Running head: SFQ factor structure

An exploration of the factor structure of Gray et al.'s Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire

Ross M. Bartels*

University of Lincoln (UK)

Craig A. Harper

Nottingham Trent University (UK)

Acknowledgments: The authors would like thank Elizabeth Deehan, Grace Pringle, and Laura Stretch for collecting the data used in this study.

* Correspondence concerning this article should be directed to Dr Ross Bartels, School of Psychology, University of Lincoln, Brayford Pool, Lincoln, LN6 7TS, UK.

Email: rbartels@lincoln.ac.uk. Telephone: +44 (0)1522 886862

Abstract

The accurate assessment of sexual fantasy use is important for both research and forensic/clinical practice. Although a number of sexual fantasy questionnaires exist, they tend to be associated with high financial cost for researchers, outdated or ambiguous terminology, and/or embody ethical problems arising from overtly explicit items. One measure that does not contain these issues is Gray et al.'s (2003) Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire (SFQ). While the SFQ has recently gained some interest from researchers, it has not been thoroughly validated. Thus, in this study, we combined data from three online survey-based samples ($N = 594$) to examine the factor structure underpinning the SFQ. After conducting parallel and principal components analyses, a six-factor structure was settled upon. The resulting SFQ-revised contained 62-items, with the six factors reflecting the following fantasy themes: (1) masochistic, (2) sadistic, (3) romantic, (4) impersonal, (5) pre/tactile courtship disorder, and (6) bodily function. Data on how the six clusters differ across genders, sexual orientation, and relationship status are also provided. We also developed a short version of the SFQ-revised (37-items) for use when time or space are constrained. The theoretical and methodological significance of the revised SFQs are discussed, as well as recommendations for research and practice.

Key words: sexual fantasies, assessment, principal component analysis, paraphilias, scale

Introduction

Sexual fantasizing refers to the deliberate act of envisaging sexual mental imagery in the form of an elaborated sexual scenario (Bartels & Beech, 2016). This mental imagery, which is “sexually arousing or erotic to an individual” (Leitenberg & Henning, 1995, p. 470), can be based on prior experience or pure imagination (Bartels, Harkins, Harrison, Beard, & Beech, 2017; Davidson, 1985; Sue, 1979). While the content typically reflects one’s primary sexual interest, both in terms of a target category (e.g., men, women, children) or behavioral category (e.g., sadism), they can also convey more specific (or secondary) interests. These can include specific targets (e.g., a current or ex-partner, a famous person) and specific behaviors (e.g., oral sex, whipping), as well as specific locations, such as a beach (Davidson, 1985; Wilson, 1978). Further, the imagery can often involve a combination of the above, such as “oral sex with an ex-girlfriend on a beach” (Turner-Moore & Waterman, 2016, p. 114). It has also been noted that sexual fantasies can portray themes that one finds sexually arousing but does not have an enduring sexual interest in (Joyal, Cossette, & Lapierre, 2015).

Sexual fantasizing is a normal and often healthy sexual activity that can serve useful functions. For example, sexual fantasizing can help induce and increase sexual arousal (Davidson, 1985; Gee, Eccleston, & Ward, 2003), as well as provide a means to indulge in sexual scenarios that one does not wish to (or has not the means to) enact in real-life (Joyal et al., 2015; Wilson, 1978). Moreover, the greater and more diverse use of sexual fantasies is typically linked to greater sexual satisfaction (Leitenberg & Henning, 1995; Rathi, Vankar, Ohri, & Gill, 2017). However, this can be dependent on the fantasy content (Davidson & Hoffman, 1986; Mizrahi, Kanat-Maymon, & Birnbaum, 2018; Trudel, 2002) and the level of guilt associated with sexual fantasizing (Cado & Leitenberg, 1990).

While sexual fantasizing can be indicative of healthy sexual functioning, it can sometimes be linked to clinical and forensic issues. The former relates to issues with the frequency of sexual fantasizing. For example, a persistent infrequent use (or absence) of sexual fantasizing is a key feature of hypoactive sexual disorder (or inhibited sexual desire) in both males (Nutter & Condrón, 1985) and females (Nutter & Condrón, 1983). Conversely, the highly frequent or recurrent use of sexual fantasies is a core feature of hypersexuality (Dyer & Olver, 2016; Kafka, 2010; Walton & Bhullar, 2018). Further, the recurrent use of *particular* sexual fantasies - namely, those relating to nonhuman objects, the suffering or humiliation of oneself or one's partner, children, or non-consenting persons - are a diagnostic criterion for paraphilias. According to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5; APA, 2013), paraphilic content can refer to pedophilia, sadism, masochism, voyeurism, exhibitionism, frotteurism, fetishism, or transvestism. There are also a range of other paraphilias not officially included in the DSM-5, such as biastophilia (sexual arousal to rape or non-consent), necrophilia (sexual arousal to corpses), somnophilia (sexual arousal to sleeping or non-conscious individuals), and zoophilia (sexual arousal to non-human animals). It should be noted, however, that sexual fantasies involving paraphilic content are not uncommon within the general community (Joyal et al., 2015).

Paraphilic sexual fantasies are of particular interest to forensic professionals as they are regarded as an important factor in sexual offending (Bartels & Gannon, 2011; Marshall & Barbaree, 1990; Ward & Beech, 2006). Indeed, sexually fantasizing about offence-related content tends to be correlated with the corresponding behavior (Bouchard, Dawson, & Lalumière, 2017; Williams et al., 2009). For example, a greater use of child-focused sexual fantasies is correlated with contact child sexual abuse (Klein, Schmidt, Turner, & Briken, 2015), while aggressive sexual fantasies are linked to rape offences (Knight & Sims-Knight,

2017). It is theorized that such fantasies provide a motivation to offend (Seto, 2017), as well as an overt and covert means of planning an offence (Gee et al., 2003; Ward & Hudson, 2000).

In light of the above, it is important to have a reliable and valid measure of sexual fantasy use that covers a diverse array of themes. Sexual fantasy questionnaires are the most commonly used form of measurement. They typically involve a list of specific fantasy themes that are scored in terms of their frequency of use, with certain items clustering together into broader overarching themes (e.g., romantic, dominance). A number of questionnaires have been devised over the years. Some have been developed for the purpose of a particular study (e.g., Arndt, Foehl, & Good, 1985; Bogaert, Visser, & Pozzebon, 2015; Crepault & Couture, 1980; Sheldon & Howitt, 2008), while others have been especially devised for other researchers and clinicians to use. Examples include the Male Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire (MSFQ; Smith & Over, 1991), Female Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire (FSFQ; Meuwissen & Over, 1991), Wilson Sex Fantasy Questionnaire (WSFQ; Wilson 1978), and O'Donohue, Letourneau, and Dowling's (1997) paraphilic Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire. Kaufman (1993) also developed a sexual fantasy questionnaire that has been used in some research studies, particularly with adolescent sex offenders (e.g., Daleiden, Kaufman, Hilliker, & O'Neil, 1998). Table 1 summarizes key information about these measures.

Table 1. Summary of questionnaires that measure the use of sexual fantasies.

