rents sexually explicit video material.

[7]It should be noted here that the safest assumption to be made about video pornography (or materials in any medium) is that anyone can obtain anything they want if they have the right

4. The Coders

A total of five coders were involved in this research. Three of the coders were female while two were male, and all had at least one university degree in a social science discipline. All of the coders are movie and/or video consumers, although only one of the coders could be considered a 'film buff'. One of the coders had seen several triple-X films before, another had seen several erotic and pornographic films in the context of a university course she had taken, while the remaining three (including the author) had never seen a triple-X film prior to their involvement in this research.

5. The Coding Scheme

The coding scheme was developed by the author for this study, since no other adequate coding scheme was found.[8] Our objective was to code videos in terms of the presence of sex,

---

[7] (cont'd) contacts, have enough money, and are willing to go through enough trouble to get it. The current study focussed on the nature of material to which the average Vancouver area resident, living in the "pornography capital" of Canada, would be exposed if he/she wanted to obtain sexually-oriented video material. Within that objective, I feel confident that our data provide a representative picture of what exists.

[8] On the other hand, it should be noted that the U.S. National Coalition on Television Violence coding scheme included several useful features that were incorporated into or adapted for the present study.

aggression, and sexual aggression and, to the extent that these were present, to code both the content and nature of these depictions. Only an overview of the coding scheme will be presented here; the detailed manual and coding sheets may be seen in Appendix A.

Coders began by completing a "cover sheet" for each movie, in which a variety of information about the video was coded (eg., year of production, type of outlet from which it was rented, whether the tape appeared to be an 'original' or 'pirate' copy, whether any editorial information was included with the video, and so forth). Once completed, coders then turned to the movie itself.

The basic unit of analysis for each video was "the scene", which was defined as "an uninterrupted sequence of activity in a given physical context".[9] Upon viewing a scene, the coder first decided whether sex, aggression and/or sexual aggression were depicted. If they were not, the scene was merely tabulated, but not coded. If one or more of the three were present, however, then the coder would complete one "scene coding sheet" for each dimension that was present, since we had separate, but parallel, coding sheets for each type of activity.

For coded scenes, coders first rated sexual activity (in the context of both sexual activity per se, and in sexual aggression) in terms of its sexual explicitness, and aggressive
_____
[9]The reader is encouraged to read the coding manual in Appendix A for a more elaborate description of how scenes were partitioned.

activity (in the context of both aggression per se and sexual aggression) in terms of the severity of aggression depicted. These scales were 7-point scales, but were constructed in such a way that scale points 1,3 and 5 were critical in defining the explicitness and/or severity of the activity depicted. These scale points were typically tied to particular kinds of activity, although coders were given 'discretionary' points to raise or lower the rating for a given scene, depending on the nature of the depiction. For example, a graphic sexual depiction involving intercourse would normally be scored "5", but might be reduced to "4" if the depiction was very brief or ambiguously depicted (eg., in partial darkness, or in a steamy shower), or increased to "6" if the depiction was of extended duration, involved multiple activities, and/or was significantly more graphic than was normally the case (eg., extreme close-ups of penetration). These discretionary points were to be infrequently utilized, however, and coders in fact used them as instructed.

The next matter of interest concerned the participants in the interaction. Interactions were divided into two phases: (1) the initiation of the interaction; and (2) the interaction in progress. In both cases, interactions were first coded as to whether they were (1)mutual, ie., all participants were willingly involved in egalitarian roles; (2) unidirectional or imbalanced, ie., one or more persons tended to be the dominant figure(s) in directing the course of the sexual interaction or, in the case of aggression and/or sexual aggression, there were

clear perpetrator/victim roles; (3) solo, ie., participant(s) were peforming the action by themselves (eg., taking a shower alone, masturbating, committing suicide); or (4) unclear, ie., one could not tell the nature of the dynamic due to the brevity of the depiction, the fact that the scene was already in progress, and so forth.

If the scene was mutually initiated, or a 'solo' scene, then all participants were aggregated and merely coded as to their number, sex (ie., gender), and apparent age (ie., adult versus adolescent versus child).[10] If the scene involved an imbalance, however, then characteristics (ie., age, sex, number) of those in the dominant/submissive or perpetrator/victim roles were coded separately. Coding in this way allowed us to ascertain the prevalence of "kiddie porn" in our sample tapes, (at least as perceived by the coders), as well as to determine the frequency with which particular age and/or sex groupings were involved in different roles.

---

[10]The reader should appreciate that making judgements about age can be a difficult task. Nonetheless, a person was considered a 'child' if they were prepubescent, and an 'adolescent' if they were post-pubescent but, in the judgement of the coder, would probably have difficulty getting a drink in a bar without producing identification. All others were considered 'adults'. Any difficulties which arose were in the distinction between 'adolescent' and 'adult'. While none of the coders perceived any instances in which adolescents were portrayed as adults, there were numerous instances in which individuals played adolescent roles (eg., members of a high school class), although they were clearly in their late 20's or early 30's. Ultimately, we came to make our judgements of whether someone was an 'adolescent' on the basis of (a) whether the person was portrayed as an adolescent; and (b) whether the portrayal was at all believable.

Scenes involving sexual activity were also coded for affect, or emotional tone. Our interest in including this judgement stemmed from the feminist distinction between "erotica" and "pornography", where erotica is seen as a loving, affectionate, egalitarian relationship, while pornography is defined as involving power imbalance and coercion (eg., see Steinhem, 1980; Wachtel, 1979). During pretesting of the coding scheme, it became clear that many sexual depictions existed which fit in neither category. These were depictions in which two (or more) consenting individuals came together and engaged in sex and, while the depiction was not at all coercive, nor was it particularly loving and affectionate. Given that we were interested in the frequency of occurence of truly erotic scenes (in the feminist sense), we consequently asked coders to make judgements about each sexual depiction in terms of whether it was (1) 'erotic', ie., a mutually enjoyable, affectionate, egalitarian relationship that seemed more than 'just sex'; (2) 'positive', ie., the relationship was not erotic as defined above, but nonetheless depicted consenting individuals all apparently enjoying the activity; (3) 'neutral or mechanical', ie., a 'robotic' depiction of sexual activity; (4) 'negative', ie., one or more of the participants seemed uncomfortable with the setting or activity; or (5) 'very negative', ie., where all participants seemed uncomfortable about the proceedings. The latter two categories were rarely found, since the existence of negativity frequently took coders into the realm of sexual

aggression rather than sex per se; the primary intent of this rating was to differentiate sexual depictions in the first three categories.

The actual content of the activity was then coded. Up to 15 categories were available within each domain of activity, and coders were instructed to check off all those that appeared in the given scene. One or more "other" categories were also supplied.

Finally, upon completion of the video, coders were asked to complete an "overall review sheet" which summarized the number of scenes in the video, the number involving the different types of activity (or their absence), as well as to supply a number of impressionistic judgements concerning the treatment of various types of themes in the movie. It was fully anticipated that these thematic judgements would likely be less reliable than other elements of the coding scheme, but the questions were deemed important to ask (eg., Were there negative consequences to sexual activity? Were aggressors depicted positively? Did this film promote rape myths?). Once again, the reader is referred to Appendix A for the complete coding sheets and a detailed description of coding definitions and procedures.

Given that the coding scheme was developed expressly for this study, considerable effort was expended in its development. We went through several iterations of the author preparing a preliminary manual, the coders reading it, all of us getting together to pretest it on an actual movie, finding its

inadequacies, rewriting the manual, further pretesting, and so on. But ultimately the day arrived when we felt comfortable with the coding scheme and our ability to use it. One adult and one triple-X movie were then rented for the purpose of assessing reliability, and each coder coded the movies independently. An initial weak point in the coding scheme involved the division of scenes, but when "scene" was held constant, exact inter-rater agreements[11] on all coded indices were 76.9 per cent overall. The worst inter-rater agreement was found on the coding of the initiation of the interaction, where mean agreement across coders was only 47.8 per cent. The identification of scene content codes was most reliably coded, with a mean of 91 per cent agreement across coders.

The initiation code was deemed substandard, and hence that aspect of the data has been ignored in this report. Once removed, average exact inter-rater agreements on all coded indices then surpass 80 per cent, which is in accord with

----

[11]The word 'exact' should be emphasized here, since reliability was assessed not by correlating sets of figures between coders, but by comparing codes on the various indices and requiring that any pair of coders had to have exactly the same information before it would be considered an 'agreement'. Correlations pay heed to numerical proximity (eq., if two coders give ratings of 4 and 5, this is treated as less problematic than if the coders were to give ratings of 1 and 5), while the 'exact' criterion used here did not (ie., both of the examples cited here would have been considered 'errors'). While one's reliability figures often don't 'look' as good in the latter case, ie., it is a more stringent criterion, it is a better indication of the interchageability of coders. That we were able to surpass traditional psychometric criteria despite this more stringent criterion of agreement, reflects positively on both the coding scheme and the coders.

traditional psychometric criteria.[12] Nonetheless, following a final discussion of these results with coders, and further elaboration of our definitions (particularly regarding the division of scenes and the affect codes), a final version of the manual was prepared (see Appendix A) which governed all subsequent coding. Coding then commenced at three independent sites.

---

[12] With the initiation codes removed, the 'worst' inter-rater reliability is then associated with the 'sexual affect' ratings, which had a mean overall agreement across coders of 60.5 per cent. While only tolerable, this rating was considered too important to delete, and hence appears in this report. It implies, however, that results involving this index should be treated with some caution.

III. Results

A total of 150 movies were coded, of which 58 were classified 'adult' and 92 were classified 'triple-X'. These tapes were rented from 43 different video outlets in the Vancouver area, and are listed in Appendix B. Of the 126 movies for which we were able to acquire information concerning year of production, 101 (or 80%) were released in the 5 year period 1979 to 1983 inclusive, with 1982 being the modal year of release (29, or 23% of the titles). The remaining movies spanned the period 1961 to 1984, with the distribution being quite negatively skewed.

As Table 1 reveals, the movies we viewed had been produced primarily in the United States (111 movies, or 89% of the 125 movies for which we were able to acquire production location information), and this was true for both types of movies. There is undoubtedly some bias in this figure, however, since the documentation we were able to obtain provided more extensive production information on American movies. Nonetheless, even if none of the 25 movies for which this information was unavailable were American (a dubious possibility), one is still left with 74% American content (111 out of 150 movies). Within the United States, it is clear from Table 1 that most of the movies

Table 1

Production Location Information
for Sampled Videos

Country (State)	Triple-X	Adult	Totals
United States	75	36	111
(California)	(61)	(14)	(75)
(New York)	(09)	(01)	(10)
(Nevada)	(02)	(00)	(02)
(Illinois)	(00)	(01)	(01)
(Ohio)	(01)	(00)	(01)
(State Not Known)	(02)	(20)	(22)
Canada (all Quebec) .	0	5	5
Italy	0	3	3
France	0	3	3
England	0	2	2
Germany	1	0	1
Country Not Known . .	16	9	25
TOTALS	92	58	150

originated, more specifically, from California.[1]

---

[1] One explanation for the large number of Californian movies in
our sample is that British Columbia is closer to California
than, say, New York, and hence more likely to receive movies
from the west coast of the United States. On the other hand, we
were able to acquire documentation concerning 32 American
producer/distributors of 'pornographic' films, and 25 of these
were located in California. Thus, it would appear that the
triple-X film production market, like the 'legitimate' film
market, is centered largely in that state.

The 150 movies contained a grand total of 4,203 separate scenes, of which 2,101 scenes (or 50%) were not coded (ie., because they did not include sex, aggression, or sexual aggression), while the remaining 2,102 scenes were coded for sex, aggression and/or sexual aggression. The most prevalent category was sex, which appeared in 1,626 scenes (38.7% of all scenes, or 77.4% of all coded scenes). Next most frequent was aggression, which appeared in 393 scenes (9.4% of all scenes, or 18.7% of coded scenes). Sexual aggression was least frequently portrayed, although it nonetheless appeared in 266 scenes (6.3% of all scenes, or 12.7% of all coded scenes). On the other hand, there were some substantial differences between the adult and triple-X movies on these indicators.

First of all, the adult movies were found to contain significantly more scenes per movie than the triple-X films (means were 33.5 and 23.9 scenes per movie, respectively; $F=34.51$, $df=1,149$, $p<.001$), as well as more non-coded scenes per movie (means were 20.4 and 10.9 non-coded scenes per movie, respectively; $F=25.03$, $df=1,149$, $p<.001$). To the extent that the number of scenes and the number of non-coded scenes are indicators of time spent on plot or plot development, these figures would seem to indicate that the adult films expended more effort in this direction than did triple-X films. It is interesting to note, however, that when we examined our data for changes over time (ie., by correlating these indicators with year of production), we found that the number of scenes and

23

number of non-coded scenes showed a tendency to decrease over time in the adult category ($r=-.38$, $p<.004$; $r=-.43$, $p<.001$, respectively), while they showed a tendency to be increasing over time in the triple-X category ($r=+.18$, $p=.13$; $r=+.26$, $p<.03$, respectively). We will now turn to a more detailed examination of the depictions which involved sex, aggression, or sexual aggression.

1. Sex

A scene was deemed to involve sex, and hence to be coded using the coding sheet for that dimension, if (any of) the focal participant(s) in the scene (a) was/were wearing any less clothing than one might wear on a public beach; or (b) was/were involved in any lascivious action, even if fully clothed, that would be noticeable and deemed inappropriate in a dimly lit, but public bar. Furthermore, it must have been the case that the participant(s) were portrayed as having entered the scene willingly (rather than being coerced or deceived), and there must not have been any overt aggression displayed as part of the sexual activity (eg., as in sado-masochism). The presence of either of these latter two criteria were deemed to make the scene one of "sexual aggression" rather than of sex per se.

