What About "He Said, He Said?"

The Effect of Rape Myth Acceptance and Extra-Legal Factors on Blame

Attributions

by

Suzanne Coble

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Master of Science

Approved April 2017 by the Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Cassia Spohn, Chair Stacia Roosevelt Jacob Young

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2017

## ABSTRACT

Many authors have shown that "real victim," "real rape," and traditional gender role stereotypes affect how people attribute blame to victims and perpetrators of sexual assault, and that jury decisions in rape cases are likewise influenced by extralegal factors, such as how much the victim resisted. Most studies *only* focus on the acceptance of rape myths and stereotypes about female victims, while myths and stereotypes about male victims are largely ignored. It is unknown how female rape myth acceptance (FRMA) and male rape myth acceptance (MRMA) may differently affect victim and perpetrator blame attributions. Whether the juror influences the effect of extra-legal factors on rape perceptions is also unknown. Using a randomized vignette design, the current study investigates 1) the effect of rape myth acceptance and gender attitudes on victim and perpetrator blame attributions, 2) how blame attributions differ by victim gender, level of resistance, and victim-perpetrator relationship, and 3) how the juror role influences the effects of rape myth acceptance and extra-legal factors on blame attributions. Results show that FRMA and MRMA are both positively associated with victim blame and negatively associated with perpetrator blame, that male victims are blamed more than female victims, and that jury membership does not influence the effect of extra-legal factors on blame attributions. Victim resistance and victim-perpetrator relationship also affected rape perceptions in unexpected ways. Implications for rape prevention programing, police and prosecutor decision-making, and jury selection are discussed.

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to thank my committee members for their help and support during this learning experience. Thank you, Cassia, for inspiring this project and for your guidance along the way. Thank you, Jacob, for your patience and statistical expertise. Thank you, Stacia, for your many insightful suggestions and enthusiasm.

I also want to thank my family: my father for always encouraging me to dig deeper, my mother for reminding me it is ok to be greedy, and my brother and sister, for s teaching me humility through laughter.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	. v
LIST OF FIGURES	vi
INTRODUCTION	. 1
LITERATURE REVIEW	. 5
THE CURRENT STUDY	29
METHODS	33
RESULTS4	41
DISCUSSION	49
CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS	57
TABLES	72
FIGURES	89
REFERENCES	96
APPENDIX	
A VIGNETTE EXAMPLES 1	04

# LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Sample Characteristics	72
2.	Attitude Scale Characteristics	73
3.	Victim and Perpetrator Blame Scale Items and Response Distribution	74
4.	Male Rape Myth Acceptance Scale Items and Response Distribution	75
5.	Female Rape Myth Acceptance Scale Items and Response Distribution	76
6.	Gender Attitude Inventory Subscale Items and Response Distribution	77
7.	Effect of Victim Resistance on Blame Attributions in Female Rape	78
8.	Effect of Dating Relationship on Blame Attributions in Female Rape	79
9.	Effect of Rape Myth Acceptance on Blame Attributions in Female Rape	80
10.	Effect of Victim Resistance on Blame Attributions in Male Rape	81
11.	Effect of Dating Relationship on Blame Attributions in Male Rape	82
12.	Effect of Male Rape Myth Acceptance on Blame Attributions in Male Rape.	83
13.	Comparison of Effect Sizes of Male and Female Rape Myth Acceptance	84
14.	Effect of Victim Gender on Blame Attributions	85
15.	Effect of Victm Gender-Resistance Interaction on Victim Blame	86
16.	Effect of Victim Gender-Resistance Interaction on Perpetrator Blame	86
17.	Effect of Jury Membership on Blame Attributions	87
18.	Summary of Hypotheses and Results	88

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	Distribution of Victim Blame Scores	89
2.	Distribution of Perpetrator Blame Scores	89
3.	Distribution of Male Rape Myth Acceptance Scores	89
4.	Distribution of Fenale Rape Myth Acceptance Scores	90
5.	Distribution of Traditional Gender Attitude Scores	90
6.	Distribution of Acceptance of Female Sexual Initiative Scores	90
7.	Distribution of Acceptance of Female Casual Sex Scores	91
8.	Distribution of Condemnation of Homosexuality Scores	91
9.	Distribution of Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scores	91
10.	Effect of Female Rape Myth Acceptance on Blame Attributions	92
11.	Effect of Male Rape Myth Acceptance on Blame Attributions	92
12.	Comparing Effects Sizes of Female and Male Rape Myth Acceptance	93
13.	Effects of Extra-Legal Factors on Blame Attributions	93
14.	Effect of Jury Membership on Blame Attributions	94
15.	Effect of Incident and Participant Characteristics on Victim Blame	94
16.	Effects of Incident and Participant Characteristics on Perpetrator Blame	95

# INTRODUCTION

Rape and sexual assault remain a serious problem in the United States. Almost 17 percent of women and about three percent of men will be sexually victimized in their lifetimes (Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network). College students are at particularly high risk, and university campuses are veritable hotspots of sexual assault perpetration. The Campus Sexual Assault Study found that 19 percent of college women and over six percent of college men were victims of attempted or completed sexual assault while in college (Krebs *et al.*, 2007), while other studies suggest much higher estimates of victimization (Humphrey & White, 2000; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Schwartz & Pitts, 1995).<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, according to a 2014 report by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the rate and prevalence of sexual assault and rape has not followed the same decreasing trend as other types of violent crime (Truman & Langton, 2015). While this in part may result from definitional changes that are more inclusive—such as the rape of men and spouses—research indicates that legal reforms over the last 40 years that were meant to decrease perpetration and increase reporting, prosecution, and conviction of sexual assault incidents, have had little success. Indeed, in their analysis of the implementation of rape law reforms in six major urban jurisdictions, Spohn and Horney (1992) found that changes were primarily symbolic, affecting the ideologies of criminal justice practitioners