Scale	Authors	No. of items	Scale type	Subscale labels*	No. of items per subscale	Reliability
Wilson Sex Fantasy Questionnaire	Wilson (1978)	40	Frequency assessed via a Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (frequently)	Intimate	10	$\alpha = .90^a$
				Exploratory	10	$\alpha = .76^a$
				Impersonal	10	$\alpha = .69^a$
				Sadomasochistic	10	$\alpha = .86^a$
Male Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire	Smith & Over (1991)	39	Frequency assessed via a Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (once a day or more often)	Genital	9	$\alpha = .93$
				Public-Sex	8	$\alpha = .90$
				Sensual	6	$\alpha = .86$
				Sexual dominance-submission	9	$\alpha = .90$
				Sexual Aggression	7	$\alpha = .86$
Female Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire	Meuwissen & Over (1991)	52	Frequency assessed via a Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (once a day or more often)	Genital	12	$\alpha = .86$
				Sensual	13	$\alpha = .90$
				Sexual Power	6	$\alpha = .75$
				Sexual Suffering	6	$\alpha = .89$
				Forbidden Sexual Activity	15	$\alpha = .90$
Kaufmann Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire	Kaufman (1993)	127	Frequency assessed via a Likert scale ranging from 0 (never in my life) to 6 (two or more times per day)	Global Deviance		$\alpha = .97^b$
				Global Non-deviance		$\alpha = .95^b$
				Narrow-band subscales		
				Traditional/Romantic	Not Reported	$\alpha = .90^b$
				Variety of Partners		$\alpha = .87^b$
				Variety of Settings		$\alpha = .88^b$
				Non-traditional		$\alpha = .89^b$
				Mild Coercion		$\alpha = .85^b$
				Aggressive		$\alpha = .90^b$

Paraphilic Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire	O'Donohue, Letourneau, & Dowling (1997)	155	Frequency assessed via a Likert scale ranging from 1 (I have never fantasized about this) to 3 (I frequently fantasize about this [at least once a week])	Normal	31	$\alpha = .89$
				Bondage	9	$\alpha = .80$
				Sadism	23	$\alpha = .76$
				Masochism	6	$\alpha = .59$
				Rape	23	$\alpha = .85$
				Other Paraphilia	22	$\alpha = .83$
				Child	14	$\alpha = .92$
Joyal Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire	Joyal, Cossette, & Lapierre (2015)	55	Intensity of interest assessed via a Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to (very strong)	Female Partner Focused	13	Not Reported
				Anonymous	10	
				Eroticized Dominance	11	
				Male Partner Focused	6	
				Paraphilias	8	
				Non-Coital Sexual Activities	5	

Note. All subscales statistically identified (e.g., factor analysis or principal component analysis), except for the Paraphilic Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire. Subscales for the Joyal Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire were identified by Dyer and Olver (2016) using 53 of the 55 items.

^a Cronbach's α reported by Baughman, Jonason, Veselka, and Vernon (2014)

^b Cronbach's α refer to college males reported by Daleiden, Kaufman, Hilliker, & O'Neil (1998).

Probably the most long-standing and commonly used measure is the WSFQ. As shown in Table 1, this 40-item questionnaire was designed to include items that span a range of sexual interests, both typical (e.g., “Receiving oral sex”) and atypical (e.g., “Exposing yourself provocatively”). The scale is comprised of four overarching themes or subscales. Two of these subscales - ‘Intimate’ and ‘Sadomasochistic’ - reflect themes of romance and dominance/submission (respectively) that are common across other measures, including those designed separately for men and women (see Table 1). However, the WSFQ has been criticized for being partially outdated and containing vague/ambiguous items, as well as those describing non-sexual behaviors (Joyal et al., 2015; O’Donohue et al., 1997). There is also a hefty financial cost associated with the online use of the WSFQ (Cymeon Research, 2016), rendering it unobtainable for many researchers wishing to examine sexual fantasy prevalence in the general community at-large. O’Donohue et al. (1997) also noted that the WSFQ contained too few items to adequately assess the use of paraphilic sexual fantasies. This is a particularly important point to note in light of the more recent research showing that sexual fantasies containing paraphilic content are common within the general community (Joyal et al., 2015).

In response to these limitations, O’Donohue et al. (1997) devised a scale primarily focused on assessing paraphilic fantasy use (which we term the Paraphilic Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire; PSFQ). The PSFQ contains 155-items that are grouped (non-statistically) into seven subscales, six of which reflect paraphilic content (see Table 1). The PSFQ also contains items that specify the gender of the other person in the fantasy scenario. Despite these strengths, as well as its sound psychometric properties (O’Donohue et al., 1997), only a few researchers have reported using the PSFQ in the 20 years since its publication (e.g., Seifert, Boulas, Huss, & Scalora, 2017; Skovran, Huss, & Scalora, 2010). One possible reason for this is that the PSFQ contains particularly graphic items (e.g., “Thrusting my penis into a

boy's rear end"), which are likely to pose ethical concerns for many researchers and increase the likelihood of social desirable responding in both forensic and non-forensic samples.

More recently, Joyal et al. (2015) addressed the limitations of the WSFQ by modifying the scale. This involved making some of the items clearer (e.g., adding 'legally' to the item "Having sex with someone much younger than me"), removing certain items (e.g., those about past experiences, petting, and non-sexual behaviors), and adding new ones (e.g., "Having sex with a child under the age of 12 years"). This resulted in a 55-item modified version of the scale, which Dyer and Olver (2016) refer to as the Joyal Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire (JSFQ). A principal components analysis was conducted by Dyer and Olver (2016) on 53 of the JSFQ items, resulting in six factors/subscales (see Table 1). Dyer and Olver argued that the 'Eroticized dominance' and 'Paraphilias' subscales could be considered to contain deviant content. However, the 'Eroticized dominance' subscale also contained items relating to locations (e.g. "having sex in an unusual place"). Moreover, it was comprised of both dominating and submissive behaviors, which may be less useful for those wanting to only assess the use of, for example, submissive fantasies. Similarly, the 'Paraphilias' subscale was comprised of various different paraphilic items, including those related to targets (e.g., "child under the age of 12") and behaviors (e.g., "forcing someone to have sex"). Thus, a greater score on this subscale provides an indication of an individual's general deviance, similar to the 'Global deviance' subscale on Kaufman's (1993) questionnaire. It does not, in and of itself, indicate which specific paraphilic fantasies are used (e.g., someone may score higher on all items except the child-related one). Of course, inspection of the individual items would provide this information. More crucially, the JSFQ does not provide an assessment of 'frequency of use' but rather 'intensity of interest'. That is, people are asked to judge their level of interest towards each fantasy item, instead of than how often they use them. While those who are very interested in a fantasy theme are likely to

use it, it does not necessarily follow that they will use it frequently. Since the act of sexual fantasizing contributes to increased sexual arousal, desire, and motivation to act, a sexual fantasy questionnaire should include ‘frequency of use’ as an outcome variable.

One measure that has started to gain some recent interest by other researchers is Gray, Watt, Hassan, and MacCulloch’s (2003) Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire (SFQ), which consists of 93 items. Six of these items refer to sexual orientation targets (i.e., adult males/females, adolescent males/females, pre-pubescent males/females), while the other 87 refer to specific sexual behaviors. Gray et al. (2003) created the measure to examine the link between indicators of sadistic sexual murder and sadistic sexual fantasies. As such, 15 of the 87 behavioral items reflect sadistic behaviors, while the other 72 are filler items “relating to other types of sexual fantasy (e.g., intimate, exhibitionistic, fetishistic, masochistic)” (Gray et al., 2003, p. 1023). Given the diversity of ‘filler items’, both typical and atypical, the SFQ possesses sufficient variation to be used as a general measure of sexual fantasy use.