A. Frequency

As may be seen in Table 2, there was little difference between adult and triple-X videos in the absolute number of scenes which we coded as involving sex (F<1.0), although the triple-X movies were found to comprise a significantly greater proportion of sex scenes relative to the total number of scenes in the videos ($\underline{F}=23.8$, $\underline{df}=1,149$, $\underline{p}<.001$) as well as to the total number of codeable scenes ($\underline{F}=26.0$, $\underline{df}=1,149$, $\underline{p}<.001$). Further, the temporal analyses revealed that adult movies were showing a tendency toward larger numbers of sex scenes ($\underline{r}=+.23$, $\underline{p}=.08$), and a significantly larger proportion of sex scenes relative to codeable scenes and scenes in total ($\underline{r}=+.52$, $\underline{p}<.001$; $\underline{r}=+.44$, $\underline{p}<.001$, respectively). In contrast, triple-X movies were remaining relatively constant over time in the absolute number of sex scenes per video and in the proportion of codeable scenes devoted to sex, but showed evidence of a significant decrease over time in the proportion of scenes that were devoted to sex in the movie as a whole ($\underline{r}=-.34$, $\underline{p}<.005$).

B. Explicitness

One should note that 'sex', as defined in our coding scheme, was a relatively broad category, however, and included everything from partial nudity to very graphic sexual activity. Thus, while it may be true that the absolute number of 'sex'

Table 2

Comparisons Between Adult and Triple-X Videos
on Four Indicators of Sexual Depictions

Sexual Indicator	Mean for Adult Videos	Mean for XXX Videos
Number of scenes in video coded for sexual content.	10.9	10.8
Sex scenes as a percentage of all scenes in the video.	36.8%	55.9%
Sex scenes as a percentage of codeable scenes only.	64.2%	82.4%
Rated Explicitness of sex scenes.	1.83	4.17

scenes in adult and triple-X movies were quite similar, it was

also true that the sexual depictions in the triple-X movies

were, overall, significantly more explicit[2] (mean explicitness

ratings for the adult and triple-X films were 1.83 and 4.17,

[2]As was noted earlier, the explicitness ratings were made on a
7-point scale, where points 1, 3, and 5 were most elaborately
defined, and all other scale points were defined in terms of
those three. Generally, a "1" was coded whenever full or partial
nudity was depicted but other sexual activity was absent. A code
of "3" designated both (1) nudity accompanied by 'foreplay'
types of activities (eg., fondling, caressing, kissing of
non-genital areas); and (2) more intimate sexual activities
where one could not tell for certain whether the activity was
real or simulated. Finally, a code of "5" designated graphic
sexual activity in which it was clear that the sexual activity
being depicted was not being simulated. The reader is encouraged
to refer to Appendix A for a more detailed delineation of the
criteria governing the coding of sexual explicitness.

respectively, on the 7-point scale; $F=338.0$, $df=1,149$, $p<.001$). The temporal analyses revealed that the average sex scene in triple-X films has remained fairly consistent in its level of explicitness over time (undoubtedly a ceiling effect), while the adult films have revealed a non-significant tendency to increase in sexual explicitness over the years ($r=+.22$, $p=.11$).

C. Affect

A central interest in this research was not only the frequency and explicitness of sexual activity, but also the nature of these sexual depictions, ie., in terms of affect, type of activity, and the characteristics of participants and their roles. Coders were asked to make judgements about the affect or emotional tone of each sexual depiction on a 5-point scale which ranged from 'erotic' ("1") to very negative ("5"), and the distribution of judgements for each video type (expressed as a percentage of sexual scenes within that video type) are shown in Table 3. More than half the scenes in both types of movies were coded as "positive" (ie., where all participants were depicted as enjoying the activity), while more than a third of the sexual depictions in both the adult and triple-X videos were coded as "neutral" or "mechanical" in affect (ie., neither negative nor positive; a somewhat 'robotic' depiction of persons going through the actions with negligible emotional tone; also for those depictions which were too brief or ambiguous in

27

Table 3

Distribution of Judgements of
Perceived Affect of Sexual Depictions
in Adult and Triple-X Videos

Coded Value	Perceived Affect	Adult Videos	Triple-X Videos
1	'Erotic'	2.6%	3.2%
2	Positive	52.0%	56.1%
3	Neutral/Mechanical	35.1%	35.0%
4	Negative	8.8%	5.3%
5	Very Negative	1.4%	0.4%

establishing tone). Only a minute proportion of depictions (2.6% of adult sex scenes and 3.2% of triple-X sex scenes) were coded as truly 'erotic' in the feminist sense, ie., not only enjoyable for participants, but also a loving, affectionate, egalitarian depiction. Overall, it was found that sexual depictions in triple-X films were significantly more positive than those in the adult films (F=6.60, df=1,149, p<.01), but the small magnitude of difference and the marginal reliability of the affect ratings do not allow much confidence to be placed in the validity of this difference.

D. Content

The differences between adult and triple-X videos continued when we looked at the type of interactions depicted, as well as their participants. Within adult videos, we found that 48.5% of the sexual depictions involved mutual, egalitarian depictions, while 72% of the triple-X depictions did so. On the other hand, adult videos had a greater frequency of "solo" activities depicted (eg., sexual entertainment depictions such as stripteases, or nude displays, masturbation) relative to the triple-X videos (34.5% versus 12.9%). The two types of videos were approximately equal in the proportion of sex scenes where participants were in more directive or submissive roles (15.4% of adult sex scenes, 13.7% of triple-X sex scenes), and where the nature of the relationship was unclear (1.6% and 1.3% of sex scenes in adult and triple-X videos, respectively).

Table 4 shows the relative frequency of depiction of various activities for the two types of videos as a percentage of all sex scenes within that video type. There were no differences between the two types of movies on the frequency of occurence of voyeurism/exhibitionism, or of activities subsumed under "other, deviant" (eg., necrophilia). It was also the case that the three most frequently depicted activities - fondling of breasts or genitals, genital intercourse, and oral-genital contact - were the same in both types of videos, although their rank order differed slightly, and the triple-X videos depicted

Table 4

Frequency of Different Sexual Depictions
As A Percentage of All Sex Scenes
Within Adult and Triple-X Videos

Content Category	Adult	Triple-X
Oral-Genital Contact	17.3%	71.7%
Full Nudity	66.9%	69.6%
Partial Nudity	63.4%	66.8%
Fondling Breasts/Genitals	41.0%	63.3%
Genital-Genital Intercourse	27.0%	51.9%
Masturbation	9.9%	27.2%
Voyeurism/Exhibitionism	14.8%	15.7%
Anal Intercourse	0.6%	10.4%
'Hardware' Involved	1.1%	8.5%
'Bought' Sex	1.1%	4.8%
Sexual Entertainment	13.5%	3.7%
Incest	0.2%	3.4%
Still Photo Shown	5.1%	3.0%
Other, Deviant	1.3%	2.0%
Other (eg., Hand-genital manipulation, ejaculation)	5.1%	26.2%

these activities much more frequently. Finally, while depictions of still photos involving sexual activity and sexual entertainment (eg., striptease, nude beauty contests) were

depicted significantly more frequently in the adult videos (chi-squares were 3.99 and 51.99, both $df=1$, $p<.05$ and $p<.0001$, respectively), the triple-X videos depicted all of the following activities with significantly greater frequency: masturbation (chi-square = 70.02, $df=1$, $p<.0001$), fondling of breasts or genitals (chi-square = 76.31, $df=1$, $p<.0001$), oral-genital contact (chi-square = 454.22, $df=1$, $p<.0001$), 'bought' sex (chi-square = 15.06, $df=1$, $p<.0001$), genital intercourse (chi-square = 96.43, $df=1$, $p<.0001$), anal intercourse (chi-square = 58.11, $df=1$, $p<.0001$), the use of 'hardware' (eg., dildos) in sexual depictions (chi-square = 38.32, $df=1$, $p<.0001$), incest (chi-square = 17.84, $df=1$, $p<.0001$), and 'other' (usually hand-genital manipulation, ejaculation, and arousal through 'talking dirty') activities (chi-square = 114.71, $df=1$, $p<.0001$).

E. Participants

As one can imagine, a listing of all the various permutations and combinations of numbers of male and female participants of varying ages could run into a very extensive listing. Consequently, efforts will be made here to summarize this information as much as possible by highlighting particular trends in the data. Information will be presented separately first for mutual and solo, and then imbalanced sexual depictions.

31

First, it should be noted that none of the adult or triple-X movies we coded portrayed pre-pubescent children of either sex in mutual or solo sexual activities. On the other hand, 1% of adult sex scenes and 2% of triple-X sex scenes involved 'apparent' adolescent males (ie., they were portrayed as adolescents and, according to the coder, looked young enough to be questioned about their age in a bar), while 4% of sex scenes in adult videos and 6% of triple-X sex scenes involved 'apparent' adolescent females. By and large, however, most sex scenes involved individuals who portrayed adults and appeared adult (male adults were involved in 47% of adult video sex scenes and 66% of triple-X sex scenes, while female adults appeared in 91% of sex scenes in adult videos 76% of sex scenes in triple-X videos). Thus, while both types of movies tended to favour the presence of females, this favouritism was particularly pronounced in the adult videos.

Solo depictions were featured in 34.5% of sex scenes in the adult videos, and in 12.9% of sex scenes in triple-X videos, although the adult videos were more likely to be portraying 'sexual entertainment' depictions (eg., striptease, nude display) in the context of these scenes, while the triple-X videos were more likely to be portraying nudity accompanied by masturbation. Within both types of videos, however, there was a clear favouritism toward females being the subject of these depictions. Within adult movies, 94.0% of the 151 solo sex scenes we observed featured adult females, while 4.7% featured

adult males, and a further 1.3% involved females who were apparently adolescents. This rank ordering was also true within triple-X videos, where 77.1% of the 109 solo scenes we observed involved adult females, 15.6% involved adult males, and 7.3% involved adolescent females.

A much more complex pattern of permutations and combinations emerged with respect to mutual sexual activity. Certainly the modal depiction in both adult and triple-X movies was the heterosexual, adult couple (41.5% and 47.5% of all mutual sex depictions, respectively). Beyond this, however, the two types of videos diverged somewhat. Within adult videos, heterosexual adult couples were followed in frequency by depictions involving multiple adult females and groups of adult males and females, and the other combinations listed in Table 5. Only five of the mutual sex scenes from the adult videos were not subsumed by any of the combinations listed above. These included 3 scenes involving multiple female adolescents, 1 scene involving a male adolescent with multiple female adolescents, and one scene involving a male adolescent and a female adult.

Within triple-X videos, however, heterosexual adult couple depictions were followed in decreasing order of frequency by those involving single adult males with multiple adult females, multiple adult females, and the other combinations listed in Table 5. It should be noted that 21 out of the 732 mutual triple-X sex depictions we coded were not subsumed under one of the combinations shown in Table 5. These involved various

33

Table 5

Different Participant Combinations
as a Percentage of All Mutual Sex Scenes in
Adult and Triple-X Videos

Participant Combination	Adult	XXX
Heterosexual Adult Couple	41.5%	47.5%
Single Adult Male(M), Multiple Adult Females(F)	13.2%	15.2%
Multiple Adult Females	23.0%	11.9%
Multiple M and F	14.3%	10.9%
Single Adult F, Multiple Adult M	4.5%	5.2%
Multiple Adult Males	0.0%	3.8%
Single Adult M, Single Adolescent F	0.0%	3.7%
Other (see text)	3.5%	2.9%

combinations of all-female or mixed-sex groups in which some or all of the persons were portrayed as adolescents.

As was noted earlier, 15.4% of all sex scenes from adult videos, and 13.7% of such scenes from triple-X videos were considered "imbalanced". This implied that at least one of the participants was portraying a more dominant or directive role than at least one other participant. And while the degree of domination in a given scene occasionally caused us to reflect yet again on the location of the boundary between dominance in a

sexual interaction and dominance that was more legitimately construed as sexual aggression (ie., involving coercion), the 90 imbalanced sex scenes in the adult videos and 138 imbalanced triple-X sex scenes referred to in this section were those which were still perceived by the coders as lying within the domain of sexual activity and, by and large, should be envisaged as scenes in which one or more persons played a more assertive role in directing the course of the interaction.

None of the adult or triple-X videos depicted prepubescent children of either sex in imbalanced sexual depictions. Apparently adolescent individuals were portrayed in dominant roles in 3 scenes of the adult videos (2 involved dominant adolescent females, while 1 involved dominant adolescent males), and in 2 scenes of the triple-X videos (both featured dominant adolescent females). On the other hand, adolescents were portrayed in the more submissive role in 2 adult video scenes (one male, one female), and in 11 triple-X video scenes (10 involved female adolescents, 1 involved a male adolescent). All other scenes involved adults.

Within adult videos, males were the individuals who tended to play the more dominant role (58.6% of these scenes depicted dominant males, 35.6% depicted dominant females, and 5.7% depicted both males and females jointly dominating others). Within triple-X videos, on the other hand, males and females were depicted in the dominant role about equally as often (43.4% of these scenes depicted males dominant, 44.9% depicted females

dominant, and 11.8% featured both sexes jointly dominating others). When the focus was turned to the more submissive individuals in the interaction, however, it was females who typically played this role in both adult and triple-X videos, although the differentiation was more marked in the adult videos. Males were submissive in 22.5% of the imbalanced scenes in adult videos compared to female submissiveness in 71.9% of these scenes, while males and females occupied the submissive role in 37.8% and 57.5% of the imbalanced scenes in triple-X videos. Males and females were jointly dominated by others in 5.6% of the adult imbalanced video scenes and 4.7% of the triple-X imbalanced video scenes.