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The vast range in prevalence estimates of sexual assault reported by various studies depends primarily on the question(s) used to ask about victimization experiences. Studies that name the experience as "a crime," "rape," or "sexual assault" typically report lower prevalence. Other studies that describe experiences in terms of specific sexual behavior that is "unwanted" or "coerced" find many more women and men have been victimized. Koss and colleagues (1987) reported 44% of college women reported "unwanted sexual contact," and Humphrey and White (2000) report that 69.8% of college women in their sample experienced some form of sexual victimization (from "unwanted contact" to "rape") since age 14.

more than their actual practices. More recently, Spohn and Tellis (2013) found that police and prosecutors continue to treat rape cases differently from other violent crime, holding these cases to a higher standard of proof than legally required to go forward with an investigation. Cases are often dismissed based on extralegal factors, including victim credibility or engagement in risky behavior, that makes them problematic or difficult to prove (Spohn & Tellis, 2013). Moreover, the instrumental benefits that have occurred are seen primarily in cases of stranger rape, which reflects the persistence of "real rape" and "real victim" stereotypes that blame victims in cases of acquaintance and intimate-partner rape, despite legal and ideological changes (Spohn & Horney, 1992, Spohn & Tellis, 2013).

These rape supportive attitudes impede instrumental change in rape reporting, prosecution, and conviction at various levels of the criminal justice system. One study found that only 9.7 percent of cases reported to the police resulted in criminal charges being filed, and most of the factors predicting the filing of charges were extralegal (Alderden & Ullman, 2012). Delays in reporting are especially suspect, as both police officers and prosecutors tend to believe that a delay represents victim culpability, false reporting, or an inaccurate identification of the incident as rape (Stewart, Dobbin & Gatowski, 1996). Perceptions of victim credibility are also based on the victim's behavior and character, especially demonstrations of non-consent through resistance, risky or "precipitative" behavior, and moral disposition (Campbell & Johnson, 1997; Gunn & Johnson, 1995; Minch, Linden, & Johnson, 1987; Page, 2007). When these extralegal factors indicate that victims diverge from the "real victim" stereotype, victims are perceived as less credible, and their cases are often dismissed without so much as an investigation.

Police and prosecutors' decisions to bring a case to trial are also affected by consistency with the "real rape" stereotype through expectations about convictability. Even though suspects are more likely to be identified in acquaintance rape, when identified, suspects in stranger rape incidents are more likely to be questioned and arrested by the police (Frazier & Haney, 1996; Tasca *et al.*, 2013). This suggests that police believe cases of acquaintance rape are harder to prosecute successfully (Frazier & Haney, 1996). Likewise, prosecutors are more likely to file charges when they believe that the jury will find the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt and may pursue only those cases they believe will result in conviction (Spohn, Beichner & Davis-Frenzel, 2001; Spohn & Tellis, 2013).

The use of physical force, presence of injuries, proof of penetration, and promptness of the report are the most influential factors determining police officers' decisions to arrest and prosecutors' decisions to charge a suspect (Alderden & Ullman, 2012; Frazier & Haney, 1996; Gunn & Linden, 1995; Minch, Linden, & Johnson, 1987; Spohn, Beichner & Davis-Frenzel, 2001; Spohn & Horney, 1992). Some authors suggest that these factors are evidentiary requirements related to standards of proof and due process. Therefore, the emphasis on "real rape" characteristics may be a result of police and prosecutors allocating scarce resources to those cases most likely to gain favorable results (Frazier & Haney, 1996). However, even though they are still the main elements by which prosecutors define legitimate, prosecutable cases, injuries, proof of penetration, and prompt reporting are no longer components of the legal definition of sexual assault and should not be relevant to its prosecution (Alderden & Ullman, 2012; Feldman-Summer & Palmer, 1980; Frazier & Haney, 1996). Adherence to these outdated standards perpetuates stereotypes that define rape incidents and rape victims narrowly and inaccurately.

Concerns about convictability cause a trickle-down process by which the expected opinions and decisions of juries indirectly affect police officers' and prosecutors' decisions to bring a case to trial. The use of jury opinion to inform police and prosecutors' decision making is dangerous because jurors often depend on gender role expectations and rape myths to inform their decisions, especially when the incident under deliberation deviates from "real rape" or "real victim" stereotypes (Ellison & Munro, 2013; Eyssel & Bohner, 2011). Unfortunately, to the extent that jurors have traditional gender role expectations, adversarial sexual beliefs, interpersonal violence acceptance (Burt, 1980), female precipitation beliefs (Krahé, Temkin, & Bieneck, 2006), ingroup biases (Harrison et al., 2008), and rape myth acceptance (Bieneck & Krahé, 2011; Burt, 1980; Ellison & Munro, 2013; Eyssel & Bohner, 2011; Gerger et al., 2007; Krahé, Temkin & Bieneck, 2006; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983), they are likely to make determinations of blame and responsibility based on extra-legal factors that support or oppose their schemas of "real rape." This process is self-perpetuating and selfreinforcing. Juries rely on the same social norms and expectations about gender, sex, and violence that define "real rape" and its characteristics, which in turn determine the cases that are prosecuted by prosecutors, investigated by police, reported by victims, and acknowledged by members of society.