However, there are a couple of issues with the SFQ. For example, the first two anchors on the response scale refer to sexual interest (0 = “No sexual interest”, 1 = “Slight sexual interest”), but then switch to the act of sexual fantasizing for the latter two (2 = “Have fantasized about frequently”, 3 = “Cannot get it out of my mind”). This was addressed by Maile (2015) who altered the anchors in a way that provided conceptual consistency across the scale (0 = “Have never fantasized about”, 1 = “Have fantasized about once or twice”, 2 = “Have fantasized about several times”, 3 = “Have fantasized about frequently”, 4 = “Have fantasized about very frequently”). Maile (2015) also converted the response options into a 5-point scale to increase sensitivity. This is an important and useful modification. A second issue is that, at present, the factor structure and psychometric properties of the SFQ are unknown. As a result, some researchers have had to resort to categorizing the items at face-value. For example, in a recent study, Spada and Jeglic (2016) categorized the items into

“normative, rape, paedophilia, sadism, masochism, non-contact (i.e., voyeurism and exhibitionism), and other paraphilias (i.e. necrophilia, frotteurism)” (p. 251). The present study aimed to address this issue by exploring the factor structure of the SFQ and its psychometric properties using a pooled sample of non-forensic community-based individuals.

Method

Participants

Data for this study were pooled together from three online studies that examined sexual interests and fantasies within the general community. The overall sample was comprised of 594 participants (311 males, 270 females, 13 ‘other’; $M_{\text{age}} = 26.19$ years, $SD = 8.72$). Of these, 66% ($n = 394$) were heterosexual, 21% ($n = 125$) were bisexual, 4% ($n = 25$) were homosexual, and 9% ($n = 50$) identified as having another sexual orientation (e.g., ‘pansexual’ or ‘asexual’). Most of the participants were either in a committed relationship (58%) or single (38%), with 4% ($n = 21$) identifying as being in an alternative relationship type (e.g., polyamory, or an open relationship).

Materials and Procedure

For the purpose of this study, we only focused on the 87 behavioral items from Gray et al.’s (2003) Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire (SFQ). That is, the specific sexual behaviors that people mentally envision, rather than the target of their desire. This allowed us to identify factors (or fantasy clusters) based on sexual behaviors alone. From this, researchers/clinicians will be able to ask respondents to complete the SFQ in relation to a specific target (e.g., women, men, children, a current partner), providing a Behavior $\times$ Target assessment of sexual fantasy use. We will return to this important point later in the Discussion. We used the modified response scale version of the SFQ developed by Maile (2015), whereby participants

rate how often they sexually fantasize about each theme on a 5-point scale (0 = “Have never fantasized about” to 4 = “Have fantasized about very frequently”).

Each study (from which the present data were acquired) was administered online using *Qualtrics* survey software. After clicking on a survey web link, all participants were briefed on the nature of the study that they were taking part in, and asked to provide their informed consent. They then provided general demographic data (e.g., age, sex, relationship status), before going to complete the SFQ and other study-specific scales (e.g., proclivity questionnaires). All participants were fully debriefed after completing their respective study. For the purposes of the present paper, only the SFQ and demographic data are analyzed.

Results

Parallel analysis

In order to identify the number of components to extract in subsequent analyses, we first conducted a parallel analysis on the SFQ items. In this type of analysis, the aim is to identify the number of unique components that underpin a given group of variables using a Monte Carlo simulation comprising a series of parallel principal components analyses. From these simulations, it is possible to estimate the eigenvalues of components at the 50th (the mean) and 95th (the threshold for statistical significance) percentiles. If an eigenvalue from a principal component is above that of the 95th percentile of those eigenvalues generated via multiple simulated permutations of the raw data, it can be said to be reliable and significantly represent a discrete component of the initial pool of variables. In essence, this is a more desirable and empirically-rigorous method for determining the number of components underpinning a measure, as opposed to visually observing scree plots, or adhering to Kaiser’s (1960) ‘eigenvalues-greater-than-one’ rule of thumb (Ledesma & Valero-Mora, 2007).

In line with O'Connor's (2000) recommendations, we generated 1000 distinct simulated datasets in order to establish the 50th and 95th percentile estimates for component eigenvalues. The results of this parallel analysis suggested that eight unique components statistically underpinned the 87 behavior-based fantasies listed in the SFQ (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Scree plot created as a function of the parallel analysis of behavior-based SFQ items. Solid line indicates the eigenvalue for each component, as determined by raw data. Dashed line indicates the 95th percentile for the estimated eigenvalue based on 1000 permutations in the parallel analysis. Components become non-significant when the two lines cross.

Principal components analysis

In line with the parallel analysis reported above, we next ran a principal components analysis (PCA) aimed at extracting eight factors. Varimax rotation was used in order to maximize the distinctiveness of each extracted component while still allowing them to be correlated with each other. We also used Field's (2005) recommendation to retain only those items that load on to a factor with a coefficient of at least 0.50. During this analysis, the

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was calculated as 0.95, while Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant ($\chi^2(3741) = 43,914, p < .001$). These statistics indicate that our data for the SFQ were suitable for this type of analysis.

As indicated above, we conducted the PCA with an explicit instruction to extract eight components. However, upon examination of the rotated component matrix, no items loaded significantly on to the eighth component. This was not entirely unexpected, as the eighth component identified through the parallel analysis was only marginally distinct, as compared against the 95th percentile of the eigenvalue estimation. As such, we proceeded with a structure composed of seven components (Table 2).

As indicated in Table 2, 66 of the 87 behavior-based SFQ items loaded significantly on to one of the seven extracted components, with no items loading significantly on to more than one distinct component. From here, we will refer to each component as a 'cluster' of sexual fantasies. In line with the item loadings and internal consistency coefficients provided in Table 2, each of these fantasy clusters represent an empirically distinct group of sexual fantasies.

Table 2. Items loading significantly on to fantasy components of the SFQ, with average component scores and Cronbach's α

	<u>Component number</u>						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Being tortured	.861						
Being physically hurt	.841						
Being humiliated	.821						
Being whipped on non-sexual parts of the body	.817						
Being physically attacked	.801						
Being forced to have sex against your will	.798						
Being controlled	.797						
Being forced to do something non-sexual against your will	.797						
Being whipped on sexual body parts (breasts or genitals)	.795						
Being raped	.771						
Sex while being threatened with a weapon	.769						
Being strangled or asphyxiated (without dying)	.769						
Being bound or tied up	.756						
Being scared by somebody	.749						
Being spanked	.724						

Being drugged or sedated without your knowledge	.611	
Being stalked or secretly followed by somebody	.512	
Physically hurting the person you are having sex with		.803
Torturing others		.801
Raping somebody		.794
Forcing somebody to have sex against their will		.788
Humiliating somebody		.780
Controlling others		.751
Scaring somebody		.750
Forcing somebody to do something non-sexual against their will		.746
Sex while threatening someone with a weapon		.742
Physically injuring the person you are having sex with		.731
Whipping somebody else		.701
Strangling or asphyxiating others (without killing)		.689
Physically attacking someone		.689

Drugging or sedating another person for sexual reasons	.617	
Tying someone up	.607	
Spanking others	.595	
Stalking or secretly following somebody	.532	
Passionate kissing		.766
Touching intimate places		.722
Sex in beautiful places		.706
Touching non-intimate places		.650
Receiving oral sex		.639
Sex on silk or satin sheets		.635
Being masturbated by another person		.627
Romantic sexual contact with somebody you know		.612
Wearing sexy underwear		.562
Giving oral sex		.547
Masturbating in front of another person		.539
Anonymous sexual contact with a stranger		.632
Sex in toilets with strangers		.626
Sex with somebody you don't like		.577
Sex with multiple partners		.576

Watching others have sex	.532						
Being watched whilst having sex	.513						
Sex whilst watching hard pornography	.506						
Frottage (rubbing yourself against others)					.676		
Others rubbing themselves against you					.655		
Making obscene phone calls					.638		
Receiving obscene phone calls					.633		
Exposing your genitals to somebody					.593		
Somebody exposing themselves to you					.548		
Defecating (shitting) on a partner						.723	
Having a partner defecate (shit) on you						.709	
Urinating (pissing) or somebody						.546	
Having a partner urinate (piss) on you						.531	
Vomiting							.687
Receiving threatening phone calls							.586
Making others vomit							.569
Making threatening phone calls							.564
Mean component score (<i>SD</i>)	1.05 (1.09)	0.76 (0.88)	2.14 (0.86)	1.34 (1.04)	0.74 (0.89)	0.33 (0.61)	0.09 (0.35)
Internal consistency (Cronbach's α)	0.97	0.95	0.89	0.88	0.86	0.73	0.75

Note. Only items that load significantly on to a distinct component (loadings > 0.50) are listed. Full item loadings are available upon request. No items loaded significantly on to more than one component.