2. Aggression

A scene was said to involve aggression if one or more persons intentionally imposed or attempted to impose hurt, abuse, or force upon one or more other persons, and where this action was not intricately tied to the occurence of sexual activity. In other words, aggression was perceived as an interpersonal activity that would typically involve at least one perpetrator and at least one victim. On the other hand, we also acknowledged that perpetrator and victim might be one and the same person (ie., self-directed aggression, such as suicide), and that aggression might be portrayed as a mutual process rather than as a unidirectional one (eg., where an argument or

36

fight spontaneously erupts, or where two individuals or groups are each looking for an argument or fight). Yet the definition also implies what aggression was not. The accidental imposition of hurt, for example, was not considered "aggression", nor did we code aggression directed toward inanimate objects, unless it was done to emphasize threat in the context of interpersonal aggression. Furthermore, aggressive activity which was intricately tied to sexual activity (eq., spanking someone during sexual activity; aggressive arousal turning into sexual arousal; sado-masochism; rape) was not coded as aggression per se, but rather treated separately as sexual aggression (see below). Finally, "aggressive activity" included content which ranged from verbal abuse or threat to physical force, and where the force could range from restraint to murder.

A. Frequency and Severity

While sexual activity as a dominant theme was more characteristic of the triple-X videos, aggression was the province of the adult videos, as may be seen in Table 6. Adult videos were found to have a significantly greater absolute number of scenes involving aggression (F=17.07, df=1,149, p<.0001), and a significantly greater poportion of scenes involving aggression relative to the total number of scenes in the movie (F=5.59, df=1,149, p<.02), and relative to the total number of coded scenes (F=21.51, df=1,149, p<.001). In addition

to having more aggression, it was also the case that the aggressive depictions in the adult videos were significantly more severe than those in the triple-X videos ($F=4.39$, $df=1,149$, $p<.04$).[3]

When these indicators were correlated with year of production, we found no indication that the severity of aggressive depictions had changed significantly over time. Further, triple-X videos were remaining relatively constant in the frequency of aggressive depictions and in the proportion of scenes devoted to aggression. The adult videos, on the other hand, showed evidence of a significant decrease in the number of aggressive scenes per movie over time ($r=-.30$, $p=.02$) and in the percentage of codeable scenes devoted to aggression ($r=-.49$, $p<.001$), but a non-significant decrease in the proportion of scenes in the movie as a whole that were devoted to aggression ($r=-.19$, $p=.17$).

---

[3] Aggression severity was coded similar to sexual explicitness in the sense that 7-point scales were utilized where the 1, 3, and 5 points were most elaborately defined, and where all other points were defined in terms of those criterion points. A "1" involved activity which was clearly aggressive, but involved no serious injury, was fairly transient in both execution and effect, and was not particularly violent or distressing. A code of "3" was utilized when the aggressive activity was longer in duration, more serious in form and effect, and was clearly in the realm of "assault" or "intimidation". Although weapons might be visible, they would not have been utilized. Finally, a code of "5" implied aggression which, if it were realized, would involve the probable hospitalization or death of the victim. The reader is encouraged to read the coding manual in Appendix A for a more detailed elaboration of the aggression severity coding criteria.

Table 6

A Comparison Between Adult and Triple-X Videos
on Four Indicators of Aggression

Aggression Indicator	Mean for Adult Videos	Mean for XXX Videos
Number of Scenes Involving Aggression	4.5	1.6
Aggression Scenes as a Percentage of All Scenes	11.0%	6.5%
Aggression Scenes as a Percentage of Coded Scenes	23.6%	9.2%
Rated Severity of Depictions	2.3	1.9

When attention was focussed on the nature of the aggressive depictions, we found some similarities and differences between adult and triple-X videos. Both types of videos tended to treat aggression as an imbalanced process, ie., where there were clear perpetrator and victim roles (74.6% of the aggressive scenes in the adult videos and 79.1% of these scenes in triple-X videos depicted aggression in this way). A smaller number of scenes were depicted as involving mutual aggression (21.6% of adult and 18.6% of triple-X aggressive depictions), and even fewer depicted self-directed aggression (1.5% of adult and 0.8% of triple-X aggressive depictions).

B. Content

As may be seen in Table 7, the two types of videos were fairly equal in their depictions of verbal aggression, pushing or shoving, confinement, the use of weapons for threat, and brawls. On the other hand, the adult videos contained a significantly greater number of scenes which depicted striking with a fist or kicking (chi-square = 4.23, $p<.05$), severe beatings or fights (chi-square = 5.13, $p<.05$), torture or dismemberment (chi-square = 5.34, $p<.02$), attempted murder or successful murder (chi-square = 3.73, $p<.05$), and in the actual utilization of weapons in aggressive encounters (chi-square = 8.27, $p<.005$).

C. Participants

Finally, our attention turned to the participants in aggressive interactions. In the sexual domain, the modal interaction was a mutual one, and the modal participants were the heterosexual adult couple. In contrast, within the aggressive domain, the modal interaction was a unidirectional/imbalanced one, with a clear differentiation of perpetrator and victim roles. It was also the case that the modal interaction was male versus male, although this was primarily the case in imbalanced depictions. In the less frequent instances of mutual aggression, it was the male and

Table 7

Frequency of Different Aggression Depictions
as a Percentage of all Aggression Scenes
Within Adult and Triple-X Videos

Content Category	Adult	Triple-X
Verbal aggression, threat	63.6%	62.8%
Pushing, Shoving	36.0%	37.2%
Strike With Fist, Kick	34.8%	24.0%
Weapon Utilized	32.2%	17.8%
Weapon Used for Threat	26.5%	21.7%
Attempted/Actual Murder	24.6%	15.5%
Confinement, Kidnapping	17.8%	11.6%
Severe Beating, Fight	12.5%	4.7%
Torture/Dismemberment	8.0%	1.6%
Brawl	4.9%	3.1%

female adult who appeared most frequently as adversaries.

Self-directed aggression was extremely infrequent. Of the 264 scenes in the adult videos which depicted aggression, only 3 involved self-inflicted aggression; two of these involved adult males, while one involved an adult female. A total of 129 triple-X scenes depicted aggression. In only one of these scenes was the aggression self-directed; the participant was an adult female.

Mutual aggression was depicted in 56 different scenes in the adult videos we observed, and in 22 different scenes in the triple-X videos. Among both types of videos, the participants in these interactions were most frequently an adult male and female; this was the case in 25.0% of the aggressive depictions in adult videos, and in 36.4% of the triple-X video scenes involving mutual aggression. Following this, one saw (in decreasing order of frequency) the involvement of multiple males (in 21.4% of adult and 27.3% of triple-X depictions of mutual aggression), groups of multiple males and females (19.6% of adult video and 9.1% of triple-X depictions), multiple females (12.5% and 9.1% of adult and triple-X depictions, respectively), and a variety of isolated other combinations. Most of the mutual aggression we observed was verbal, although male-female aggression included an occasional slap across the face while male-male aggression frequently involved fights.

As was noted previously, aggression was mostly unidirectional, with a clear distinction between perpetrator and victim roles. Single adult males were the most frequent perpetrators in both the adult and triple-X videos (in 44.7% of adult video and 38.4% of triple-X video unidirectional aggressive depictions), as well as the most frequent victims (in 42.5% and 45.2% of the adult and triple-X depictions, respectively). Single adult females were next most frequent in these roles. Adult videos portrayed females as perpetrators in 24.4% of the unidirectional imbalanced depictions, and as

victims 31.5% of the time. For triple-X videos, these figures were 35.6% and 28.8%, respectively. Following this, in decreasing order of frequency, one saw mixed-sex adult groups, multiple adult males, multiple adult females, and then adolescents of both sexes in both roles in both types of videos.

3. Sexual Aggression

In order to be coded for content involving "sexual aggression", a scene had to intricately tie these two domains (sex and aggression) together, ie., sexual arousal had to be achieved in part through aggressive/coercive means, and/or aggressive activity had to occur with and be tied to a sexual context.

A. Frequency

As was the case with aggression, sexual aggression was also the province of the adult videos. In all comparisons (see Table 8), adult films were found to have more sexually aggressive content, although the strength of the effect depends on which indicator one chooses. Adult movies were found to have a significantly greater absolute number of depictions of sexual aggression per movie than did triple-X videos (F=11.4, df=1,149, p<.001). On the other hand, the difference between the two types of videos only approached statistical significance when one

Table 8

A Comparison Between Adult and Triple-X Videos
on Three Indicators of Sexual Aggression

Indicator of Sexual Aggression	Mean for Adult Videos	Mean for Triple-X
Number of scenes involving Sexual Aggression	2.6	1.2
Sexual Aggression Scenes as a Percentage of All Scenes	6.6%	6.4%
Sexual Aggression Scenes as a percentage of Coded Scenes Only	15.4%	11.7%

---

compared the relative proportion of codeable scenes per movie which involved sexually aggressive depictions ($F=3.39$, $df=1,149$, $p=.06$), and was clearly non-significant when one compared the proportion of scenes involving sexual aggression relative to the total number of scenes in the movie ($F<1.0$, $df=1,149$, $p=$n.s.).

While the results above revealed that, overall, less sexual aggression was found in triple-X videos than in the adult ones, the temporal analyses also indicated that this gap seems to have been widening over time. When we correlated year of production with the three indicators of sexually aggressive content, we found that, in triple-X videos, the number of sexually aggressive scenes, the proportion of sexually aggressive scenes relative to the number of codeable scenes, and the proportion of

scenes involving sexual aggression relative to the total number of scenes in the movie, had all decreased significantly (r's were -.29, -.28, and -.29, respectively; all p's <.02). This was not the case within the adult videos, however, where the amount of decrease in sexually aggressive content was non-significant on all three indicators.

B. Content

The frequency of different types of sexually aggressive activity for the two types of videos, expressed as a proportion of sexually aggressive scenes within that video type, may be seen in Table 9. (Recall that the adult videos included 155 scenes that involved sexual aggression, while there were 111 scenes of this type in the triple-X videos). The rank ordering of frequency of the different acts was quite similar in the two types of movies, although there were occasional differences in absolute frequency. The most frequent activity depicted involved the use of verbal abuse, humiliation and/or threat for stimulation. This was observed significantly more frequently in the adult videos than in the triple-X videos (chi-square = 8.22, df=1, p<.005), although it was quite pervasive in both groups. Sexual activity involving bondage or confinement were next most frequently observed in both types of videos, followed by the practice of being rough in otherwise normal sexual activity; the inclusion of spanking, hitting, slapping or pulling hair in

Table 9

Frequency of Different Sexually Aggressive
Depictions as a Percentage of All Sexually
Aggressive Scenes Within Adult and Triple-X Videos

Content Category	Adult	Triple-X
Verbal Anger, Humiliation	77.4%	60.4%
Bondage, Confinement	45.8%	37.8%
Being Rough in Otherwise Normal Activity	25.2%	33.3%
Slap/Hit/Spank/Pull Hair	23.2%	33.3%
Rape	21.9%	30.6%
Sexual Harassment	18.1%	17.1%
Coercion With Weapons	16.8%	10.8%
Mud Wrestling, etc.	6.5%	0.0%
Sado-Masochism	3.9%	13.5%
Sexual Mutilation	3.2%	2.7%

sexual activity; and rape. In none of these latter four activities did the two types of videos differ significantly in the relative frequency of their occurence within sexually aggressive depictions. There were significant differences on two lower frequency activities, however: triple-X videos showed sado-masochistic activity significantly more frequently than did the adult videos (chi-square = 7.00, $df=1$, $p<.01$), while the adult videos more frequently depicted activities such as mud

wrestling (chi-square = 5.76, $df=1$, $p<.03$).

When we turned our attention to the nature of these sexually aggressive depictions, we found that this domain shared more similarities with our aggression data than the sexual data. In particular, sexual aggression tended to be depicted more frequently as a unidirectional act involving clear perpetrator and victim or dominant and submissive roles, than as a mutual act (87.7% and 79.7% of the adult and triple-X video depictions of sexual aggression, respectively, were coded as 'unidirectional'). Nonetheless, 7.1% of the adult video and 19.8% of the triple-X depictions involved mutual sexual aggression. Finally, 2.6% of the adult depictions involved self-administered sexual aggression, while none of the triple-X depictions did so.

C. Participants

Within "mutual" sexual aggression scenes, the adult videos most frequently depicted multiple females as participants (in 5 of 15 scenes), followed in frequency by a single male and female adult (4 scenes) and groups of multiple male and female adults (3 scenes). No adolescents or children of either sex were involved. Within the triple-X videos, the majority of scenes (9 out of 15) involved a male and female adult, while 2 scenes were devoted to each of (a) multiple female adults; (b) multiple male and female adults; and (c) a male adult and a female adolescent.

47

The unidirectional scenes painted a clear picture of men as perpetrators and females as victims of sexual aggression. Within the adult videos, 79 (or 58.5%) of the depictions featured single males as perpetrators, while a further 15 (or 11.1%) featured multiple males. The corresponding figures within triple-X videos were 42 (or 43.8%) and 15 (15.5%). On the victim side, adult videos portrayed single and multiple females in victim roles in 99 and 7 (or 73.3% and 5.2%) of the scenes, while the same figures for triple-X videos were 66 and 5 scenes (or 69.5% and 5.3% of the depictions). Other combinations were substantially less evident. Occasionally roles were reversed. Adult videos portrayed females as the aggressors in 31 (or 23.0%) of the scenes, and males as victims in 17 (or 12.6%) of the scenes. In triple-X videos, the corresponding figures were 23 (or 24.0%) and 16 (or 16.8%). Most other scenes portrayed mixed-sex groups of adults in both perpetrator and victim roles. The notable exception is that 8 scenes in the adult videos, and 5 scenes in the triple-X videos, portrayed female adolescents in victim roles. No children were involved in any of the sexually aggressive scenes.