It may be that police and prosecutors' concern with jury responses to extralegal indicators of victim credibility and case convictability is misguided. Much of the literature investigating rape perceptions among lay persons and mock jury samples is based on rape scenarios that themselves reflect "real rape" and "real victim" stereotypes. The current study investigates the effect of rape myth acceptance on victim and perpetrator blame attributions in rape scenarios that reflect more common, though less stereotypical, incidents of rape. Varying the level of victim resistance, victim-perpetrator relationship, and victim gender of incidents in which all victims engage in risky and precipitative behavior can shed light on the way individuals perceive guilt and responsibility in the cases least likely to be prosecuted. Furthermore, comparing groups of mock jurors and non-jurors can help identify the effect of the juror role on these perceptions.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

#### Rape Myth Acceptance and Traditional Gender Role Expectations

In 1980, Martha Burt used the term *rape myths* to describe "prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists" (p. 217) that minimize or neutralize the violent, harmful nature of rape, effectively exonerating perpetrators and blaming victims. She further linked endorsement of such myths to other social attitudes, including acceptance of interpersonal violence, sex role stereotyping, sexual conservatism, and adversarial sexual beliefs. Other authors have noted that rape myth acceptance (RMA) is higher among men than women, and tends to be positively associated with traditional gender role attitudes and oppressive and discriminatory beliefs in general (Black & McCloskey, 2013; Davies, Gilston, & Rogers, 2012; Hockett *et al.*, 2009; Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderup, 2000; Suarez & Gadalla, 2010).<sup>2</sup>

Some myths define what rape is, who can be raped, and who is to blame if a rape occurs. For example, "real rape" includes only those incidents in which a credible woman is suddenly and forcefully penetrated by a stranger, without her consent and despite utmost resistance, resulting in injury, and an immediate reporting of the incident (Estrich, 1987). Likewise, "real victims" must reflect the social ideals of femininity. As such, a woman who dresses in revealing clothing, behaves provocatively, or drinks, effectively "consents" to any sexual activity (Estrich, 1987; Stewart, Dobbin, & Gatowski, 1996). Furthermore, as men are considered unable to control themselves once aroused—the "uncontrollable male sex drive" myth—it is the responsibility of women to avoid dressing and behaving in provocative ways if they do not want to have sex (Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999; Walker, 1997). Women who dress and act in ways that are inconsistent with feminine gender role expectations cannot be "real victims" because they precipitate their own rapes. (Amir, 1971).

Even "real victims" can be blamed for their rapes if their resistance does not result in injury. Myths such as "Many women secretly desire to be raped," "Many women find being forced to have sex very arousing," and "If a woman doesn't physically resist sex...it can't really be considered rape," redefine rape as consensual, noncriminal sex (Estrich, 1987; Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999). Because passivity is an expected quality of femininity, the "rape as fantasy" myth not only permits sexual violence perpetration, but

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Various studies have linked rape myth acceptance with ageism, classism, racism, religious intolerance, and homophobia (Berger *et al.*, 2008; Black & McCloskey, 2013; Davies, Gilston, & Rogers, 2012; Krahé, Temkin, & Bieneck, 2007; Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderup, 2000; Suarez & Gadalla, 2010).

encourages it as the only acceptable form of female sexual fulfilment (Estrich, 1987). Accordingly, men who use force are simply fulfilling the desires of insatiable women who are socially prohibited from being sexually aggressive themselves (Edwards, Bradshaw, & Hinsz, 2014; Estrich, 1987). Such myths legitimize male sexual violence against women by neutralizing perpetrator culpability and shifting all the responsibility for both rape and rape prevention onto the victim. To the extent that individuals endorse rape myths, these myths are likely to affect how they perceive of rape incidents, rape victims, and rape perpetrators.

## The Effect of Rape Myth Acceptance on Female Rape Perceptions

Research has consistently found that individuals with high RMA tend to blame victims more and perpetrators less, especially in incidents that deviate from the "real rape" or "real victim" stereotypes. For example, a sober woman who physically resists the sexual assault of a stranger is blamed less than an intoxicated, nonresistant woman who is raped by an acquaintance or dating partner. Furthermore, studies find that respondents' blame attributions are mediated by their endorsement of rape myths and traditional gender roles (Berger *et al.*, 2008; Black & McCloskey, 2013; Grubb & Turner, 2102; Harrison *et al.*, 2008; Krahé, Temkin, & Bieneck, 2007; Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderup, 2000). It may be that for individuals with high RMA and traditional gender attitudes, incident and victim characteristics that deviate from "real rape," "real victim," and feminine gender role stereotypes are more salient than the gender-conforming behavior of male aggressors, which results in a focus on the victim and her perceived "precipitation" of the incident rather than the perpetrator's violence.