For clarity of presentation, the names and an example item from each cluster are provided in Table 3. As demonstrated in Table 3, the seventh cluster was comprised of sexual fantasies about vomit and threatening phone calls (both in terms of active and passive behaviors). Thus, while this component is empirically distinct within the PCA, it is difficult to conceptually define in terms of an overarching theme. As such, it likely to be of little use to researchers or clinicians, and so was dropped from the model and all subsequent analyses. This resulted in a final scale with 62 items.

Table 3. Fantasy cluster names and example items

Cluster name	Example items
Masochistic fantasies	Being humiliated Being forced to have sex against your will
Sadistic fantasies	Raping somebody Controlling others
Romantic fantasies	Passionate kissing Touching intimate places
Impersonal fantasies	Anonymous sexual contact with a stranger Sex with multiple partners
Pre/tactile courtship disorder fantasies	Frottage (rubbing yourself against others) Exposing your genitals to somebody
Bodily function fantasies	Having a partner defecate (shit) on you Having a partner urinate (piss) on you
Vomit/Threatening calls	Vomiting Receiving threatening phone calls

We further conducted correlational analyses in order to examine the various relationships between the fantasy clusters. As demonstrated in Table 4, all clusters were significantly related to each other (all p 's < .001), with correlation coefficients small-to-moderate in terms of effect size. Further, the clusters were not collinear, supporting our

analyses and assertions above regarding their distinctiveness as specific clusters of sexual fantasies.

Table 4. Zero-order correlations between SFQ-R fantasy clusters

Fantasies	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Masochistic	-					
2. Sadistic	.24	-				
3. Romantic	.44	.47	-			
4. Impersonal	.50	.55	.61	-		
5. Pre/tactile Courtship Disorders	.41	.49	.53	.62	-	
6. Bodily functions	.31	.47	.33	.49	.37	-

Note. All correlations are statistically significant at $p < .001$.

Alternative forms of the SFQ

A visual inspection of Table 2 demonstrates that there is an uneven number of items in each of the emerging fantasy clusters. This potentially poses an issue for the usability of the scale, as the measure as a whole is weighted heavily in the direction of masochistic and sadistic sexual fantasies. This is perhaps unsurprising, this this being the focus of Gray et al.'s (2003) initial research with the measure. To address this, we conducted further analyses to afford researchers the opportunity to use either: (1) the full 62-item 'Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire - Revised' (SFQ-R), which contains all the items that significantly loaded on to one of the six clusters identified above; or (2) a 'Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire-Revised - Short Version' (SFQ-R-SV), for situations where brevity is required. We created the short version by retaining the seven highest-loading items within each of the larger clusters (i.e., masochistic, sadistic, and romantic fantasies), along with all the items within the impersonal, pre/tactile courtship disorders, and bodily functions fantasy clusters (as these had a maximum of seven items loading on to them).

To examine the psychometric equivalence of the alternative forms of the SFQ-R, we conducted correlational analyses between the full and short versions of the affected fantasy clusters. We found evidence for very strong correlations between the full and short versions of the masochistic cluster ($r(592) = .97, p < .001$), the sadistic cluster ($r(592) = .98, p < .001$), and the romantic cluster ($r(592) = .98, p < .001$). As such, we recommend the use of the SFQ-R-SV as a reliable alternative to the SFQ-R when survey space is at a premium.

Demographic differences in SFQ-R scores

To provide preliminary normed data for the SFQ-R, we examined demographic differences across the six fantasy clusters. We conducted a 2 (Participant Sex: Male vs. Female) x 2 (Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual vs. Non-Heterosexual) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), with average fantasy cluster scores as dependent variables. For necessity, participants were only included in this analysis if they identified as a specific sex ($n = 581$). For clarity of presentation, significant effects are presented below, with estimated marginal means presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Estimated marginal means for SFQ-R fantasy clusters, by Participant Sex and Sexual Orientation

	<u>Cluster Number</u>					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Men						
Heterosexual	0.59 (0.06)	0.98 (0.05)	2.12 (0.06)	1.44 (0.06)	0.74 (0.06)	0.37 (0.04)
Non-Heterosexual	0.92 (0.12)	1.06 (0.10)	2.04 (0.11)	1.56 (0.13)	1.02 (0.11)	0.58 (0.08)
All	0.75 (0.06)	1.02 (0.06)	2.08 (0.06)	1.50 (0.07)	0.88 (0.06)	0.47 (0.04)
Women						
Heterosexual	1.12 (0.08)	0.34 (0.07)	2.09 (0.07)	0.95 (0.09)	0.50 (0.07)	0.12 (0.05)
Non-Heterosexual	1.18 (0.09)	0.63 (0.07)	2.28 (0.08)	1.42 (0.09)	0.83 (0.08)	0.33 (0.05)
All	1.48 (0.06)	0.48 (0.05)	2.19 (0.05)	1.19 (0.06)	0.66 (0.05)	0.22 (0.04)

Note. Figures represent estimated marginal means calculated within the MANOVA test, with ± 1 SE in parentheses.

There was a significant multivariate main effect of Participant Sex (Wilks' $\lambda = 0.70$, $F(6, 572) = 41.87$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.31$). This effect was driven by men scoring higher on (i.e., more frequently using) the following fantasy clusters:

1. Sadistic fantasies: $M_{\text{difference}} = 0.54$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.08$, 95% $CI_{\text{difference}}$ [0.39, 0.69];
2. Impersonal fantasies: $M_{\text{difference}} = 0.32$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.02$, 95% $CI_{\text{difference}}$ [0.13, 0.50];
3. Pre/tactile courtship disorder fantasies: $M_{\text{difference}} = 0.22$, $p = .007$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.01$, 95% $CI_{\text{difference}}$ [0.06, 0.38];
4. Bodily function fantasies: $M_{\text{difference}} = 0.25$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.04$, 95% $CI_{\text{difference}}$ [0.14, 0.36].

Masochistic fantasies were used more frequently by women than by men, $M_{\text{difference}} = 0.73$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.10$, 95% $CI_{\text{difference}}$ [0.55, 0.91]. There was no sex difference in relation to romantic fantasies, $M_{\text{difference}} = 0.10$, $p = .195$, partial $\eta^2 < 0.01$, 95% $CI_{\text{difference}}$ [-0.05, 0.26].