4. Some General Themes

The analysis above presented a scene by scene analysis of the 150 videos we coded. But several other issues, more thematic in nature and hence not conducive to scene by scene coding,

needed to be addressed. When coders completed each movie, they were asked to express their judgements regarding a number of different themes. We must admit the questionable reliability of these impressionistic judgements, but feel they may help to focus discussion and highlight a number of issues which pervade this area of research.

With respect to sexual activity, coders were first asked to indicate whether the video they had just seen had portrayed any negative consequences to participants as a function of their involvement in sexual activity. Such situations do, after all, sometimes occur in everyday life: people feel guilty, they have unwanted pregnancies, they contract sexually transmitted diseases, they come to regret their involvements, and so forth. In fact, the coders noted that negative consequences did occur in 47 (or 31.3%) of the movies, usually in the way of imposing new difficulties or complexities in the participant's life as a function of a new interpersonal involvement. There was a significant association between movie type and the answer to this question, with the triple-X movies being significantly less likely to portray such negative consequences (chi-square = 5.23, $df=1$, $p=.02$).

In the aggression domain, two questions were included. The first asked whether the video had depicted aggressive perpetrators in positive fashion, eg., as a hero or heroine, or as an otherwise 'good' person. For the 103 videos for which the question was relevant and which the coder answered a clear yes

or no, the answer was 'yes' on 62 occasions (ie., approximately 60% of time). The second question asked whether aggressive perpetrators ever received negative consequences for their actions, eg., were charges laid against them, or did they receive some form of 'just desserts'? On the 100 occasions on which this question was relevant and answered unambiguously, the answer was 'no' 73 times.

Finally, in the domain of sexual aggression, coders were asked whether they felt the video they watched had in some way reaffirmed or encouraged 'rape myths', eg., the idea that even though a woman says 'no' to a prospective sexual involvement, she really means 'yes'; or that once a male imposes himself upon a woman, she will ultimately come to enjoy the experience; or that women who get raped in some sense 'deserved' that experience. The coders answered 'yes' on 36 occasions (for 16, or 28% of the adult videos, and for 20, or 22%, of the triple-X videos). Although the proportion of 'yes' judgements was greater among adult videos, there were no significant differences between the adult and triple-X videos in the frequency of such perceived endorsement.*

----

*It should be noted that the 'relevance' of this question to the coded video was not purely a function of the presence of sexual aggression, or of rape depictions in particular. There were several instances where none of these depictions had occured, but, because of the nature of the sexual depictions involved, the coders expressed the view that rape myths were in some sense reaffirmed.

IV. Summary

The primary objective of this research project was to systematically assess the content of sexually explicit videos with respect to the prevalence and nature of depictions involving sex, aggression, and sexual aggression. While the focus was in large part intended to be on the 'pornographic' video industry and the content/nature of its sexual depictions, the distinction was made between this "under the counter" triple-X material and the more socially acceptable adult material that sits openly on the shelves awaiting your consumption.

In comparing the two types of videos, one finding was not particularly surprising, ie., that triple-X videos had a significantly greater proportion of sexual content, and significantly more graphic/explicit sexual content, than the adult videos. This is, after all, the primary criterion upon which the single-X/triple-X distinction is made, and hence may be seen as more a validation of the coding scheme than a significant empirical revelation. Instead, the surprises emerged when comparisons were made in the realms of aggression and sexual aggression. In contrast to the claims one reads and hears about the violence and sexual violence that exists in "pornography", and despite the fact that a significant proportion of the triple-X movies were sampled in an effort to

find the 'worst' pornography available in this area, we found
that it was the adult material, available in your local video
outlet, that included this material significantly more
frequently, and depicted the aggression with significantly
greater severity.

We found that if one wanted to rent a triple-X video, then
one's surest bet would be to enter a sex-specialist outlet,
where anywhere from 700 to more than 1000 triple-X titles would
be available. These would undoubtedly bear the label of the
outlet chain, and would in all probability be a locally produced
copy of a tape which was originally purchased in the United
States. On the other hand, there is also a good chance that a
triple-X tape could be acquired at one's local general purpose
video outlet, by merely taking out a membership and asking for
the triple-X list. This was the case in all the community areas
we sampled except the west side of Vancouver (area 2), where
only one of the outlets had triple-X tapes available. If one did
follow this latter route, the choice would be more limited
(generally to between 20 and 100 tapes), but the tape so
acquired would nonetheless have a high probability of bearing
the label of one of the two major distributors who run most of
the sex specialist outlets and keep most of the general purpose
outlets stocked in sexually explicit tapes.

And what would you see if you rented one of these triple-X
tapes? Table 10 lists the 10 content categories, across all
three content domains (sex, aggression, and sexual aggression),

52

that we observed most frequently in the 92 triple-X videos we coded. Note that all 10 entries are from the "Sex" content domain. In all probability, the scenes would feature heterosexual adult couples, adult females only, and/or adult group sex depictions in which everyone was portrayed as having a good time. The primary purpose behind the plot, if there were one, would be to provide opportunities to show different people engaging in different sexual activities in as many positions as possible.

If, on the other hand, you chose to rent an "adult" or "single-X" tape from your local video outlet, your viewing and renting experience would be somewhat different. First of all, you would be viewing an authorized copy of a tape that had cleared customs, and which bore the label of its original American distributor. Your video would probably be one of two major 'generic' types. The first is often referred to as the "T&A" variety, where you watch participants, usually female participants, in various stages of undress. Or you may be exposed to actual sexual activity, generally heterosexual, although the degree of explicitness will be limited. The second major type of "adult" video would be more of a "film" in the sense of including potentially significant efforts at plot development, and its sexual component might be more tangential to or integral to the dominant theme of the video.

The ten content categories we observed most frequently in the 59 adult videos we coded are listed in decreasing order of

Table 10

The Ten Most Frequently Observed Content
Categories in Triple-X Videos

Domain	Content Category	Number of Depictions
Sex	Oral-Genital Sex	715
Sex	Full Nudity	694
Sex	Partial Nudity	666
Sex	Fondling of Breasts/Genitals	631
Sex	Genital-Genital Intercourse	517
Sex	Masturbation	271
Sex	Hand-genital Manipulation, Ejaculation, "Talking Dirty"	261
Sex	Voyeurism/Exhibitionism	157
Sex	Anal Intercourse	104
Sex	Use of 'Hardware' (eg., dildos)	85

frequency in Table 11. Note that in contrast to the ubiquity of

sex in the triple-X videos, the adult videos were more likely to

include sex, aggression, and sexual aggression. Along with the

sexual categories of nudity, fondling, and intercourse, we also

see verbal abuse and/or threat in the context of both aggression

and sexual aggression, as well as assaultive activities such as

pushing, shoving, striking and kicking. And, as was noted

earlier, the sexual activity is significantly less explicit, and

Table 11

The Ten Content Categories Most Frequently
Observed in Adult Videos

Domain	Content Category	Number of Depictions
Sex	Full Nudity	421
Sex	Partial Nudity	399
Sex	Fondling of Breasts/Genitals	258
Sex	Genital-Genital Intercourse	170
Agg	Verbal Aggression/Abuse/Threat	168
SexAgg	Verbal Abuse/Humiliation/Threat	120
Sex	Oral-Genital Sex	109
Agg	Pushing/Shoving	95
Sex	Voyeurism/Exhibitionism	93
Agg	Strike With Fist/Kick	92

the aggressive activity significantly more severe, than in the triple-X videos.

These tables are a reaffirmation of the more detailed results presented in Chapter 3. They suggest that if one wants to see sex, then the triple-X videos are the place to look -- one will see lots of it, and it will be depicted very graphically. But if one wants to see aggression and sexual aggression, then one is better off looking on the shelves of the

local video outlet than in looking "under the counter". The irony of the situation is difficult to overlook. It was perhaps nowhere best demonstrated than in a video outlet we visited on the West Side of Vancouver. In response to the 'usual' question of whether the outlet had triple-X materials available, the proprietor answered, somewhat indignantly, that "We don't have much call for that type of material in this area". Yet a cursory glance across his shelves revealed numerous titles which we knew contained depictions of persons, usually females, being raped, tortured, and mutilated. You don't see the breast being kissed or fondled as a part of more graphic sexual activity, you just get a quick glimpse of it when the woman is in the shower, and then another while she is being butchered. It is a curious statement of how "acceptable" depictions of violence are in our culture.

There are many ways in which the results of our research should be placed in some perspective. First of all, one should realize that our focus in this research was on videos which had "sex" as a common theme, and our results make only a partial statement of what one is exposed to in adult and triple-X videos where sexual activity is the primary focus. Our observations during the course of this study suggest that there are other film genres that warrant similar scrutiny with violence and sexual violence as the focus, all of which enter the country legally and sit innocuously on the shelves. One genre which obviously merits some attention is the "horror" film, which

varies from the tension of Hitchcock to the blatant sex and gore butchery of more contemporary offerings. A second is the "martial arts" or "vengeance" film which shows the utility and satisfaction of violence and revenge. A third is the "war" film that shows how you, too, can gain respect through zealous nationalism and the efficient, large-scale imposition of death.

A second caveat to be noted here is that one's results are inevitably limited by the measuring instrument one imposes. In other words, while the content coding scheme developed for this research focussed on what were perceived as crucial aspects of preliminary importance, there are many elements which were not addressed by the coding scheme, and hence, were not coded. We did not, for example, address in any direct way the role of humour in the depictions we assessed, nor was there a way to code the discomfort of observing a rape scene with a pleasant muzak soundtrack playing in the background, nor could we really distinguish between a serious depiction and parody, nor did we attempt to deal with dimensions like "objectification" or "degradation". In sum, while we feel our research has much to offer, one must also acknowledge its limitations.

And finally, it should also be noted that even in the more violent (overall) adult videos, aggression and sexual aggression were relatively infrequent. But while this infrequency was in a sense pleasing to discover, these results should not be interpreted as suggesting that no further attention is warranted within either type of movie. It is gratifying to know, in other

words, that "only" 6% of the scenes depicted sexual aggression, yet this should not undermine the attention that those 6% of scenes should receive.

V. Concluding Comments

The 'pornography issue' has changed considerably since 1970 when the U.S. Commission on Obscenity and Pornography released its report and gave 'pornography' a relatively clean bill of health. At that time, pornography was defined on the basis of explicit sexuality, and the issue of determining whether some material was 'merely' pornographic, or should be considered 'obscene', rest on the point of whether the material in question was in some sense more graphic than community standards would tolerate. Contemporary legislation, in both the U.S. and Canada, is in large part a reflection of that definition. Beginning in the mid-1970's, however, numerous (primarily feminist) authors (e.g., Brownmiller, 1975; Morgan, 1975) began directing attention away from the issue of sexual explicitness per se, and toward a concern over the nature of these depictions, particularly in terms of their violent and coercive content. The distinction made by these authors was not one of pornography versus obscenity, but rather of pornography versus erotica, where the latter referred to material which was sexual in content, but which portrayed sexual relations in more egalitarian and loving fashion. Pornography, on the other hand, changed from being a categorical word which merely denoted explicit sexual content, and became by definition pejorative, since it implied violence, coercion, and imbalanced depictions of social relationships. And

there is no doubt that this proposed shift in definition has had an impact, as attendance at the hearings of the Special Committee and a recent study by Palys, Olver & Banks (1984) would attest.

Yet, changing the meaning of a word that has been used in a given way for at least 200 years (eg., see Wilson, 1973) has both advantageous and unfortunate consequences. Its primary advantage is that it has helped focus our societal attention on the very important issues of violence and sexual violence and, in particular, on our relative tolerance of material in these domains. But its disadvantages are several. First, it has produced societal conflict in which ostensibly competing camps of opinion have argued about two incredibly different types of material, each of which is known in its respective camp as "pornography". And second it is unfortunately true that even when words come to change their meaning, they seem inevitably to bring along extra baggage from their earlier incarnation.

This would seem to be the case within the 'pornography' domain, at least within the context of our research in the area of video 'pornography'. While societal concern has shifted to a focus on the issues of violence and sexual violence, the place we have looked for this 'pornographic' material is in the realm of sexually explicit material, perhaps because that is where we have 'always' looked for 'pornographic' material in the past. But as the present study has revealed, we may be looking in the wrong place. When we focus on "sex-specialist" video outlets and

60

on sexually explicit material, what we find is largely sexually explicit material -- incredibly graphic, often somewhat tasteless a celebration of a "sex is fun" mentality, but little else. While violence and sexual violence were indeed discovered, the analyses revealed not only that this material has apparently decreased in frequency, but that if indeed our priorities are in the realm of violence and sexual violence, then our attention would be better directed at what is on the shelves rather than at the material "under the counter". If, on the other hand, sex per se is our concern, then triple-X is obviously the place to look.

But while our findings are relatively clear-cut, they beg the question of "why?" they were obtained. In other words, what factors might account for the results that were observed? It was noted in the introduction to this report that the video industry represents a relatively free market at this point in time, since videos do not currently fall under film censor board control. We also expressed the feeling that the safest assumption to make was that any type of material could probably be acquired if one had enough time, money, and resources to acquire them. But if this is true, if even the most despicable depictions of violence and sexual violence are available, then why did these materials not appear more frequently in the video outlets we sampled?

Part of the answer undoubtedly appears in the data we have already reported, where there were indications that the sexually explicit video industry itself has changed over the years. While

they are still in the business of producing material showing graphic sexual depictions, these videos were found to be including more scenes, more non-coded (ie., plot development) scenes, and, in many ways were becoming more like "movies" than "skin flicks". One gets the impression that a different market is being pursued -- less the young bucks at the stag party who relish the consumption of objectified femininity, but more the young or middle-aged couple who obtain arousal value from watching a sometimes humorous, always graphic portrayal in the privacy of their own home.