Victim-Perpetrator Relationship and Victim's Sexual History. Many rape perception studies have focused on the effects of three incident characteristics-victimperpetrator relationship, level of resistance, and victim intoxication—on respondents' attributions of victim and perpetrator blame (Berger *et al.*, 2008; Black & McCloskey, 2013; Krahé, Temkin, & Bieneck, 2007; Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderup, 2000; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983). People who endorse rape myths tend to blame victims more, and perpetrators less, as the victim-perpetrator relationship increases in intimacy. In a randomized vignette survey that examined respondents' victim and perpetrator blame attributions over three conditions of victim-perpetrator relationshipstranger, acquaintance, and ex-partner—Berger and colleagues (2008) found that victim blame was highest in the ex-partner rapes, followed by acquaintance and then stranger rapes. Furthermore, the disparity in blame attributions for victims and perpetrators depending on their level of past intimacy is greatest among respondents with high RMA (Berger et al., 2008; Krahé, Temkin, & Bieneck, 2007). As such, individuals with high RMA are more influenced by victim-perpetrator relationship when attributing blame to victims and perpetrators than individuals who do not endorse these myths.

It may be that victim-perpetrator relationship affects blame attributions via expectations about the victim's past sexual history. One study compared victim blame across three conditions of dating relationship—early dating, late dating, and married and found that victims were blamed more when they were described as having had sex with the perpetrator in the past, regardless of the actual dating condition (Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderup, 2000). The addition of sexual intimacy information enables individuals to speculate about the nature of the sexual relationship

between the victim and perpetrator. In a study of a mock jury deliberation in an exintimate partner rape trial with intentionally ambiguous physical evidence—the results of the rape exam were inconclusive—Ellison and Munro (2013) noted that some "jurors" speculated that rough sex may have been a normal aspect of the couple's sexual routine, and blamed the alleged victim for ambiguously communicating her sexual intent. Participants focused on the woman's behavior, referencing gender norms and drawing on their own experiences to define more appropriate means of communication and interaction (Ellison & Munro, 2013). This kind of supposition is less likely in cases of stranger rape because there is no past sexual intimacy between victim and perpetrator upon which to make such assumptions. As such, victims who have been intimate with the perpetrator in the past, or had the opportunity to be intimate due to their acquaintance, dating, or marriage relationship are blamed more than victims raped by strangers when their behavior can be construed as ambiguous or inconsistent with prescribed (gendered) rules of sexual communication.

Another possibility, as Harrison and colleagues (2008) found, is that *any* sexual history can increase victim blame (Harrison *et al.*, 2008), suggesting that promiscuous women are blamed more for their rapes than chaste women, even if the perpetrator is not a current or past partner. Traditional gender roles demand that women maintain an image of sexual innocence and docility—comportment that is simultaneously meant to protect them from sexual aggression of easily aroused men—and deviations from this ideal are considered sexually provocative and therefore rape precipitative (Ashmore, Del Boca, & Bilder, 1995; Burt, 1980; Estrich, 1987). Women who are perceived as promiscuous have not only failed in their femininity performances; they also lack the protections

afforded by those performances. In this way, speculations about the victim's sexual history minimize the perceived harm caused by the rape, shed doubt on the credibility of her claims, and blame her for provoking the assault with provocative, gender deviating behavior.

Level of Resistance. Other rape perception studies focus on the level and timing of the victim's of resistance. In a randomized vignette study, Black and McCloskey (2013) found that victims of a date rape were blamed more when they verbally resisted, compared to when they resisted both verbally and physically, especially by respondents who endorsed traditional gender roles. Futher, other have found that submissive, passive, or incapacitated victims are blamed more than victims who resist physically (Davies, Rogers, & Whiteleg, 2009; Kassing & Prieto, 2003; Krahé, Tempkin, & Bieneck, 2007; Berger *et al.*, 2008). Many rape myths suggest that the incident can only be considered rape if the victim resists. These myths depend on the belief that resistance is the normal response to unwanted sexual advances. As such, women who do not resist either "secretly desire to be raped" (Estrich, 1987; Payne, Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1999)— another myth—or are responsible because they could have prevented the rape by resisting.

Even though many perceive resistance as the "natural" response to forced sexual contact and as necessary to demonstrate non-consent, the resistance expectation effectively shifts the focus from the perpetrator's violence to the victim's reaction, defining it as consent if she fails to resist. However, because traditional gender expectations fetishize women as sexually insatiable while simultaneously demanding their innocence and passivity, some resistance is expected of women in order to maintain

the façade of chastity (Estrich, 1987). Rape-as-fantasy myths specifically define the use of force as appropriate in sexual encounters with women, and many studies have shown that men who endorse more traditional gender roles (Loh et al., 2005), who believe that "most women say 'no' at first most times" (Abbey & McAuslan, 2004, p. 753) and who have perceived "token resistance" from dates in the past (Krahé, Scheinberger-Olwig, & Kolpin, 2000) are more likely to commit sexual assault. Therefore, people who believe that all women secretly want to be raped are more likely to perceive their resistance as a feigned feminine response to desired sex. Appellate court judges of the 20<sup>th</sup> century regularly construed incidents of violent rape as "love play" in which the confused girl, not knowing her own desires, actually enjoyed the physical struggle (Estrich, 1987, p. 39). This representation of resistance underlines a conflicting, though not atypical, portrayal of women as both submissive virgins and coy temptresses. On the one hand, she is supposed to be passive and chaste, yet on the other, she is imagined to be sexually aggressive, even kinky, and enjoys being sexually dominated (Estrich, 1987; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983). As such, only "utmost" resistance-that is, resistance resulting in severe physical injury—is perceived as a true expression of non-consent (Estrich, 1987, p. 33). In all other circumstances, resistance is a façade of innocence intended to hide the woman's true, deviant nature.