There was also a significant multivariate main effect of Sexual Orientation (Wilks' $\lambda = 0.78$, $F(6, 572) = 8.10$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.08$). There was no effect of Sexual Orientation in relation to use of romantic sexual fantasies, $M_{\text{difference}} = 0.06$, $p = .494$, partial $\eta^2 < 0.01$, 95% $CI_{\text{difference}}$ [-0.10, 0.21]). However, non-heterosexual participants were found to more frequently use:

1. Masochistic fantasies: $M_{\text{difference}} = 0.53$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.08$, 95% $CI_{\text{difference}}$ [0.35, 0.70]
2. Sadistic fantasies: $M_{\text{difference}} = 0.19$, $p = .017$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.01$, 95% $CI_{\text{difference}}$ [0.03, 0.34];

3. Impersonal fantasies: $M_{\text{difference}} = 0.30$, $p = .002$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.02$, 95% $CI_{\text{difference}}$ [0.11, 0.48];
4. Pre/tactile courtship disorder fantasies: $M_{\text{difference}} = 0.30$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.02$, 95% $CI_{\text{difference}}$ [0.15, 0.46];
5. Bodily function fantasies: $M_{\text{difference}} = 0.21$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.03$, 95% $CI_{\text{difference}}$ [0.10, 0.32].

Finally, there was no significant multivariate interaction between Participant Sex and Sexual Orientation (Wilks' $\lambda = 0.98$, $F(6, 572) = 1.55$, $p = .161$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.02$). However, when examining individual interactions in relation to each fantasy cluster, there was a significant effect for masochistic fantasies, $F(1, 577) = 14.54$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.01$. Decomposing this interaction, heterosexual participants sexually fantasized about masochistic behaviors less frequently than non-heterosexual participants, with this effect being significantly greater among females ($M_{\text{difference}} = 0.72$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.06$, 95% $CI_{\text{difference}}$ [0.49, 0.95]) than among males ($M_{\text{difference}} = 0.33$, $p = .015$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.01$, 95% $CI_{\text{difference}}$ [0.06, 0.60]). There were no interactions between Participant Sex and Sexual Orientation in relation to sadistic, romantic, impersonal, pre/tactile courtship disorders, or bodily function fantasies.

We further examined whether those participants in a relationship differed in terms of the content of their sexual fantasies from those who were single. In these analyses, we excluded those who stated that they were in an alternative relationship structure. Thus, these analyses are based on a subset of the overall sample ($n = 571$). We observed significant differences between those participants who were single vs. in a relationship across all fantasy clusters, with the exception of pre/tactile courtship disorder fantasies. Those in a relationship were more likely to express having sexual fantasies involving masochism, sadism, romance, impersonal themes, and bodily functions, compared to single participants. These differences

were generally small-to-medium in magnitude. Descriptive and inferential statistics are provided in Table 6.

Table 6. SFQ cluster differences in participants who were single vs. in a committed relationship

	Single (<i>n</i> = 226)	Relationship (<i>n</i> = 345)	
Fantasy cluster	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Inferential statistics
Masochistic	0.77 (0.95)	1.21 (1.13)	$t(535) = 5.10, p < .001, d = 0.42$
Sadistic	0.62 (0.77)	0.81 (0.91)	$t(531) = 2.59, p = .010, d = 0.23$
Romantic	1.95 (0.88)	2.26 (0.83)	$t(569) = 4.29, p < .001, d = 0.36$
Impersonal	1.13 (0.97)	1.45 (1.07)	$t(513) = 3.72, p < .001, d = 0.31$
Pre/tactile courtship disorders	0.65 (0.84)	0.79 (0.92)	$t(569) = 1.78, p = .076, d = 0.16$
Bodily functions	0.24 (0.51)	0.37 (0.65)	$t(552) = 2.79, p = .006, d = 0.22$

Note. Unequal degrees of freedom are present as the scores for the masochistic, sadistic, impersonal, and bodily functions fantasy clusters did not pass Levene's test for equality of variances ($ps < .05$). As such, equal variances between the two relationship groups could not be assumed for these cluster

Finally, we correlated age with each of the six fantasy clusters. With increasing age, there were significant positive correlations with sadistic ($r(591) = .14, p = .001$), romantic ($r(591) = .14, p = .001$), impersonal ($r(581) = .21, p < .001$), and bodily function fantasies ($r(591) = .16, p < .001$). However, these correlations were weak in magnitude, and statistical significance in these cases is likely attributable to the large sample size. Age was not associated with masochistic ($r(591) = -.03, p = .510$) or pre/tactile courtship disorder fantasies ($r(591) = .07, p = .105$).

Discussion

The aim of this paper was to examine the component structure underpinning the behavior-based items of Gray et al.'s (2003) SFQ measure. Using a parallel analysis, we identified eight components that statistically comprised the SFQ. However, after a principal

components analysis, no items loaded significantly (> 0.50 ; Field, 2005) on to the eighth component. As such, we argue that the SFQ is comprised of seven clusters of sexual fantasies, comprising themes related to (1) masochism, (2) sadism, (3) romance, (4) impersonal sexual activities, (5) pre/tactile courtship disorders, (6) bodily functions, and (7) vomit/threatening calls. Each of these clusters were psychometrically distinct (no items loaded significantly on to more than one cluster), moderately positively correlated with the other clusters, and possessed excellent levels of internal consistency. However, the seventh cluster was deemed conceptually ambiguous and, thus, of little use to researchers. As a result, we dropped it from the final revised scale and subsequent analyses, leaving a six-component structure.

In terms of demographic differences in scores on our identified fantasy clusters, men sexually fantasized more frequently about sadistic, impersonal, pre/tactile courtship disorder, and bodily function themes, while women reported a greater use of masochistic fantasies. There was no sex difference regarding the use of romantic fantasies. In relation to sexual orientation, heterosexual participants sexually fantasized less frequently across all clusters or themes, compared to participants who identified as having a non-heterosexual sexual orientation. The only exception to this general trend was in relation to romantic fantasies, where there was no difference between heterosexual and non-heterosexual participants. Participants who were in a relationship at the time of data collection reported more frequent use of all fantasy clusters, with the exception of pre/tactile courtship disorder fantasies. Age was generally unrelated to any fantasy cluster (r 's $< .21$).

Theoretical and conceptual significance

With sexual fantasy questionnaires, factor analytically-derived clusters will inevitably reflect the range and number of items present within the measure (Leitenberg & Henning,

1995; Smith & Over, 1991). In light of this, and with the aim of Gray et al.'s (2003) original study in mind, we expected to find a cluster comprised of sadistic items. We also anticipated other clusters reflecting the range of paraphilic and non-paraphilic 'filler' items within the SFQ. In line with these expectations, we identified a sadistic cluster comprised of fantasies about dominance, control, humiliation, physical injury, and rape. The 'anal sex' item did not load on to this cluster, which is in line with previous research suggesting that this behavior is not a core feature of sexual sadism (Marshall, Kennedy, Yates, & Serran, 2002).

A distinct masochistic cluster also emerged. This stands in contrast to the PCA analyses of other sexual fantasy questionnaires, where sadistic/dominance items are clustered together with masochistic/submissive items (Arndt et al., 1985; Dyer & Olver, 2016; Smith & Over, 1991; Wilson, 1978). The clustering of sadistic and masochistic items can be problematic because any group differences on these two fantasy behaviors will be difficult to determine without examining individual items. Indeed, males and females tend to not differ on fantasy subscales that combine sadistic and masochistic items (Dyer & Olver, 2016; Wilson & Lang, 1981). Thus, the distinction of these two SFQ clusters in the present study is useful as it allows researchers to examine them separately. For example, we found that males scored higher than females on the sadistic cluster, while females scored higher on the masochistic cluster, which corresponds with previous research (Joyal et al., 2015; Leitenberg & Henning, 1995).