Our interviews with the proprietors of Greater Vancouver video outlets provided some support for this notion. When asked to identify their clientele for triple-X videos, the proprietors indicated that most were in the 25 to 45 year age range, and that the largest consumers were couples (who would typically rent one or two videos "over the counter" for family consumption, and one "under the counter" for their own viewing), and single males. Single females are apparently infrequent consumers.

Another part of the answer, however, would appear to lie in the interaction between the proprietors and the context in which they operate. The proprietors we interviewed were homogeneous in the sense that each was an entrepreneur who wanted to succeed financially in his or her chosen domain, ie., owning a video rental establishment. Each of the persons with whom we spoke was also in the position of determining what videos would be made

available in that outlet. What determined their choices? Several factors might be cited: (1) the legal environment in which they operate, ie., the prospect that they might be charged with distributing obscene materials; (2) the social environment in which they operate, ie., the prospect that they might incur demonstrations, protests, or complaints about the material they made available; (3) their own personal values, ie., their desire to maintain a reasonable self-image in renting materials whose existence they would be prepared to defend; and (4) the demands of the market, ie., their knowledge or belief that if one is to succeed, then one must have that which their clients desire.

Of all these factors, the least effective, in a direct sense, was the existing legislative provisions regarding obscenity. More than half the proprietors we interviewed did not even know what these provisions were, and of those who indicated they did, most were not entirely clear on how they might apply the legal definition of obscenity to the material available to them. Several also commented on the apparent capriciousness of the application of these provisions, eg., when a movie with a person being whipped was declared obscene (and, they acknowledged, reasonably so), but where their shelves are allowed to contain dozens of films (eg., in the 'horror' section) where women are killed, dismembered and mutilated in depictions far more graphic and brutal than anything which exists in triple-X. On the other hand, it should be noted that most of the proprietors we interviewed commented positively on

the idea of legislation, and viewed it as a formal expression of societal guidelines. They merely expected a clearer assertion of the location of the boundaries, and/or some centralization of responsibility with respect to classification.

But while our interviews were clear in indicating that legal provisions were quite ineffective in a direct sense for the proprietors of general purpose outlets who chose to make sexually explicit material available, they may be seen as more effective in an indirect way in determining the range of materials which are made available on the broader rental market. As was noted, many of the video proprietors did not even know what the obscenity provisions of the Criminal Code were, let alone how to interpret them. On the other hand, those who operate the sex specialist outlets do seem aware of these provisions, and, although they, too, have argued over their ambiguity, these operators seem to be quite responsive to deleting titles and/or offending scenes when violations or alleged violations are brought to their attention. Given that those who established the sex specialist outlets are, in general, also the primary distributors of sexually explicit material to the general purpose outlets, then one can see that the ripples which emerge from attention to the source ultimately has an impact on the broader market. Yet there is an unfortunate paradox in that while it is the sex specialist outlets who are subjected to the greatest scrutiny, it is often the general purpose outlets which stock the most questionable material. This

is because many of the general purpose proprietors have 'old' stock to which they pay little attention, and hence may well have titles on hand which, since they were acquired, had been declared obscene.

Notwithstanding these legal considerations, our interviews indicated that the other three factors were more directly influential in determining video rental offerings in general purpose establishments. Proprietors, and even the many proprietors who (astonishingly) knew little about films and rarely even watched them themselves, typically provided general dicta to distributors indicating that while they wished to receive 20 titles of a certain type of film, they did not wish to receive videos containing X,Y, or Z, where X,Y, and Z have been determined by (1) their own personal values; and (2) the demands of the market, within the context of (3) the social environment in which they operate.

Our data revealed that triple-X material was relatively more innocuous than adult material in terms of violence and sexual violence. But was that because of "real" differences in the nature of such materials, or because of the intense scrutiny under which such materials have been placed? One can never know for certain, and it was at that point that we had to confront the limitations of our own research. While our data revealed a representative picture of 'now' in the video rental industry, our temporal analysis was constrained by the inevitable limitations of a cross-sectional research design. Our

understanding of both this industry and social process would be greatly enhanced if studies like the one reported here were to be replicated in future years and, in that way, to monitor social change. In sum, one would hope that this piece of research will not remain _the_ study of video pornography, but rather be just the first in a longitudinal design.

Notwithstanding these limitations, one lesson we have learned is that the influence of the social environment on video content and video rental practices should not be minimized. It was clear that many video proprietors did not acquire certain kinds of materials because they did not wish to incur the wrath of some very vocal and effective protesters. Those individuals have been very effective in sensitizing proprietors and their clients to issues involving violence and sexual violence within the context of sexually explicit materials, and have demonstrated the power that censure can have, even in the absence of restrictive censorship.

VI. References

Barlow, M. (1983). Invited luncheon address at a symposium on Pornography, held at the Justice Institute of British Columbia. (Ms. Barlow is adviser to the Prime Minister on Women's Issues).

"B.C. Video Firm Fined for Renting 'Snuff' Film". (1 June 1983). The Ottawa Citizen, p.1.

Boyd, N. (1984). Sexuality and violence, imagery, and reality: Censorship and the criminal control of obscenity. Report prepared for the Department of Justice.

Brownmiller, S. (1975). Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape. New York: Bantam Books.

Morgan, K. (19 March 1984). B.C. Exports Porn. The Vancouver Province, pp.1,5.

Morgan, R. (1980). Theory and practice: Pornography and rape. In L. Lederer (Ed.) Take Back the Night: Women on Pornography. New York: William Morrow.

Palys, T.S., Olver, J.N., & Banks, L.K. (1984). Ipsatively and normatively derived definitions of pornography. Unpublished manuscript currently under journal review.

Price, D.G. (1979). The role of choice in a definition of obscenity. Canadian Bar Review, 57, 301-324.

Proulx, B.Z. (2 June 1984). Video porn: Where do we draw the line? The Montreal Gazette, p.F-1.

Steinhem, G. (1980). Erotica and pornography: A clear and present difference. In L. Lederer (Ed.) Take Back the Night: Women on Pornography. New York: William Morrow.

United States Commission on Obscenity and Pornography. (1970). The Report of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography. New York: Bantam Books.

Wachtel, E. (1979). Our newest battleground: Pornography. Branching Out, 6(3), 33-37.

Wilson, W.C. (1973). The emergence of a social issue and the beginning of psychological study. The Journal of Social

Issues, 29(3), 7-19.

APPENDIX "A"

Video Coding Manual & Coding Sheets

CONTENT ANALYSIS OF VIDEOS

You've Seen the Movie.

Now Read...

The Manual

Prepared by:

T. S. Palys, Ph.D.

with

Gloria Baker-Palys

Susan Bluck

Deborah Landy

John N. Olver

<u>Overview</u>

The coding of any given video involves three types of coding sheets. First, a **COVER SHEET** will be completed for the video. This includes general information about the video, its source, and the coder. Information about the video itself (title, production information) can be obtained from the video outlet from which the video was rented, the video's packaging, the credits at the beginning of the video, and/or "trade" magazines we will endeavour to procure. Cross-check this information across sources whenever possible, and note any inconsistencies that arise, including the sources of the conflicting information.

The coder then begins viewing the video. The basic unit of analysis for coding will be **THE SCENE**, which is defined as "an uninterrupted sequence of activity which occurs in a given physical context". The opening credits do not count as a scene, although the credits may be superimposed on a scene, in which case the scene would indeed be coded. Otherwise, the first scene would commence after the credits are completed. Appropriate **SCENE CODING SHEETs** are completed for each scene in which sex, aggression, and/or sexual aggression are considered present. Scenes which do not include any of these three types of content are tabulated, but not coded. Detailed information about how and when to use each SCENE CODING SHEET is given below.

Upon completion of a given video, the coder will fill out an **OVERALL REVIEW SHEET** which asks for general summary and

impressionistic or evaluative information about the video.

In sum, a complete video coding will include the completion of one COVER SHEET, as many SCENE CODING SHEETS as there are codeable scenes in the video (appended in sequence), and one OVERALL REVIEW SHEET at the back of the package.

THE COVER SHEET

1. <u>Coder</u>. Put the first initial of your first name in this space (ie., Susan=S, John=J, etc.).

2. <u>Movie Number</u>. Each movie will be assigned a movie number. Enter it if you know it; otherwise leave blank.

3. <u>Date</u>. Indicate the date the coding was completed, in the order of year, month, day of month, using numbers in all cases.

4. <u>Name of Video</u>. This title should appear both on the packaging and at the beginning of the movie. Note this in full in the space provided. Please print legibly, using block capital letters.

5. <u>Tape Status</u>. Does the tape appear to be a "pirate" copy, or does it appear to be an original? Originals will probably have a production company sticker on the top side that may also show a photo from the video, video title, and/or production information. They will probably also have serial numbers of some sort printed on the ends of the front edge of the casing. Both types will have the title of the video on the front edge (ie., an uninformative attribute). It's doubtful that you will receive the original box in either case, so this, too, is an uninformative attribute.

6. <u>Date of Production</u>. This is an important element since it will allow the testing of hypotheses concerning changes in video content over time. Check packaging information <u>and</u> opening credits for this information, and note any

73

inconsistencies. If this information is not available through either of these sources, point this out when submitting the completed coding forms, as a more exhaustive search will have to be undertaken. Only the <u>year</u> of production is required.

7. <u>Location of Production</u>. This refers to the location of the production company, NOT the location in which the movie was shot. Once again, scan the packaging and credits for this information, note inconsistencies, and draw missing information to Ted or John's attention. In the event that production location is unavailable, be certain to at least note the production company in the "Comment" item at the bottom of the COVER SHEET, as locational information may be facilitated through this information. Note further that there are two ways for you to respond to this item (given that locational information is available), and you should do both: (1) <u>Write</u> the location, being as specific as possible, in the space provided; but also (2) enter a location code. The location code is three digits long. The first digit is the COUNTRY code, where 1 = Canada and 2 = United States; codes for other countries are listed in the appendix. The second and third digits of the location code are for the province or state of origin. See the province/state code list in the appendix. Finally, note that while there is no place for CITY in the location code, you would nonetheless note this information in writing in the space provided, if

it were available.

8. Video Outlet Code. Each video outlet from which videos are secured will be given a code number, and this number should be entered here by the person who secured the video. The first digit will represent the area in which the video outlet is located. Areas and codes are as follows: (1) **Eastern Suburbs,** including New Westminster, Port Coquitlam, Port Moody, and Coquitlam; (2) **East Side Vancouver,** bounded by Main Street to the West, Boundary Road to the East, Hastings Avenue to the North, Kingsway to the Southwest, and King Edward to the South; (3) **West Side Vancouver,** including Kitsilano and Kerrisdale north of King Edward Avenue; and (4) **The West End of Vancouver,** bounded by Denman Avenue to the West, Georgia Avenue to the North, Burrard Street to the East, and Pacific Street to the South. Within each area, the person who is primarily responsible for acquiring tapes from that area will compile a list of outlets dealing in "Adult" and/or "Triple-X" material. List them as you find them, in sequential, numerical order with double-digit codes beginning at 01. Keep these codes in a safe place, ie., don't lose them. The two digit code you provide will constitute the second and third digits of the video outlet code. These codes will only be distributed on a "need to know" basis, and should be treated as **CONFIDENTIAL,** ie., you should not discuss sources with ANYONE not connected to the study.

9. Type of Outlet. This, too, should be noted by the person who secures the video. A "sex specialist" shop is one which deals primarily in sexually explicit films, while a "general purpose" outlet is one which deals in a broad selection of titles, of which a minor proportion are sexually explicit.

10. Type of Video Operation. At the point where you discuss memberships with the proprietor or clerk at the outlet, ask whether they are related organizationally to any other outlets (eg., "Is my membership card 'good' anywhere else?"). Note whether the outlet is (1) an independently owned operation not related to any other outlets; (2) one of a small chain with perhaps a few other outlets in the Lower Mainland Area or elsewhere in B.C.; (3) part of a national chain with outlets in other provinces in Canada; (4) part of an international organization, with outlets also in the United States. If you are unable to determine this information, use code "5".

11. Declared Classification. This will be completed by the person who secured the video. Typically, sexually explicit films will be designated as "adult" or "Triple-X", although they may be innocuously listed and displayed with other movies (code 3), or given some other label (code 4; note label in space provided).

12. Location of Video in Outlet. Where in the outlet was the video located? Note code "1" if the video was out on the shelves, visible to all, and not in any way demarcated as

"different" from other stock. If videos are partitioned by movie type (eg., drama, comedy) and the video you secure is set aside as "Adult" or "Triple-X" or any other title implying sexual explicitness, but still readily visible on the shelves, you would note code "2". Note that the crucial variable differentiating codes "1" and "2" is not sectioning per se, but whether the adult or Triple-X video you get is clearly noted as such (ie., a code '2') or whether it is just buried among other titles (code '1'). Code '3' implies that the listing from which you chose the video was not visible to all those who entered the shop, but, rather, required an "extra step" to secure, eg., asking for a list and/or being required to take out a membership before being given access to the list and/or being allowed to rent adult or triple-X movies. The next code (4) implies that more extensive efforts were required than those listed in category (3), ie., even the average patron who was looking for a movie of this type would have had difficulty securing it. If none of codes "1" through "4" apply, then check code "5" and explain the situation.