Even if the level of resistance is enough to indicate non-consent, victims may still be held responsible for the rape if their resistance is delayed. Kopper (1996) found that victims who resisted late in a sexual encounter with an acquaintance were blamed more than victims who resisted early, while the rapists were blamed less. Furthermore, participants with high RMA were more likely than participants with low RMA to believe

that the rape could have been avoided when resistance occurred late, but not when it occurred early (Kopper, 1996). This finding demonstrates that the victim's behavior, including precipitative foreplay and resistance are more salient in people's attributions of blame when they endorse more rape myths. Individuals who endorse myths defining rape as the result of the man's uncontrollable sex drive may blame victims more for the rape if they are perceived to have aroused the perpetrator. As such, victims who engage in some sexual behavior with a partner may be held responsible for their victimizations even if they later resist to the utmost (Estrich, 1987). In an experimental vignette design randomizing the level of force (violence) and the onset of resistance during a date rape scenario, Shotland and Goodstein (1983) found that participants blamed the victim the most when she protested late in the sexual encounter, even if she physically resisted her partner's sexual escalation. Furthermore, participants were least likely to define the incident as rape in the low force-late onset condition, even when they indicated that the man's actions were wrong (Shotland & Goodstein, 1983). The combination of perceived sexual desire on the part of the victim with the low level of force used and the late onset of resistance enabled participants to view this scenario more in terms of sex than violence. As such, respondents perceived the rape less as a crime and more as an unhappy ending to an otherwise pleasant sexual encounter, blaming the victim for her rape because she failed to stop her date before he became too aroused to control himself.

**Victim and Perpetrator Intoxication**. One important rape myth suggests that women are at least partially to blame if they are raped while intoxicated (Longsway, Payne, & Fitzgerald, 1999). Indeed, Harrison and colleagues (2008) found that participants blamed the victim more and the perpetrator less when the victim in the

scenario was drunk. Likewise, Berger *et al.* (2008) found that even victims whose alcohol-induced incapacitation is exploited by perpetrators are blamed more than those who are raped by force. Participants with high levels of RMA are especially likely to blame incapacitated victims and to find perpetrators of incapacitated rape less liable than perpetrators of forcible rape (Krahé, Tempkin, & Beineck, 2006).

There are several possible explanations for the effect of intoxication on blame attributions. Because alcohol use is often viewed as risky behavior, intoxicated victims may be blamed more than sober victims, simply because they put themselves at greater risk for any crime. When comparing incidents of robbery and rape, Bieneck and Krahé (2011) reported that victims were blamed less, and perpetrators blamed more, when victims were sober in both types of violent crime. However, the difference in amount of blame attributed to the victim and perpetrator in the rape case was much greater than in the robbery case, indicating that intoxication has a greater negative impact on responses to rape victims than victims of other violent crimes (Bieneck & Krahé, 2011). On the other hand, intoxicated perpetrators are blamed less than sober perpetrators (Grubb & Turner, 2012; Richardson & Campbell, 1982) such that male intoxication excuses their behavior and minimizes their responsibility. This creates a double standard, whereby intoxication increases victim blame but decreases perpetrator blame (Grubb & Turner, 2012). When both victim and perpetrator are intoxicated, participants are least likely to perceive the incident as rape, suggesting that the presence of alcohol not only affects how victims and perpetrators are blamed but how individuals interpret the incident (Abbey et al., 2004; Norris & Cubbins, 1992). Clearly the blaming of intoxicated rape victims is more than an issue of negligence or risky behavior. Rather, the presence of alcohol

interacts with the perceived sexual nature of rape to affect participants' perceptions of victim and perpetrator responsibility.

Given that alcohol use is traditionally a masculine activity, female victims who drink may be blamed more than sober victims simply for violating traditional gender norms (Abbey *et al.*, 2004; Burt, 1980). The feminine ideal assumes a woman is sexually pure and innocent, and as long as she behaves accordingly, she is less likely to be blamed for provoking a rape. However, women who violate traditional gender roles, including by drinking alcohol, are nolonger perceived as chaste and virtuous. Indeed, women who drink in general are often perceived as more sexual and promiscuous than women who do not drink (Abbey, Zawacki, & Buck, 2003; Abbey *et al.*, 2004). Furthermore, because alcohol is believed to increase sexual arousal, its intentional use by women, especially in a dating situation, may be perceived as an invitation for sex (Abbey *et al.*, 2004). Therefore, intoxicated victims are blamed for causing their own rapes because, regardless of their actual sexual intent, their drinking communicates sexual desire through its violation of traditional feminine roles meant to protect her from unwanted advances.

It appears that the presence of alcohol highlights the sexual nature of the incident over the violence. If the victim intoxication increases her perceived interest in sex, then the rape that follows may be perceived as sex. Indeed, when a victim is intoxicated, observers are more likely to perceive the incident as consensual sex than rape even if she resists (Abbey *et al.*, 2004). Defining rape as sex shifts the focus away from the violent motivations of the perpetrator to the ineffective communication of the victim, so that instead of the perpetrator being blamed for his violent actions, the victim is blamed for incorrectly or ineffectively communicating sexual interest.