Consistent with previous studies (Arndt et al., 1985; Kaufman, 1993; Meuwissen & Over, 1991; Smith & Over, 1991; Wilson, 1978), a fantasy cluster comprised of romantic behaviors also emerged from the PCA. This cluster contained fantasies involving non-paraphilic behaviors that are common to both men and women, regardless of their self-reported sexual orientation. Further to this, a cluster comprised of impersonal behaviors was identified. A similar cluster of the same name was also found for the WSFQ (Wilson, 1978),

as well as the modified version (JSFQ), which Dyer and Olver (2016) labeled as ‘Anonymous’. Supporting prior research, males scored higher on this cluster than females (Dyer & Olver, 2016; Ellis & Symons, 1990; Wilson & Lang, 1981).

The final two clusters each contained items describing paraphilic behaviors. In previous research, other paraphilic items tend to load on to a single factor, such as the ‘Paraphilia’ factor in Dyer and Olver’s (2016) study. However, in our study, we found two distinct, conceptually meaningful paraphilic clusters. The first contained active and passive forms of exhibitionism, frotteurism, and obscene phone calling (a verbal form of exhibitionism often referred to as ‘telephone scatologia’). These items reflect some of the paraphilias related to the theory of *courtship disorder* (Freund & Blanchard, 1986; Freund, Scher, & Hucker, 1983). According to this theory, there are typically four phases of human courtship: (1) locating a potential partner; (2) pretactile interaction (e.g., looking, smiling, talking); (3) tactile interaction; and (4) copulatory interaction. Distortions in each of these phases can be expressed as a paraphilic behavior; namely, voyeurism (locating a partner), exhibitionism, including obscene phone calls (pretactile interaction), frotteurism (tactile interaction), and preferential rape (copulatory interaction). Thus, in the aforementioned cluster, the exposing and obscene phone call items reflect distortions in the pretactile phase of human courtship, while the frottage items relate to the tactile phase. As such, we named this cluster ‘pre/tactile courtship disorder fantasies’, given that voyeuristic fantasies loaded on to the impersonal cluster (similar to the WSFQ and JSFQ) and rape fantasies loaded on to the sadistic cluster.

Finally, the second paraphilic cluster contained items relating to active and passive forms of urophilia (sexual arousal related to urination) and coprophilia (sexual arousal related to feces/defecation). As such, we labeled this cluster ‘bodily function fantasies’. Should any researchers be interested in investigating urophilic and coprophilic fantasies/interests, given

that both are under-researched topics (Briken, Klein, & von Franqué, 2016), the bodily functions cluster provides an empirically-sound subscale to do so.

Methodological significance

A secondary aim of our research was to develop a usable and psychometrically-strong version of the SFQ that researchers can use confidently and with relative ease. At present, research on sexual fantasy content is based around a small number of established measures, such as the WFSQ (Wilson, 2010), the MSFQ (Smith & Over, 1991), the PSFQ (O'Donohue et al., 1997), and other study-specific measures (e.g., Arndt et al., 1985). There are methodological and pragmatic issues in each of these alternatives, whether they be linked to item ambiguity (WFSQ), scale length (PSFQ; Kaufman's SFQ; Gray et al.'s original SFQ), the expense associated with the use of the scales (WFSQ), the explicitness of the items and concerns about institutional/ethical approval (PSFQ), or the subjective grouping of items (PSFQ; Gray et al.'s original SFQ). As such, we sought to create a freely-available and psychometrically strong version of the SFQ (i.e., the SFQ-R), as well as a more accessible shorter version for researchers with minimal survey space (i.e., the SFQ-R-SV).

We found that 66 fantasy items significantly loaded on to one of the seven SFQ components. Further, as mentioned earlier, we removed the seventh component from the revised scale due to being conceptually ambiguous in its content. Thus, the final 62-item SFQ-R reduces the length of the original SFQ by 34%. However, we acknowledge that a 62-item scale may still be an onerous task for some participants, particularly those taking part in online surveys with high rates of attrition (Zhou & Fishbach, 2016), or for researchers operating in clinical or forensic settings. As such, we created the SFQ-R-SV by including only the best-loading seven items from the masochistic, sadistic, and romantic fantasy clusters, along with all items from the impersonal, pre/tactile courtship disorder, and bodily

functions fantasy clusters (as these had a maximum of seven items). This is a shorter, 37-item scale that is psychometrically identical to the SFQ-R (r correlation coefficients between the full and reduced clusters $> .90$).

The full item list for both the SFQ-R and SFQ-R-SV are provided in the Appendix, including two added open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire. As recommended by Joyal et al. (2015), the first open-ended question asks respondents to write a favorite sexual fantasy that was not included in the questionnaire. The second asks respondents to write out their favorite sexual fantasy scenario that includes multiple behaviors, thus, providing a context for how certain sexual behaviors are combined in fantasy. We also provide a blank datasheet and scoring syntax for the SFQ-R (and SFQ-R-SV), which can be downloaded at [OSF WEBLINK TO BE ADDED AFTER BLIND REVIEW]. Our hope is that the open-access nature of the SFQ-R will enable researchers to use and easily score the measure in future studies without error.

Future directions

By specifying a clear operational definition of the term ‘sexual fantasizing’, along with using Maile’s (2015) conceptually consistent response scale (see Appendix), the revised SFQs presented in this paper provide researchers and clinicians with a reliable means to assess how often an individual deliberately fantasizes about a variety of specific sexual behaviors, as well as six overarching thematic clusters. Four of these clusters convey behaviors related to an overarching paraphilic theme. These include sadistic and masochistic themes, meaning that researchers and clinicians can easily assess sadistic and masochistic fantasies separately. The other two are pre/tactile courtship disorder fantasies and bodily functions fantasies. Researchers are encouraged to use these SFQ subscales in future research, as they represent two themes that have received little attention in the academic

literature. The final two clusters represent common romantic sexual behaviors and impersonal sexual behaviors, respectively. The latter may be of interest to sexual aggression researchers, as an interest in impersonal sexual behavior is theorized to be an etiological component of male sexual aggression (Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes, & Acker, 1995).

Previous PCA studies using sexual fantasy questionnaires have identified clusters containing target-specific items. For example, the Paraphilia cluster in Dyer and Olver's (2016) study contained items relating to pedophilia and zoophilia in addition to behavioral items. In the present study, only behavioral SFQ items were used in the PCA. Thus, none of the clusters contain target-specific items, such as adult males or females, children, a current or ex-partner, or a famous person. As such, the SFQ can be completed in relation to a particular target, providing a Behavior x Target assessment of sexual fantasizing. For example, non-exclusive (heterosexual) male pedophiles could be asked to complete the SFQ in relation to women as the target, and then again with children as the target. This will provide a clearer indication of what behaviors are being fantasized about with respect to adult women and children separately. For example, sadistic behaviors may be fantasized more in relation to adult women, while romantic behaviors may be envisioned more often with children. Using the SFQ in this manner (i.e., multiple administration per participant) highlights an added benefit of the short version. It should also be noted that, if researchers or clinicians are interested in a specific item from the original scale that did not load on to a cluster (e.g., anal sex, sex with a dead person), they can be easily added into the scale. This would provide an assessment of the six clusters, along with the specific item/s of interest that was added in.