13. Comments. Any comments about the video and/or the outlet from which it was rented may be noted here. For example, some of the movies we viewed during the pretest period included formal editorial comment about freedom of choice; these comments would be noted here. Any other production and distribution information of interest should be written here

as well. For example, (1) Is there any special "credit" information, eg., that the video contains "true" or "fictitious" events?; (2) Are there any disclaimers about the willing participation of persons in the video?; (3) Is there any attempt to put forth the idea that the film is a documentary, intended for educational purposes, or whatever?

SCENE CODING SHEETS

As noted earlier, the basic unit of analysis for video coding is the "scene", which is defined as "an uninterrupted sequence of activity which occurs in a given physical context". Thus, shifts in physical context will generally imply changes in scene, although there will be occasional exceptions to this. For example, a scene may show two people going for a walk and having an extended conversation. In the process of having the conversation, they may walk through several different physical locations. Yet, as long as the continuity for the scene came from the conversation, and as long as entry in to the different physical contexts did not shift the focus of action or interrupt the conversation, then you would consider this to be one extended scene. It should also be noted that even if physical location does not change, there may be scene changes nonetheless. For example, if the nature of the focal activity shifts dramatically, or if new participants enter the scene and a significant change in the action occurs because of their entry, then a new scene would be coded.

One thing to watch for is the editorially interrupted (rather than thematically interrupted) scene. Let's say that there are three separate events which occur concurrently. The editor or director of the film has a choice in how to portray this. One alternative is to first show one scene, then the next, and then the last. Each scene would thus be thematically whole,

and you would have coded three scenes. A second alternative, however, would involve intertwining the scenes in such a way as to give the impression of concurrence. This might be done by showing a glimpse of scene one, a glimpse of scene two, a glimpse of scene three, back to scene one again, back to scene two again, and so forth through (possibly) several iterations. Given an overly rigid adherence to our earlier definition of "scene", you might feel compelled to do a new coding sheet with each change from scene to scene; this is problematic from at least three perspectives: (1) an inordinately large number of scene coding sheets will be completed; (2) a given thematic scene will end up being coded several times over (ie., once each time a scene 'glimpse' is depicted); and (3) it distorts what is going on. Consequently, you should attempt to recognize editorially interrupted scenes and code them as a unitary whole on the coding sheets (ie., in the example above, you should end up with only three coded scenes). Of course, all other rules for scene changes still apply, eg., if there is a dramatic change in action and/or personnel and/or context, etc.

In coding the scene, you are asked to note whether sexual activity, aggressive activity, and/or sexually aggressive activity are occuring. The definitions for each of these are delineated in their respective sections below. If none of these three activity types is occuring, then the scene is still tabulated (ie., consider it a scene and give it a scene number) but not coded (ie., do not fill out a SCENE CODING SHEET for

it). If at least one of these types of activity is present, then you fill out whichever SCENE CODING SHEETs are relevant to that scene. Normally, a given scene will only include one of the three types of activity, in which case you would fill out only one type of coding sheet. On the other hand, more than one would be coded if (a) there is a clear mix of activity in the scene, eg., the participants engage in various discrete activities, some of which are in one category and some in another; or (b) the scene contains parallel activities, some of which are in one category and some of which are in another, eg., sexual activity in the foreground with aggressive activity of other participants in the background.

Note that coders should not feel they must code in "real" time, ie., feel free to use freeze-frame, fast forward or rewind, and forward or reverse visual search in order to maximize coding accuracy and efficiency.

Note also that one of the things you are asked for on every type of coding sheet is the "scene number". This refers to the number of the scene within the movie you are coding. Recall that scenes will be coded only IF they involve at least one of sex, aggression, or sexual aggression. You should, however, keep track of the number of non-coded scenes, as you will need this information when you get to the OVERALL REVIEW SHEET. While scenes which do NOT involve one of the dimensions noted above will not be coded, you should nonetheless acknowledge their existence in the scene numbers. For example, let's say scene

number one is a non-coded scene, scene two is sexually explicit, scene three is a non-codeable one, and scene four involves both aggression and sex. In this example, only two scenes would be coded, since only two of the scenes involve sex, aggression, and/or sexual aggression. Despite the fact that scene two is the first scene to be coded, it would nonetheless be listed as Scene 02; this would imply that Scene one was considered non-codeable. Similarly, scene 04 would be listed as such, despite the fact that it would only have been the second scene to be coded. And finally, note that for scene 02, the only coding sheet to be filled out would be a SEX sheet, while both a SEX sheet and an AGGRESSION sheet would be completed for scene 04.

A last noteworthy point is that at the top of each of the SCENE CODING SHEETS is a row of seven boxes. These boxes are where you are to insert the Seven Digit Magic Number Code (SDMNC). The SDMNC is both 7 digits and quite magical. The seven digits are (1) Coder initial; (2 to 4) Movie number; (5 and 6) Scene number; and (7) Card type. The card type code is '2' for AGGRESSION, '3' for SEX, and '4' for SEXUAL AGGRESSION. The magic comes in that inclusion of this code plays a major role in helping me to analyze all of this. Now let's look at each of the individual SCENE CODING SHEETs in turn.

AGGRESSION
(ie., Independent of Sex).

Note first of all that this section refers to aggression or violence per se, ie., aggression that is not intricately tied to sexual activity. If you witness aggression which is a part of sexual activity, then you would code it as sexual aggression in a later section of this coding sheet. Note also that aggresion in this context refers to interpersonal aggression; violence directed toward inanimate objects or other non-persons is not counted (unless it is done in the context of interpersonal violence, eg., to emphasize threat). Also, you may wish to comment on any non-interpersonal violence you witness in your comments in this section. Note further that "aggression" is said to occur whenever one or more persons intentionally imposes or attempts to impose hurt, abuse, or force upon one or more other persons.

3. Aggression Severity Code. Is there any aggression, as defined above, in the scene? If not, then do not complete an AGGRESSION sheet for the scene. If there is aggression in the scene, however, then you would begin by rating the scene in terms of the severity of violence involved. Three main levels of violence are recognized: (1) minimal (coded as a "1"); (2) moderate (coded as a "3"); and (3) severe (coded as a "5").

The aggression would be considered "minimal" (and coded as a "1") if the act was clearly aggressive but involved no serious injury to the recipient(s), was fairly transient in both execution and effect, and/or was not particularly

violent. Examples might include grabbing someone and shaking them a bit, a single slap across the face, a non-sexual spanking of short duration and which resulted in no more than pink cheeks, verbal abuse, a bit of pushing and shoving, and so forth.

The next (moderate) level, coded as a "3", is starting to be rather serious. There is a clear intent to inflict hurt, or to induce threat through a combination of verbal abuse, confinement/restriction and/or available weaponry. Examples would be fist fights, slapping someone around at length, throwing someone on or against a solid object, kicking, imposing cuts or wounds, or threatening with weapons. In other words, we're in to the realm of rather clear assault and intimidation here. Weapons may be visible, but would not have been utilized.

Finally, the third (severe) level of aggression (coded as a "5") implies a strong intent to injure which, if successful, would involve probable hospitalization or death of the victim. Weapons may or may not be involved. Examples would include severe beatings, shootings, maiming, torture, throwing off a cliff, running over with a car, and so forth.

If you witness aggression of the types described above, they will normally be coded "1", "3", or "5". Note, however, that within each of the three levels, you may choose to rate the scene 1 point higher or lower than "normal", if and only if there are mitigating or aggravating aspects to the scene

that lead you to believe a deviation from the "normal" code for that level is warranted. This should not be a frequent practice, however, and should only be done if you feel the choice of the 'usual' 1/3/5 codes would distort the nature of the depicted activity, which you felt was in some sense qualitatively different from the 'usual' activities of that type. In other words, be reluctant to use discretionary points, but don't be afraid to use them.

Examples of mitigating factors that would warrant giving one point less than the code for a given level (ie., 0 instead of 1; 2 instead of 3; 4 instead of 5) might be that the aggression is of brief duration, or that the action (while clear as to its nature) occurs off-screen, or is done comedically or only half-seriously, or that, because of the acting, the violence does not have the air of "reality" to it that would warrant the higher, normal rating. Aggravating factors that would warrant giving one point more than would normally be coded (ie., 2 instead of 1; 4 instead of 3; 6 instead of 5) would be if the violence was of lengthy duration, was depicted quite graphically, and/or had a definite air of "reality" and immediacy to it.

Finally, it may be noted that very rarely, the rating of "7" might be considered appropriate. This rating would only be used if the violence were so severe and the depiction so graphic that you were truly amazed and felt ill due to the violence involved.

4. Aggression Initiation. Some aggressive scenes will depict two or more individuals who both/all contribute to the initiation of the event, eg., a fight spontaneously erupts or where both enter the scene looking for a fight. If this is the case, insert code "1" (AGGRESSION MUTUALLY INITIATED) and then proceed to item 4a. In other instances, however, one (or more) persons will initiate an aggressive act against another person(s). If there is a clear distinction between perpetrator(s) and prospective victim(s), then insert code "2" (AGGRESSION UNIDIRECTIONALLY INITIATED) in the box and then proceed to item 4b. **Note, incidentally, that the coding in this item refers to how the aggression is initiated**, and **not** on the eventual outcome. Thus, if a person starts a fight with another person, and the second person fights back in defense, then this would nonetheless still constitute aggression that was unidirectionally initiated because the one person started it.

Furthermore, there may be some instances in which a person directs aggression toward themselves, such as in self-mutilation or suicide. In this case, you should insert code "3" (AGGRESSION SELF-DIRECTED) and then proceed to item 4a.

Finally, it may be unclear who initiated the aggressive activity, eg., when the action is already in process as the scene begins. If this is the case, insert code "4" in item 4, but do not bother to code participants in items 4a or 4b,

86

ie., proceed directly to item 5. Note also that "initiation" should only be coded <u>once</u> for any given scene. That is, once you've coded initiation for a given sequence of activity, don't keep on coding it on subsequent coding sheets that refer back to the same initiation. From that point on, just code "4" for unclear/in progress.

a. <u>Aggression Participants: Mutual or Self-Directed Initiation</u>. If the aggression you witnessed was mutual or self-directed, then you will want to now code the attributes of the participant(s). Six cells are presented in a 3x2 matrix. Indicate the number of persons of each type "involved" in that scene. Ignore persons who are "incidentals" in the scene. With respect to the gender variable, note the apparent sex of the person(s) involved, eg., if males were dressed and portrayed as females, they would be coded as "female". As for the age variable, do your best to code for "apparent" age, ie., the way the person is portrayed in the film. "Child" implies pre-pubescence; "adolescent" implies post-pubescent but probably a teenager -- could this person, <u>as portrayed</u>, legally get a drink in a bar?; "adult" implies all persons not included in the first two categories. Remember that you are coding the <u>number</u> of each type of person in each of the six cells of the matrix. Finally, use only single-digit numbers in each cell, ie., only code up to <u>nine</u> persons in any

given cell of the matrix; if there are more than nine, you would just insert a "9" in the appropriate cell.

b. Aggression Participants: Unidirectional Initiation. If the aggression you witnessed was unidirectionally initiated, then you will now want to code the age and gender attributes of both the initiator(s) and the recipient(s) of the initial aggressive act(s). In each case, you are given a 3x2 matrix like that described in the preceding section, and your task is to code the number of each type of person in each of the six cells of the two matrices (up to 9 per cell).

5. Aggression in Process. The preceding item asked you to address the question of how the aggressive interaction got started. Now you are asked to address the question of whether, overall, you felt the aggressive interaction was a mutual, balanced involvement, or whether there was a clear differentiation between perpetrator(s) and victim(s). If the aggressive interaction was a mutual involvement among willing participants, then insert code "1" (mutual) in the box, even though one or more person(s) may have emerged as the eventual "winner(s)" of the interaction. Interactions in which 'perpetrator' and 'victim' roles exist, but switch back and forth, are to be coded as "mutual". If, on the other hand, the interaction was an apparently imbalanced interaction with one person/group clearly and consistently dominating the other, such that there are clear perpetrator

and victim roles, then insert code "2" (unidirectional).
Finally, if the aggression is self-directed, note code "3"
or, if none of the codes above apply, insert code "4" and
explain. If you noted mutual (code 1) or self-directed (code
3), proceed to item 5a. If you noted unidirectional (code
2), proceed to item 5b. If you coded code 4 (other), then
move on to item 6.

a. Participants: Mutual or Self-Directed Aggression. Note
   the number of each type of participant(s) in each cell
   of the 3x2 matrix, just as you did in item 4a.

b. Participants: Unidirectional Aggression. If there is a
   clear division between perpetrator and victim in this
   interaction, then note the number of each type of person
   in the appropriate cells of the respective matrices.

6. Aggression Content Codes. A number of different aggressive
acts are listed under this item. Put a "1" in all boxes
where that activity is present; put a "0" (zero) if the
activity was not included in the scene. In the event that
some important act you witness is missing from the list,
then note "other" and specify the nature of the activity. In
general, the listing should be self-explanatory. I'll
mention only two here. First, activities like pushing off a
cliff and any other activity where the object was to kill
someone will be included under the "attempted murder, death"
code (item 7), regardless of whether the attempt was
successful or not. Second, "weapon" (in items 7 and 8) will

include not only "traditional" weapons like guns and knives, but also items used as weapons, eg., baseball bats, candle holders, and other 'blunt instruments'.

SEXUAL ACTIVITY

(ie., independent of aggression)

Note that this refers to explicit sexual activity per se, ie., sexual activity that does not involve any element of deception, coercion, or aggression. If any of these elements are part of the sexual activity, then it would be coded below under "Sexual Aggression" (see item 12). Two further points are worthy of note here: First, the mere fact that one or the other person(s) tends to dominate or direct the nature of the sexual activity will not in and of itself lead to the coding of the relationship as coercive (ie., sexual aggression), although you will probably want to note these attributes in your open-ended comments for this section. In other words, as long as all participants are apparently entering the scene willingly, then the scene will be coded as purely sexual even though some element of dominance/submission is involved. On the other hand, if the aggression is overt (eg., in sado-masochism), it will be coded as sexual aggression even though the participants enter willingly.