Unfortunately, studies that measure the effect of victim intoxication on rape perceptions typically represent it as a form of coercion or exploitation by the perpetrator so that the victim is either physically forced to have sex against her will, or her intoxicated state is exploited. Emphasis in recent years on date rape drugs used by predatory rapists to induce incapacitation may be perpetuating a new "real victim" stereotype that includes drunk and high victims only if their intoxication results in incapacitation. This can explain why more recent rape perception literature reports less victim blame when the perpetrator uses alcohol or drugs to induce victim incapacitation purposefully (Hockett *et al.*, 2015). In some ways this is a positive development. However, in the Campus Sexual Assault Study, Krebs and colleagues (2007) reported that drug-facilitated rape is quite rare, and the focus on this stereotype may increase the risk of sexual assault if individuals fail to expect or recognize less stereotypical threats such as when a victim *willingly* consumes some alcohol with a friend or dating partner, who later forces her to have sex. In a longitudinal study of rape victimization among college women, Turchik and colleagues (2009) reported that women who endorsed specific rape scripts (such as the "real rape" stereotype) were more likely to experience forms of sexual victimization that conflicted with these stereotypes, and were less likely to acknowledge these incidents as sexual assault. Therefore, even seemingly positive changes in rape scripts and stereotypes can have dire consequences on individuals who endorse them.

Contrary to the scenarios used in most rape perception studies, exploitation of a victim's intoxication and the use of physical force are not mutually exclusive. In fact, both perpetrator force and victim resistance may be a function of their respective

intoxication and interactions between all these factors (Ullman *et al.*, 1999). Furthermore, alcohol is implicated in most rapes among young adults (Abbey, et al., 2004; Krebs et al, 2006; Rickert & Wiemann, 1998; Weiss, 2010). As most rape perception studies use college samples, it seems more appropriate to present scenarios that align with rape incidents that they are most likely to confront during their college experience. Indeed, it may be that individuals' direct or indirect experiences with rape have a greater influence on blame attributions than rape myths (Hockett, Saucier, & Badke, 2015). Therefore, the current study investigates the effect of rape myth acceptance on victim and perpetrator blame in rape scenarios that vary by level of resistance and victim-perpetrator relationship, but that keep the level of intoxication (not incapacitation) of both the victim and the perpetrator and the amount of foreplay (precipitative behavior) constant across all conditions.

## The Effect of Male Rape Myth Acceptance on Male Rape Perceptions

The research conducted to date clearly establishes that, in the case of female rape, the endorsement of rape myths and traditional gender roles increase victim blame and decrease perpetrator blame. Myths encourage observers to perceive rape incidents in terms of sex instead of violence. Attributions of victim and perpetrator responsibility, then, are affected more by gendered expectations about how the victim communicates sexual interest and consent than the perpetrator's coercion or violence. However, less is understood about the way that rape myths affect male rape perceptions. Since the groundbreaking work of Susan Brownmiller, Martha Burt, and Susan Estrich, scholars have generated considerable research about rape, rape myths, and rape perceptions. Unfortunately, most of the literature has focused on female rape and female victims, while male rape and male victims have received only minimal attention. This absence is emblematic itself of rape myths that deny "real victim" status to men. Nevertheless, lifetime prevalence rates suggest that about 10 percent of all sexual assault victims are male, and about three percent of all men are victims of attempted or completed sexual assault (Rape, Abuse, and Insest National Network; Weiss, 2010). As with women, men in college are nearly twice as likely as community peers to be raped (Krebs *et al.*, 2007; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992) and this rate is even higher among gay men (Rothman, Exner, & Baughman, 2011). Therefore, while not as prevalent as female rape, male rape is a relatively common phenomenon that deserves more attention.

**Male Rape Characteristics and Consequences.** Aside from victim gender, male and female rape incidents are very similar. Victims tend to be young adults, and college students are more likely to be victimized than same-aged peers not in school (Weiss, 2010). Likewise, men are most often victimized by someone they know; the presence of alcohol (victim intoxication) is common but the presence of weapons is not; and the incidents rarely result in injuries requiring hospitalization (Weiss, 2010). Furthermore, while reporting is rare regardless of gender, in her review of victims' narratives gleaned from the National Crime Victimization Survey collected from 1992-2000, Weiss (2010) found that men are even less likely to report incidents of rape and sexual assault than women. This finding likely reflects the fact that men, like women, fear being believed, or being blamed for the assault by practitioners in the criminal justice system (Anderson & Lyons, 2005; Davies & Rogers, 2006; Krebs *et al.*, 2007; Weiss, 2010; Wolitzky-Taylor *et al.*, 2011). Furthermore, men who endorse the myth that "real men cannot be raped" may fail to acknowledge that their victimization experience was a crime (Anderson & Lyons, 2005; Weiss, 2010; Wolitzky-Taylor *et al.*, 2011). Endorsement of male rape myths by criminal justice personnel specifically, and by people more generally, likely creates the same barriers to reporting, prosecution, and conviction in male rape cases as it does in cases with female victims.

Nevertheless, male rape victims experience the same negative consequences as female victims, with some studies indicating that men who are raped actually suffer more psychological trauma than women. In addition to depression (Frazier, 1993; Vicary, Klingmaman, & Harkness, 1995), anxiety and related disorders (Akard & Neumark-Sztainer, 2002; Frazier, 1993; Kassing & Prieto, 2003) and self-blame (Weiss, 2010; Krebs *et al.*, 2007), male victims often question their own sexuality (Javaid, 2016; Turchick & Edwards, 2012; Weiss, 2010). Victims who believe that myths suggesting that "homosexual men get raped" and that "men who have been raped have lost their manhood" or that "real men can't be raped" may experience additional anxiety over their gender and sexual identity (Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992; Turchick & Edwards, 2012; Weiss, 2010). Clearly, as in the case of female rape, myths regarding male rape are related to norms about gender that define what men are and how they should act.