In conclusion, a parallel analysis and PCA of the behavioral items from Gray et al.'s (2003) Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire ultimately led to identification of a six-factor structure. The surviving 62 items (i.e., that loaded above 0.5) were used to formulate the SFQ-R, along

with a 37-item short version (the SFQ-R-SV) comprised of the most strongly loading items per cluster. Each fantasy cluster contained items that are conceptually linked, conveying a range paraphilic and non-paraphilic fantasy themes. The clusters also demonstrated very good psychometric properties (e.g., internal consistency), as well as (expected) differential patterns of use across genders. We hope that this information will encourage researchers and clinicians to use the revised SFQs, particularly those interested in assessing the use of sexual fantasies that involve less conventional sexual behaviors.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: Author.
- Arndt, W. B., Foehl, J. C., & Good, F. E. (1985). Specific sexual fantasy themes: A multidimensional study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 472–480. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.48.2.472.
- Bartels, R. M., & Beech, A. R. (2016). Theories of deviant sexual fantasy. In D. P. Boer (Vol. Ed.), In D. Boer (Ed.), *Theories, assessment and treatment of sexual offending* (pp. 165–186). New York: Wiley.
- Bartels, R. M., & Gannon, T. A. (2011). Understanding the sexual fantasies of sex offenders and their correlates. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 16, 551–561. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2011.08.002.
- Bartels, R. M., Harkins, L., Harrison, S. C, Beard, N., & Beech, A. R. (2017). The effect of bilateral eye-movements versus no eye-movements on sexual fantasies. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 59, 107-114. doi:10.1016/j.jbtep.2018.01.001.

- Bogaert, A. F., Visser, B. A., & Pozzebon, J. A. (2015). Gender differences in object of desire self-consciousness sexual fantasies. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 44, 2299–2310. doi:10.1007/s10508-014-0456-2.
- Bouchard, K. N., Dawson, S. J., & Lalumière, M. L. (2017). The effects of sex drive and paraphilic interests on paraphilic behaviours in a nonclinical sample of men and women. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 26, 97–111. doi:10.3138/cjhs.262-a8.
- Briken, P., Klein, V., & von Franqué, F. (2016). Other specified paraphilic disorders. In R. Balon (Ed.), *Practical guide to paraphilia and paraphilic disorders* (p. 187-196). Springer: Cham.
- Cado, S., & Leitenberg, H. (1990). Guilt reactions to sexual fantasies during intercourse. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 19, 49–63. doi:10.1007/BF01541825.
- Crépault, C., & Couture, M. (1980). Men's erotic fantasies. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 9, 565–581. doi:10.1007/BF01542159.
- Cymeon Research (2016). *Wilson Sex Fantasy Questionnaire*. Retrieved from: <http://cymeon.com/all-products/wilson-sex-fantasy-questionnaire>. [July 27, 2018].
- Daleiden, E. L., Kaufman, K. L., Hilliker, D. R., & O'Neil, J. N. (1998). The sexual histories and fantasies of youthful males: A comparison of sexual offending, nonsexual offending, and nonoffending groups. *Sexual Abuse*, 10, 195–209. doi:10.1023/A:1021365804076.
- Davidson, Sr., J., & Hoffman, L. E. (1986). Sexual fantasies and sexual satisfaction: An empirical analysis of erotic thought. *Journal of Sex Research*, 22, 184–205. doi:10.1080/00224498609551299.

- Davidson Sr, J. K. (1985). The utilization of sexual fantasies by sexually experienced university students. *Journal of American College Health*, 34, 24-32.
doi:10.1080/07448481.1985.9939614.
- Dyer, T. J., & Olver, M. E. (2016). Self-reported psychopathy and its association with deviant sexual fantasy and sexual compulsivity in a nonclinical sample. *Sexual Offender Treatment*, 11, 1–18.
- Ellis, B. J., & Symons, D. (1990). Sex differences in sexual fantasy: An evolutionary psychological approach. *Journal of Sex Research*, 27, 527–555.
doi:10.1080/00224499009551579.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London: Sage.
- Freund, K., & Blanchard, R. (1986). The concept of courtship disorder. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 12, 79–92. doi:10.1080/00926238608415397.
- Freund, K., Sher, H., & Hucker, S. (1983). The courtship disorders. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 12, 369–379. doi:10.1007/BF01542881.
- Gee, D., Ward, T., & Eccleston, L. (2003). The function of sexual fantasies for sexual offenders: A preliminary model. *Behaviour Change*, 20, 44-60.
doi:10.1375/bech.20.1.44.24846.
- Gray, N. S., Watt, A., Hassan, S., & MacCulloch, M. J. (2003). Behavioral indicators of sadistic sexual murder predict the presence of sadistic sexual fantasy in a normative sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 1018–1034. doi:10.1177/0886260503254462
- Joyal, C. C., Cossette, A., & Lapierre, V. (2015). What exactly is an unusual sexual fantasy? *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 12, 328–340. doi:10.1111/jsm.12734
- Kafka, M. P. (2009). Hypersexual disorder: A proposed diagnosis for DSM-V. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39, doi:10.1007/s10508-009- 9574-7.

- Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20, 141-151. doi:10.1177/001316446002000116.
- Kaufman, K.L. (1993). *Sexual fantasy questionnaire*. Available from author, Portland, OR: Portland State University.
- Klein, V., Schmidt, A. F., Turner, D., & Briken, P. (2015). Are sex drive and hypersexuality associated with pedophilic interest and child sexual abuse in a male community sample? *PLoS One*, 10, 1–11. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0139533.
- Knight, R. A., & Sims-Knight, J. E. (2016). A theoretical integration of aetiological and typological models of rape. In D. Boer (Ed.), *Theories, assessment and treatment of sexual offending* (pp. 73–102). New York: Wiley.
- Ledesma, R. D., & Valero-Mora, P. (2007). Determining the number of factors to retain in EFA: An easy-to-use computer program for carrying out parallel analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 12. Retrieved from: <http://pareonline.net/pdf/v12n2.pdf>.
- Leitenberg, H., & Henning, K. (1995). Sexual fantasy. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 469–496. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.469.
- Maile, J. S. (2015). *The effects of mood and perceived cost on self-disclosure of deviant sexual fantasies and behavior*. Doctoral thesis, City University of New York, USA.
- Malamuth, N. M., Linz, D., Heavey, C. L., Barnes, G., & Acker, M. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men's conflict with women: A 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 353–369. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.69.
- Marshall, W. L., & Barbaree, H. E. (1990). An integrated theory of the etiology of sexual offending. In W. L. Marshall, D. R. Laws, & H. E. Barbaree (Eds.), *Handbook of*

- sexual assault: Issues, theories, and treatment of the offender* (pp. 257–275). New York: Plenum Press.
- Marshall, W. L., Kennedy, P., Yates, P., & Serran, G. (2002). Diagnosing sexual sadism in sexual offenders: Reliability across diagnosticians. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 46, 668-677.
doi:10.1177/0306624X02238161.
- Meuwissen, I., & Over, R. (1991). Multidimensionality of the content of female sexual fantasy. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 29, 179–189. doi:10.1016/0005-7967(91)90046-6.
- Mizrahi, M., Kanat-Maymon, Y., & Birnbaum, G. E. (2018). You haven't been on my mind lately: Partner responsiveness mediates the link between attachment insecurity and sexual fantasies. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 35, 440-459.
doi:10.1177/0265407517743083.
- Nutter, D. E., & Condon, M. K. (1983). Sexual fantasy and activity patterns of females with inhibited sexual desire versus normal controls. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 9, 276-282. doi:10.1080/00926238308410914.
- Nutter, D. E., & Condon, M.K. (1985). Sexual fantasy and activity patterns of males with inhibited sexual desire and males with erectile dysfunction versus normal controls. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 11, 91–98. doi:10.1080/00926238508406074.
- O'Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components using a parallel analysis and Velicer's MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods*, 32, 396-402. doi:10.3758/BF03200807.
- O'Donohue, W., Letourneau, E. J., & Dowling, H. (1997). Development and preliminary validation of a paraphilic sexual fantasy questionnaire. *Sexual Abuse*, 9, 167-178.
doi:10.1007/BF02675062.