A second point to be made here concerns the definition of "sexual activity". A scene will be considered "sexual" if (any of) the focal participant(s) in the scene is/are (a) wearing any less clothing than one might wear on a public beach; or (b) is involved in any lascivious action, even if fully clothed, that would be noticeable and deemed inappropriate in a dimly lit, but public, bar.

7. Sexual Explicitness Code. If the activity in the scene is not "sexual" as defined above, then you would not complete a SEX coding sheet. If the activity is sexual per se (ie., it meets either of the above criteria and occurs in the absence of aggressive or coercive activity), then you would begin by rating the scene in terms of its sexual explicitness. Three levels of sexual explicitness are recognized: (1) minimal (coded as a "1"); (2) moderate (coded as a "3"); and (3) maximal (coded as a "5"). Your task is to determine the level of sexual explicitness in the scene, ie., which would normally involve the coding of a 1, 3, or 5. A discretionary allowance of plus or minus one point is allowed, as in the aggression severity codes. Note, finally, that in the event that various sexual activities are depicted, you would normally code for the level of the most explicit of these activities, although the nature of other activities may possibly influence your decision to use discretionary points.

A code of "1" (minimal sexual explicitness) would be appropriate where full or partial nudity is depicted, or the scene involves fondling of breasts, buttocks or genitals through clothing, striptease, "talking dirty", massage where the apparent object is titillation rather than relaxation, still photos of sexual activity, or "vague images" of explicit sequences (eg., shadows on the wall; ambiguous action in a steamy shower; dark lighting making action ambiguous).

A "moderate" level of sexual explicitness (coded 3), on the other hand, would be coded if an activity like sexual intercourse or oral genital contact were depicted and you, given your viewing position, were unable to tell whether the action was "real" or "simulated". (An example would be a scene in which a woman was depicted administering fellatio to a male. He is standing, she is on her knees, and the camera angle is from behind the woman's head. Although oral genital contact is an intimate sexual activity, and it appears this is what is occuring in the scene, you can't tell for certain whether this is the case because of the camera angle.) A "3" would also be coded if fondling/caressing or other 'foreplay' were occuring while nude, but not accompanied by any other activities designed to facilitate ejaculation or which involved penetration. In sum, code 3 refers to explicit foreplay activities or implicit intercourse or oral-genital or oral-anal

activities.

Finally, a code of "5" (extremely or maximally explicit) would be warranted if the activity were an extremely intimate one (ie., involving contact between one person's genitalia and another's genitalia, mouth, hands, or with 'hardware') and if the depiction indicated quite clearly what was occuring, ie., the hypothesis of 'simulation' is untenable. Continuing with the fellatio example from the previous paragraph, a code of "5" would be warranted if the camera were relatively close to the characters (ie., giving a feeling of involvement rather than mere observing), the camera shot was from the side, and one witnessed the man's penis entering the woman's mouth. Other examples would include stimulation designed specifically for ejaculation of the male or of the orgasm of the female, where both the activity and its result were graphically depicted; or close-up depiction of any penetration activity, whether vaginal or anal and whether by hand, penis, or accessory.

A few general points should also be noted. First, the above scheme assumes that there is nothing inherently more or less sexually explicit about masturbation, heterosexual acts, or homosexual acts per se. Further, it is possible to utilize discretionary points to code a given scene as one point more or less sexually explicit than "normal" in the event that the presence of mitigating or aggravating factors

93

leads you to feel that the depiction is more or less explicit than the prototypical member of that class. Mitigating factors might include the presence of greater ambiguity than usual about the nature of the activity, or where the portrayal is of relatively short duration. Aggravating factors that would warrant giving an "extra" point might be portrayals of long duration, the compounding of several simultaneous acts, and/or the addition of such graphic indicators as spurting semen or the breaking of taboos (eg., incest, necrophilia) in addition to the activity per se.

Finally, as was the case with the "Aggression" coding, it is possible you may come across a scene that is so incredibly graphic and explicit that you find it hard to believe. If this is the case, a code of "7" may be utilized.

8. Sexual Initiation. Did the participants enter the scene willingly? Does an egalitarian relationship prevail in the initiation of the scene? If so, then the scene will be considered "mutually initiated" and you should insert code "1" in the box and proceed to item 8a. Or, did one or more person(s) take the initiative in the interaction? If so, then the scene is said to be "unidirectionally initiated", and you should insert code "2" in the box and proceed to item 8b. In the event you feel that the interaction was unidirectionally initiated, then you should, of course, be able to specify who initiated it and who was drawn in to the

activity.

Four further points should be made. First, note that "taking the initiative" here is still defined within the range of "normal" interaction patterns; if the power differential during initiation is unduly severe and/or if overt aggression is present, then you should be coding the activity as sexual aggression, not sex per se. Second, note that if only one person is portrayed (ie., a masturbatory activity is depicted), then you would insert code "3" and proceed to item 8a. Third, if the initiation roles are unclear (eg., the scene begins with the activity already in progress), then insert code "4" and proceed to item 9. Fourth, any given sexual sequence should only be coded for initiation once. Any subsequent sexual activity which stems from the same initiation should thenceforth just be coded "4" (unclear/in progress).

a. Sexual Initiation: Mutual or Solo. A 3x2 matrix is depicted which concatenates apparent age and gender of participants. You should note the number of each type of participant in the appropriate cell of the matrix (up to nine per cell). See the analagous section under "Aggression" for further information.

b. Sexual Initiation: Unidirectional. Assuming you've chosen this alternative, then it should be clear who took the initiative here and who was drawn in to the interaction. Two 3x2 matrices are depicted, one for the

95

initiator(s), and another for the submissive one(s). Note the <u>number</u> of each participant type in the appropriate cells of the respective matrices.

9. <u>Sexual Activity in Process</u>. Forget about how the activity was initiated. Look at the action in process. Does the interaction as a whole appear mutual and egalitarian? If so, insert code "1" and answer item 9a. Or were there 'dominant' and 'submissive' roles involved? eg., does one person play a greater role in directing the activity?; is one person more 'in charge' of the situation?; is one person more passive than another? If there are dominant and submissive roles involved, but these roles switch back and forth, consider the interaction 'mutual' and proceed as above. But if the dominant and submissive roles stay relatively constant, then consider the interaction 'imbalanced', insert code "2", and proceed to item 9b. If only one person is involved, then insert code "3" (solo activity) and proceed to item 9a, or if the roles fall in to none of the above categories, insert code "4", explain, and proceed to item 10.

a. <u>Sexual Activity: Mutual or Solo Participants</u>. If the sexual activity was mutual or solo, code the apparent gender and age of participants in the matrix, indicating the number of each type. If you forgot how to do this, follow instructions for items 4a, 4b, 5a and 5b <u>mutatis mutandis</u>.

b. <u>Sexual Activity: Imbalanced</u>. If there were consistent

96

dominant and submissive roles undertaken by participants, then you should be able to identify the individuals in the respective roles. Do so by indicating the numbers of each type of participant in the appropriate cells of the respective matrices.

10. Affect. You're being asked to make a fairly qualitative judgement in this item, regarding the presence, absence, and valence of affect in the scene. Positive depictions refer to scenes in which the activity is depicted as enjoyable for both/all participants. A super-positive depiction is indicated when both/all participants are depicted as not only having enjoyed themselves, but where at least two of the following indicators are present: (1) you have the impression that participants are there for more than 'just sex'; (2) the participants cuddle or otherwise show affection to one another above and beyond stimulation in the sexual activity itself, either (3) physically (eg., by hugging, kissing, caressing); or (4) verbally (eg., by professing love, affection, consideration). A negative depiction is indicated whenever at least one of the participants exhibits fear, guilt, insecurity, jealousy, frustration, and/or being 'turned off' or disgusted by the activity. A super-negative depiction is when both/all participants seem to feel this way. Finally, the neutral/mechanical alternative implies scenes in which the sexual activity seems emotionless, uninvolving, shallow,

neither positive nor negative, and/or participants seem merely to be going through the motions. Read these descriptions carefully, and then follow your intuitions about this one. If you can't decide which applies, then code "neutral".

11. Sexual Content Code. Listed are a number of activities. Put a "1" in the appropriate space if the activity was depicted in this scene; put a "0" (zero) in the space if the activity was not depicted. In the event some important act that was depicted is not included in the list, then check either "other, deviant" if the activity involves a deviant activity like urination, defecation, necrophilia, etc., or simply "other" if it is another, relatively "normal" activity.

SEXUAL AGGRESSION

(ie., Sex and Aggression intricately tied together).

In order to be considered "sexual aggression", the activity depicted in the scene must obviously mix sexual activity (as defined above) with actual or threatened aggression, coercion, or deception. Sexual aggression thus involves the use of force and/or an attempt to hurt, in the context of sexual activity. Sex and aggression must be intricately entwined. Note, however, that you are first asked to rate the degree of sexual explicitness and aggression severity of the scene separately.

For "sexual aggression", the ratings of both sexual explicitness and aggression severity will necessarily both be greater than zero. If only one is greater than zero, then you're in the wrong category. If both are zero, then you shouldn't be coding sexual aggression at all.

12. Sexual Explicitness Code. Rate the sexual explicitness of the activity per se, using the same coding scheme you utilized in item 7 above (ie., sexual explicitness per se). Recall that three levels of sexual explicitness are recognized (minimal, moderate, and maximal; coded 1, 3, and 5, respectively), discretionary points are possible, and a "7" may be utilized for extreme instances.

13. Aggression Severity Code. Rate aggression severity per se using the same coding scheme you utilized in item 3 above (ie., aggression severity per se). Recall that three levels of aggression severity are recognized (minimal, moderate and severe; coded 1, 3, and 5, respectively), discretionary points are possible, and a "7" may be utilized in extreme instances.

14. Sexual Aggression Initiation. Was the sexually aggressive interaction mutually initiated? ie., did both/all participants enter in to the sexually aggressive activity of their own accord? Or did some/one of the participants unidirectionally initiate the sexual aggression? Or was the sexual aggression directed toward self? Insert the appropriate code, and proceed to item 14a if mutual or

self-directed, or to item 14b if unidirectional. If the initiation was unclear, or already coded in a previous "sexual aggression" coding sheet, then insert code "4" and proceed to item 15.

   a. Sexual Aggression Initiation: Mutual or Solo. Indicate the gender and apparent age of participants in the sexually aggressive interaction by putting the number of each type in the appropriate space (up to 9 per cell).

   b. Sexual Aggression Initiation: Unidirectional. If the sexual aggression was unidirectionally initiated, then there will be both an initiator or perpetrator(s) and recipient or victim(s). Note the number of each type in each role in the appropriate cells of the respective matrices (up to 9 per cell).

15. Sexual Aggression in Process. Forget about the initiation at this point. Look at the sexual aggression in progress. Is the activity mutual, imbalanced (involving dominant and submissive roles), self-directed, or ambiguous/none of the above? Code the appropriate alternative (see item 9 if you'd like definitions), and proceed to item 15a if mutual or self-directed, to item 15b if imbalanced, and to item 16 if ambiguous/none of the above.

   a. Sexual Aggression Participants: Mutual or Self-Directed. Code the number and type of participants in the matrix, as you have done before.

   b. Sexual Aggression Participants: Imbalanced. Code the

number and type of participants in each role in each
matrix as you have done before.

16. Sexual Aggression Content Codes. A number of sexually
aggressive activities are listed. Code a "1" for those
present in the scene, and a "0" (zero) for those that were
not. Specify any "other" important activities you see that
are not on the list. on your "others".

OVERALL REVIEW SHEET

1. <u>Coder/Movie</u>. You should begin by noting both the coder's first initial and the three digit movie number, to ensure continuity and as a precaution for inadvertant shuffling.

2. <u>Scene Tally</u>. Enter the total number of scenes, ie., coded <u>and</u> non-coded scenes, in the space for item 2a. In section (b), you should note the total number of <u>non-coded</u> scenes only, ie., the total number of scenes which did <u>not</u> involve at least one of sex, aggression, or sexual aggression. Finally, in sections (c), (d) and (e), you should note the total number of scenes in which sex, aggression, and sexual aggression were coded, respectively. Note that the total of a+b+c+d will not necessarily add up to the total number of scenes in (a), since scenes could have been coded on more than one dimension.

3. <u>Overall Potpourri</u>. Listed are a number of questions (3 to 10) which ask you to make some subjective judgements about the video you just watched. These are opinion items and should be seen as no more, no less. Place a "1" in the space beside each item if you think "yes" to the item, place a "2" if you think "no", place a "3" if you are undecided or uncertain, and place a "4" if the question is irrelevant to the video (eg., it asks about aggression and there was no aggression in the video). Finally, note that in question 10, the word "message" should be interpreted liberally as a set

of conclusions one might come to about sexuality (and/or other dimensions) if the director's and scriptwriter's words were heeded. What does this video "say" about sex? About relationships? There may not be a message, but, if there is, spit it out in about 25 words or less.

SCENE SUMMARY SHEET

The purpose of the SCENE SUMMARY SHEET is both to help you keep an inventory of scene numbers as well as to end up with a fairly comprehensive summary of the video. SCENE NUMBERS (along the left) should thus commence at 01 and be incremented by 1 each time. In the four columns under CODING, you should insert a check mark or "X" to indicate the dimension(s) on which the scene was coded (or check "NO" if the scene was non-codeable). This will make it easier for you to do your scene tally figures on the OVERALL REVIEW SHEET. And finally, a BRIEF SYNOPSIS (ie., description of the scene in one or two sentences) should, overall, give the reader a good 'feel' for the content and flow of the movie.