Male Rape Myth Acceptance. Many of the attitudes and demographic characteristics that predict endorsement of rape myths concerning female victims are similarly associated with male rape myth acceptance (MRMA). Studies regularly report that men tend to have higher levels of male rape myth acceptance than women (Chapleau, Oswald, & Russell, 2008; Davies, Gilston, & Rogers, 2012; Kassing, Beesley, & Frey, 2005; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992). This is often attributed to the fact that men also tend to have more traditional gender role attitudes than women (Davies, Gilston, & Rogers, 2012; Hammond, Berry, & Rodriquez, 2011; Sleath & Bull, 2010). Similarly, ambivalent sexism, homophobia, and female rape myth acceptance (FRMA) have also been positively associated with MRMA (Chapleau, Oswald, & Russell, 2008; Davies, Gilston, & Rogers, 2012; Kassing, Beesley, & Frey, 2005). The similarity between male and female rape and the overlapping attitudinal dimensions that predict acceptance of male and female rape myths suggests that MRMA may similarly predict male victim and perpetrator blame in cases that deviate from the violent, stranger rape stereotype.

While some of the myths about male and female victims are the same—men and women enjoy forced sex; it is not rape if the victim does not fight back; rape is provoked by promiscuous behavior—homosexuality is uniquely integral to many male rape myths. For example, "Male rape is usually committed by homosexuals," "A man who allows himself to be raped by another man is probably a homosexual," and "Many men claim rape when they have consented to homosexual relations but changed their minds afterward" define male rape as a problem primarily for homosexuals (Melanson, 1999). This myth is evident even in the research, as most male rape perception studies focus on victim sexual orientation and participant homophobia. Anderson (2004) found that male participants with high homophobia scores viewed the male rape victim was not described explicitly as homosexual. Although male rape myth acceptance was not assessed, these results suggest that men, particularly homophobic men, view male rape as a result of the victim's sexuality, and this in turn increases their negative perceptions of male rape

victims. Davies and colleagues (2012) found that homophobia, along with female rape myth acceptance, hostile sexism, and traditional gender role attitudes, was positively associated with male rape myth acceptance. Their study also revealed that male respondents had higher levels of male rape myth acceptance and blamed male rape victims more than female respondents (Davies, Gilston, & Rogers, 2012). Sleath and Bull (2010) also found that participants with high levels of male rape myth acceptance including acceptance of myths emphasizing victim and perpetrator homosexuality blamed victims more and perpetrators less in both stranger and acquaintance rape scenarios.

Myths that confine male rape within the population of men attracted to other men effectively redefine rape as sex instead of violence. In their qualitative analysis of cross-gender conversations about rape, Doherty and Anderson (2003) noted that participants perceived rape as less traumatic for female and homosexual male victims than for heterosexual male victims because the penetrative act was understood as part of their normative sexual experience. This myth that "male rape is more serious when the victim is heterosexual than when the victim is homosexual" (Melanson, 1999) further suggests that homosexual male victims, like female victims, may enjoy being raped. Mitchell and colleagues (1999) found that participants thought homosexual victims of a stranger rape experienced more pleasure and less trauma than heterosexual victims. Likewise, Wakelin and Long (2003) showed that potential sexual attraction between victim and perpetrator was more important than either homophobia or perceived gender role deviance in predicting participants' negative attitudes toward heterosexual male and female, gay, and lesbian victims. Arguing that rape mimics normative sexual acts and experiences of women and gay men minimizes the trauma experienced by the victim and denies the violent nature of the act (Brownmiller, 1974; Doherty & Anderson, 2004).

Perceiving rape as sex instead of violence also facilitates victim blaming and diminishes perpetrator responsibility because, once the sexual attraction between the victim and perpetrator is assumed, victim precipitation myths and rape-as-fantasy myths come into play. Male victim precipitation myths—including "Men who parade around nude in a locker room are asking for trouble," and "Most men who have been raped have a history of promiscuity"—in combination with myths that define rape as normal sex between gay men hold victims more accountable for the rape if they could be sexually attracted to the perpetrator. Indeed, Wakelin and Long (2003) concluded that victims whose sexual orientation implies sexual attraction to the perpetrator are perceived as "having more unconscious desire for rape to happen to them" (Wakelin & Long, 2003, p. 485). This may explain why homosexual victims are held more responsible for rape than heterosexual victims, even when the incident is consistent with the "real rape" stereotype (Mitchell, Hirschman, & Hall, 1999; Wakelin & Long, 2003)<sup>3</sup>. Furthermore, observers blamed chance factors more in the homosexual male rape than in heterosexual male rape, suggesting that the gay man's sexuality was somehow apparent to the perpetrator, and as such he provoked the attack (Wakelin & Long, 2003). Once the act is perceived as sex, myths about resistance and promiscuity affect blame attributions in the same way as in female rape, by focusing on the victim's "responsibility" to correctly communicate consent or disinterest.

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$  In the Wakelin & Long (2003) study, the similarities between the "real rape" stereotype and the stranger rape described are striking: a stranger accosts the victim at night in a public park, drags him into the bushes where he anally penetrated him. This makes the results of their study even more surprising and distressing.