- Rathi, P., Vankar, G., Ohri, N., & Gill, A. (2017). Sexual fantasies in Indian male. *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*, *14*, doi:10.1016/j.jsxm.2017.04.449.
- Seifert, K., Boulas, J., Huss, M. T., & Scalora, M. J. (2017). Response bias on self-report measures of sexual fantasies among sexual offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *61*, 269-281. doi: 10.1177/0306624X15593748.
- Seto, M. C. (2017). The motivation-facilitation model of sexual offending. *Sexual Abuse*, Advanced online version. doi:1079063217720919.
- Sheldon, K., & Howitt, D. (2008). Sexual fantasy in paedophile offenders: Can any model explain satisfactorily new findings from a study of internet and contact sexual offenders? *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *13*, 137–158. doi:10.1348/135532506X173045.
- Skovran, L. C., Huss, M. T., & Scalora, M. J. (2010). Sexual fantasies and sensation seeking among psychopathic sexual offenders. *Psychology, Crime, and Law*, *7*, 617–629. doi:10.1080/10683160902998025.
- Smith, D., & Over, R. (1991). Male sexual fantasy: Multidimensionality in content. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *29*, 267– 275. doi:10.1016/0005-7967(91)90117-L.
- Spada, A. H., & Jeglic, E. L. (2016). A cognitive-based indicator of deviant sexual interest: Concurrent validation of the Stroop task. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, *22*, 246-262. doi:10.1080/13552600.2015.1078000.
- Sue, D. (1979). Erotic fantasies of college students during coitus. *Journal of Sex Research*, *15*, 299–305. doi:10.1080/00224497909551053.
- Trudel, G. (2002). Sexuality and marital life: Results of a survey. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, *28*, 229–249. doi:10.1080/00926 2302760328271.

- Turner-Moore, T., & Waterman, M. (2017). Men presenting with sexual thoughts of children or coercion: Flights of fancy or plans for crime? *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 14, 113-124. doi:10.1016/j.jsxm.2016.11.003.
- Walton, M. T., & Bhullar, N. (2018). Hypersexuality, higher rates of intercourse, masturbation, sexual fantasy, and early sexual interest relate to higher sexual excitation/arousal. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, Advanced online version, 1-7. doi:10.1007/s10508-018-1230-7.
- Ward, T., & Beech, A. R. (2006). An integrated theory of sexual offending. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 11, 44–63. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2005.05.002.
- Ward, T., & Hudson, S. M. (2000). Sexual offenders' implicit planning: A conceptual model. *Sexual Abuse*, 12, 189-202. doi: 10.1023/A:1009534109157.
- Williams, K. M., Cooper, B.S., Howell, T. M., Yuille, J. C., & Paulhus, D. L. (2009). Inferring sexually deviant behavior from corresponding fantasies: The role of personality and pornography consumption. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36, 198-222. doi:10.1177/0093854808327277.
- Wilson, G. D., & Lang, R. J. (1981). Sex differences in sexual fantasy patterns. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 2, 343-346. doi:10.1016/01918869(81)90093-3.
- Wilson, G. (1978). *The secrets of sexual fantasy*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons.
- Zhou, H., & Fishbach, A. (2016). The pitfall of experimenting on the web: How unattended selective attrition leads to surprising (yet false) research conclusions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 111, 493-504. doi:10.1037/pspa0000056.

Appendix:

Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire-Revised

Sexual fantasizing is the deliberate act of mentally envisioning a sexual scenario in your mind's eye. This does **not** include fleeting sexual thoughts that spontaneously 'pop into your mind' for a few seconds.

On the following questionnaire, please indicate the frequency in which you sexually fantasize about the following sexual behaviors using the scale provided.

Response scale:

- 0 = have never fantasised about
- 1 = have fantasised about once or twice
- 2 = have fantasised about several times
- 3 = have fantasised about frequently
- 4 = have fantasised about very frequently

No.	Item	Fantasy Cluster
1	Being spanked	Masochistic
2	Sex whilst watching hard pornography ^a	Impersonal
3	Anonymous sexual contact with a stranger ^a	Impersonal
4	Whipping somebody else	Sadistic
5	Having a partner urinate (piss) on you ^a	Bodily functions
6	Being drugged or sedated without your knowledge	Masochistic
7	Watching others have sex ^a	Impersonal
8	Physically attacking someone	Sadistic
9	Being humiliated ^a	Masochistic
10	Making obscene phone calls ^a	Courtship disorder
11	Being strangled or asphyxiated (without dying)	Masochistic
12	Sex while being threatened with a weapon	Sadistic
13	Being physically attacked ^a	Masochistic
14	Sex on silk or satin sheets ^a	Romantic
15	Giving oral sex	Romantic
16	Wearing sexy underwear	Romantic
17	Defecating (shitting) on a partner ^a	Bodily functions
18	Raping somebody ^a	Sadistic
19	Having a partner defecate (shit) on you ^a	Bodily functions

20	Others rubbing themselves against you ^a	Courtship disorder
21	Sex in toilets with strangers ^a	Impersonal
22	Being stalked or secretly followed by somebody	Masochistic
23	Being forced to have sex against your will ^a	Masochistic
24	Forcing somebody to have sex against their will ^a	Sadistic
25	Sex with multiple partners ^a	Impersonal
26	Physically hurting the person you are having sex with ^a	Sadistic
27	Frottage (rubbing yourself against others) ^a	Courtship disorder
28	Receiving obscene phone calls ^a	Courtship disorder
29	Receiving oral sex ^a	Romantic
30	Torturing others ^a	Sadistic
31	Being physically hurt ^a	Masochistic
32	Being whipped on sexual body parts (breasts or genitals)	Masochistic
33	Being masturbated by another person ^a	Romantic
34	Exposing your genitals to somebody ^a	Impersonal
35	Physically injuring the person you are having sex with	Sadistic
36	Forcing somebody to do something non-sexual against their will	Sadistic
37	Scaring somebody ^a	Sadistic
38	Controlling others ^a	Sadistic
39	Masturbating in front of another person	Romantic
40	Being tortured ^a	Masochistic
41	Spanking others	Sadistic
42	Being forced to do something non-sexual against your will	Masochistic
43	Sex with somebody you don't like ^a	Impersonal
44	Being scared by somebody	Masochistic
45	Touching non-intimate places ^a	Romantic
46	Stalking or secretly following somebody	Sadistic
47	Being bound or tied up	Masochistic
48	Sex while threatening someone with a weapon	Sadistic
49	Drugging or sedating another person for sexual reasons	Sadistic

50	Being watched whilst having sex ^a	Impersonal
51	Humiliating somebody ^a	Sadistic
52	Being whipped on non-sexual parts of the body ^a	Masochistic
53	Strangling or asphyxiating others (without killing)	Sadistic
54	Tying someone up	Sadistic
55	Somebody exposing themselves to you ^a	Courtship disorder
56	Being controlled ^a	Masochistic
57	Passionate kissing ^a	Romantic
58	Urinating (pissing) on somebody ^a	Bodily functions
59	Being raped	Masochistic
60	Sex in beautiful places ^a	Romantic
61	Touching intimate places ^a	Romantic
62	Romantic sexual contact with somebody you know	Romantic

- If a favourite sexual fantasy of yours was not included in the list, please write it below:

- People often combine fantasies from the list above into one scenario (e.g., receiving oral sex while being tied up). Please write your favorite sexual fantasy scenario that combines multiple behaviors:

^a Item used in the SFQ-R-SV.