PROVINCE/STATE CODES FOR

COVER SHEET ITEM 7

CODE	PROVINCE/STATE
01	California
02	New York
03	Michigan
04	Illinois
05	British Columbia
06	Ontario
07	Quebec
08	Nevada
09	Ohio

COUNTRY CODES FOR

COVER SHEET ITEM 7

CODE	COUNTRY
1	Canada
2	United States
3	Sweden
4	England
5	Italy
6	France
7	Germany

VIDEO CODING/COVER SHEET

1. CODER [ ] Col.1)

2. MOVIE NUMBER [| | | O | O | 1] (Cols.2-7)

3. DATE (YY/MM/DD) [8 | 4 | | | |] (Cols.8-13

4. VIDEO TITLE _____

5. TAPE STATUS
Col.4
- [ ] 1. ORIGINAL
- [ ] 2. PIRATE
- [ ] 3. CAN'T TELL

6. DATE OF PRODUCTION: 19[|] (Cols.15-16)

7. LOCATION OF PRODUCTION COMPANY: [| |] (Cols.17-19)

8. VIDEO OUTLET CODE: [| |] (Cols.20-22)

9. TYPE OF OUTLET:
Col.23
- [ ] 1. SEX SPECIALIST
- [ ] 2. GENERAL PURPOSE

10. TYPE OF OPERATION
Col.24
- [ ] 1. INDEPENDENT
- [ ] 2. LOCAL CHAIN
- [ ] 3. NATIONAL CHAIN
- [ ] 4. INTERNATIONAL CHAIN
- [ ] 5. UNKNOWN

12. DECLARED CLASSIFICATION:
Col.25
- [ ] 1. ADULT
- [ ] 2. TRIPLE-X
- [ ] 3. UNCLASSIFIED
- [ ] 4. OTHER (SPECIFY)

13. LOCATION OF VIDEO IN OUTLET
Col.24
- [ ] 1. Part of general stock
- [ ] 2. Separate from general stock, but still clearly visible on shelves
- [ ] 3. 'Special' access required
- [ ] 4. Extensive effort required
- [ ] 5. Other (please speeify) _____

14. COMMENTS(eg., regarding video, production info, or outlet).
leave col.27 blank

SDMNC:

| | | | | | | 2 | AGGRESSION |

(Cols. 28-34) (leave Col.35 blank)

3. AGGRESSION SEVERITY [ ] (Col.36)

4. AGGRESSION INITIATION [ ] (Col.37)   (1=mutual; 2=unidirection;
3=self; 4=unclear/*in progress*)

4a/MUTUAL/SELF   OR   4b/UNIDIRECTIONAL

| | (i)INITIATOR(S) | | (ii)RECIPIENT(S) | |
| | M | F | M | F |

	M	F		M	F		M	F
ADULT	(Col.38)	(Col.41)	ADULT	(Col.44)	(Col.47)	ADULT	(Col.50)	(Col.53)
ADOL	(Col.39)	(Col.42)	ADOL	(Col.45)	(Col.48)	ADOL	(Col.51)	(Col.54)
CHILD	(Col.40)	(Col.43)	CHILD	(Col.46)	(Col.49)	CHILD	(Col.52)	(Col.55)

5. AGGRESSION IN PROCESS [ ] (Col.56)   (1=mutual; 2=imbalanced; 3=self-directed; 4=unclear)

5a/MUTUAL/SELF   OR   5b/IMBALANCED

| | (i)PERPETRATOR(S) | | (ii)VICTIM(S) | |
| | M | F | M | F |

	M	F		M	F		M	F
ADULT	(Col.57)	(Col.60)	ADULT	(Col.63)	(Col.66)	ADULT	(Col.69)	(Col.72)
ADOL	(Col.58)	(Col.61)	ADOL	(Col.64)	(Col.67)	ADOL	(Col.70)	(Col.73)
CHILD	(Col.59)	(Col.62)	CHILD	(Col.65)	(Col.68)	CHILD	(Col.71)	(Col.74)

(leave column 75 blank)

6. AGGRESSION CONTENT:

[ ] 1. verbal aggression
        humiliation, threat
(Col.76)

[ ] 2. pushing,
        shoving
(Col.77)

[ ] 3. striking with fist,
        kicking
(Col.78)

[ ] 4. severe beating,
        fight
(Col.79)

[ ] 5. confinement,
(Col.80)

[ ] 6. torture
        dismember
(Col.81)

[ ] 7. attempted
        murder, death
(Col.82)

[ ] 8. weapons
        for threat
(Col.83)

[ ] 9. weapons
        utilized
(Col.84)

[ ] 10. brawl
(Col.85)

[ ] 11. other
(Col.86)

[ ] 12. other
(Col.87)

[ ] 13. other
(Col.88)

[ ] 14. other
(Col.89)

[ ] 15. other
(Col.90)

SDMNC:

| | | | | | | 3 | SEX |

(Cols.28-34)

7. SEXUAL EXPLICITNESS   [   ] (Col.35)
(leave column 36 blank)

8. SEXUAL INITIATION   [   ] (Col.37)   (1=mutual;2=unidirectional;
3=self-directed,4=unclear/in progress)

8a/MUTUAL/SELF   OR   8b/UNIDIRECTIONAL

                              (i)INITIATOR(S)   (ii)SUBMISSIVE(S)

	M	F			M	F			M	F
ADULT	(Col.38)	(Col.41)	ADULT		(Col.44)	(Col.47)	ADULT		(Col.50)	(Col.53)
ADOL	(Col.39)	(Col.42)	ADOL		(Col.45)	(Col.48)	ADOL		(Col.51)	(Col.54)
CHILD	(Col.40)	(Col.43)	CHILD		(Col.46)	(Col.49)	CHILD		(Col.52)	(Col.55)

9. SEX IN PROCESS   [   ] (Col.56) (1=mutual;2=imbalanced;3=solo; 4=unclear)

9a/MUTUAL/SOLO   OR   9b/IMBALANCED

                              (i)DOMINANT   (ii)SUBMISSIVE

	M	F			M	F			M	F
ADULT	(Col.57)	(Col.60)	ADULT		(Col.63)	(Col.66)	ADULT		(Col.69)	(Col.72)
ADOL	(Col.58)	(Col.61)	ADOL		(Col.64)	(Col.67)	ADOL		(Col.70)	(Col.73)
CHILD	(Col.59)	(Col.62)	CHILD		(Col.65)	(Col.68)	CHILD		(Col.71)	(Col.74)

10. AFFECT OF DEPICTION   [   ] (Col.75) (1=super-
positive;2=positive;3=neutral/mechanical;4=negative;5=super-
negative).

11. SEXUAL CONTENT CODES:

(Col.76) [ ] 1. Partial nude display   (Col.81) [ ] 6.Oral-genital contact

(Col.86) [ ] 11.still photo shown

(Col.77) [ ] 2. Full nude display   (Col.82) [ ] 7.'Bought' sex

(Col.87) [ ] 12. Sexual Entertainment (eg., striptease)

(Col.78) [ ] 3. Masturbation (Col.83) [ ] 8.Genital-genital

(Col.88) [ ] 13.Incest

(Col.79) [ ] 4. Voyeurism/ Exhibitionism (Col.84) [ ] 9.Anal sex

(Col.89) [ ] 14.other, deviant

(Col.80) [ ] 5. Fondling of breasts,genitals (Col.85) [ ] 10.'Hardware'

(Col.90) [ ] 15.Other

SDMNC:

| | | | | | | 4 | **SEXUAL AGGRESSION** |

Cols.28-34

12. **SEXUAL EXPLICITNESS CODE** [ ] (Col.35)

13. **AGGRESSION SEVERITY CODE** [ ] (Col.36)

14. **SEXUAL AGGRESSION INITIATION** [ ] (Col.37) 1=mutual; 2=undirectional;
3=self-directed;
4=unclear/in progress)

	14a/MUTUAL/SELF			OR	14b/UNDIRECTIONAL			
					(i)INITIATOR(S)		(ii)RECIPIENT(S)	
	M	F			M	F	M	F
ADULT	(Col.38)	(Col.41)	ADULT		(Col.44)	(Col.47)	(Col.50)	(Col.53)
ADOL	(Col.39)	(Col.42)	ADOL		(Col.45)	(Col.48)	(Col.51)	(Col.54)
CHILD	(Col.40)	(Col.43)	CHILD		(Col.46)	(Col.49)	(Col.52)	(Col.55)

15. **SEXUAL AGGRESSION IN PROGRESS** (Col.56) → [ ] (1=mutual; 2=imbalanced;
3=self-directed; 4=unclear).

	15a/MUTUAL/SELF		OR		15b/IMBALANCED			
					(i)PERPETRATOR		(ii)SUBMIT/VICTIM	
	M	F			M	F	M	F
ADULT	(Col.57)	(Col.60)	ADULT		(Col.63)	(Col.66)	(Col.69)	(Col.72)
ADOL	(Col.58)	(Col.61)	ADOL		(Col.64)	(Col.67)	(Col.70)	(Col.73)
CHILD	(Col.59)	(Col.62)	CHILD		(Col.65)	(Col.68)	(Col.71)	(Col.74)

(leave column 75 blank)

16. **SEXUAL AGGRESSION CONTENT CODES:**

Col.76 [ ] 1. Verbal anger, abuse, humiliation,threat.

[ ] 6. Bondage, confinement (Col.81)

[ ] 11. other(specify) (Col.86) _____

Col.77 [ ] 2. Sexual harassment

[ ] 7. Sexual mutilation (Col.82)

[ ] 12. other(specify) (Col.87) _____

Col.78 [ ] 3. Slapping/hitting/ spanking/hair-pulling

[ ] 8. Coercion with weapons for stimulation (Col.83)

[ ] 13. other(specify) (Col.88) _____

Col.79 [ ] 4. sado-masochism

[ ] 9. Being rough in otherwise usual sexual activity (Col.84)

[ ] 14. other(specify) (Col.89) _____

Col.80 [ ] 5. Mud-wrestling or such, depicted as entertainment

[ ] 10. Rape (Col.85)

[ ] 15. other(specify) (Col.90) _____

OVERALL REVIEW SHEET

1. CODER/MOVIE ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ O O 5 (Cols.92-98)

2. INDICATE

(a) ☐ ☐   total number of scenes in movie
(Cols.99-100)

(b) ☐ ☐   number of non-coded scenes
(Cols.101-102)

(c) ☐ ☐   number of SEX scenes
(Cols.103-104)

(d) ☐ ☐   number of AGGRESSION scenes
(Cols.105-106

(e) ☐ ☐   number of SEXUAL AGGRESSION
(Cols.107-108)

3. ☐ Were there any negative consequences to any participants as a function of their sexual involvements (eg., herpes, unwanted pregnancy, guilt, death)?
(Col.109)

4. ☐ Overall, would you say that aggressive perpetrators were depicted positively in this video? ie. the hero/oine is aggressive, aggressive acts portrayed as acceptance parts of encounters.
(Col.110)

5. ☐ Were there any negative consequences depicted for perpetrators of aggressive activity in this video (eg., just desserts, charges laid, guilt)?
(Col.111)

6. ☐ If you knew someone who was looking for 'good' pornography, would you recommend this video to them?
(Col.112)

7. ☐ Were there any efforts in this video to be "educational" in terms of explicit efforts to endorse particular sexual lifestyles? ie. editorial comments pertaining to appropriate ways of leading one's sexual life?
(Col.113)

8. ☐ Were there any efforts in this video to be "educational" about specific sexual practices?
(Col.114)

9. ☐ Do you feel that the sexually aggressive depictions in this video reaffirm or endorse acceptance of "rape myths".
(Col.115)

10. ☐ Is there a "message" to this film? What is it?
(Col.116)

APPENDIX "B"

List of Coded Videos

List of Video Titles

```
-----------------------------------------------------
Video Title.....................Classification
-----------------------------------------------------

  A Girls Best Friend .................Triple-X

  A Little More Than Love .............Triple-X

  A Scent of Heather ..................Triple-X

  Afternoon Delights ..................Triple-X

  Alice in Wonderland .................Triple-X

  Autumn Born .........................Adult...

  Babyface ............................Triple-X

  Bad Girls ...........................Adult...

  Bad Girls 2 .........................Triple-X

  Barbara Broadcast ...................Triple-X

  Beauty ..............................Triple-X

  Best of Sex and Violence, The .......Adult...

  Big Bird Cage .......................Adult...

  Black Emmanuelle ....................Adult...

  Blonde Next Door, The ...............Triple-X

  Brief Affair ........................Adult...

  Budding of Brie, The ................Triple-X

  California Valley Girls .............Triple-X

  Caligula ............................Adult...
```

French Finishing School ....Triple-X

Fritz the Cat ....Adult...

Gas Pump Girls ....Adult...

Gemini ....Triple-X

Getting Ahead ....Triple-X

Girl From S.E.X., The ....Triple-X

Girls and Their Toys ....Triple-X

Happy Hooker, The ....Adult...

Health Spa ....Adult...

Her Name Was Lisa ....Triple-X

Hey Goodlookin ....Adult...

Honey ....Adult...

I Like to Watch ....Triple-X

Illusions Within Girls ....Triple-X

Indecent Exposure ....Triple-X

In Love ....Triple-X

Innocent, The ....Adult...

Insatiable ....Triple-X

Inside Desiree Cousteau ....Triple-X

Inside Seka ....Triple-X

I Spit on Your Grave ....Adult...

Jailbait ....Triple-X

Jesse St. James's Fantasies ....Triple-X

Johnny Wadd ....Triple-X

Joy ....Adult...

Justine ....Adult...

Kept After School ....Triple-X

111

112