Clearly, MRMA facilitates male victim blame through assumptions about his sexuality, precipitative behavior, and sexual experiences. However, unlike the studies on female rape perceptions, few studies have investigated the effect of male rape myth acceptance on perceptions of rapes that vary by victim-perpetrator relationship, level of resistance, or alcohol consumption. For example, even though men, like women, are usually victimized by someone they know (Weiss, 2010), most studies only measure reactions to stranger rape. Only one study to date investigated victim and perpetrator blame across different levels of victim-perpetrator relationship in a male rape. Using a randomized vignette design, Sleath and Bull (2010) found that, as is the case in female rape, victims are blamed more, and perpetrators are blamed less, when the perpetrator is an acquaintance than when he is a stranger. These authors also found that high MRMA also predicted higher levels of victim blame and lower levels of perpetrator blame, but they did not indicate if rape myth acceptance mediated the effect of the victim-perpetrator relationship on the blame attributions. Nor did they control for participant gender role attitudes (Sleath & Bull, 2010).

Likewise, resistance level warrants further investigation. Some authors have suggested that the level of resistance may have an even greater impact on perceptions of victim responsibility in male rape than in female rape, because male gender norms expect men to be physically fit, aggressive, and able to protect themselves from harm (Davies & Rogers, 2006, Howard, 1984a,b). As such, resistance may play a particularly important role in perceptions of male victim responsibility. In a study of counselor trainees' attitudes toward male victims of rape incidents that varied by level of resistance, Kassing and Prieto (2003) found that trainees blamed victims more when they did not resist. Disparities in victim blaming based on resistance level remained even after controlling for the trainees' age, experience treating sexual assault victims, and level of rape myth acceptance, suggesting that for men, resistance is more than just an issue of proving consent (Kassing & Prieto, 2003). Indeed, in a study measuring the type of blame attributed to male and female victims of violent stranger rapes and robberies, Howard (1984b) concluded that whereas male victims tend to be blamed when their *behavior* contradicts male gender stereotypes (not fighting back/failing to escape), female victims tend to be blamed when their *characteristics* are consistent with gender stereotypes (being trusting/careless). Therefore, while women who do not resist (enough) are blamed for failing to be "good" women, it may be that men who fail to resist, or fail to resist adequately are blamed because they fail *to be men*.

Unfortunately, there are many gaps in the male rape perception literature. Of primary concern is the ecological validity of myriad studies that use violent stranger rape scenarios instead of the more typical acquaintance and date rapes. While many studies have investigated the role of alcohol in female rape, including how its presence affects victim and perpetrator blame attributions, no studies to date have investigated the effect of alcohol on male rape perceptions. Furthermore, studies on male rape often ignore important social attitudes, including male rape myth acceptance and gender role expectations, or measure these with scales that do not reach traditional validation standards (Chapleau, Oswald, & Russel, 2008).<sup>4</sup> The first goal of this study is to further

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Most of the male rape perception literature uses Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson's (1992) male rape myth acceptance scale. Unfortunately, this scale addresses only three myths concerning male victims: male rape cannot happen; men are to blame for their rape; male rape is not traumatizing for the victim. Myths about homosexuality, male precipitation/promiscuity, and resistance are lacking in this scale. Furthermore, Chapleau, Oswald, & Russel (2008) found that it did not reach traditional standards of

the understanding of male rape perceptions by investigating victim and perpetrator blame attributions toward scenarios that are more common than those used in previous literature. I ask, *do victim-perpetrator relationship, level of resistance, and MRMA affect male rape perceptions in the same way that these extra-legal factors affect female rape perceptions*? Another goal of this study is to determine if blame attributions in male rape are influenced in the same way, and by the same amount, by the extra-legal factors that influence blame attributions in female rape.

### The Effect of Victim Gender on Rape Perceptions

Unfortunately, there is a dearth of rape perception studies comparing victim and perpetrator blame attributions across victim gender, and those available have mixed results. Because in many states male rape only recently became defined as a crime and as such still falls outside the "real rape" stereotype, one might expect that male victims would be blamed more than female victims. Similarly, the common (mis)association between male rape and homosexuality is likely to have a cumulatively negative effect on the perception of male victims. However, early studies comparing rape perceptions by gender found the opposite effect. Participants attributed more blame to female victims than male victims (Perrott & Webber, 1996; Schneider, Soh-Chiew Ee, Aronson, 1994), especially characterological blame (Howard, 1984a,b; Anderson, 1999). Nevertheless, these studies all described violent stranger rape scenarios, sometimes with multiple perpetrators, which are likely to highlight female rape myths about victim precipitation more than male rape myths suggesting victim homosexuality.

validity. As such, a more in depth understanding of the effect of MRMA on blame attributions is warranted.

Studies that employ more common rape scenarios report different results.

Although the effect of victim gender on victim and perpetrator blame only approached statistical significance in a study describing a post-party acquaintance rape, participants tended to blame female victims less than male victims, and this was especially true of male participants who scored high in homophobic attitudes (Anderson, 2004). Similarly, in their study of an acquaintance rape, Anderson and Lyons (2005) found that, while victim gender did not affect victim blame, perpetrators were blamed less when the victim was male, indicating that participants perceived male rape as a less serious crime. Finally, Gerber, Cronin and Steigman (2004) presented participants with a date rape incident that varied by both the victim and the perpetrator's gender, and found that victims were blamed more, and perpetrators blamed less, when the victim was male, and this effect was statistically significant. These studies seem to indicate that male victims are blamed more relative to female victims as the level of intimacy between victim and perpetrator increases. Unfortunately, there are no studies to date that vary both victim gender and victim perpetrator relationship, a gap that the current study will fill.

On the other hand, if victim blame is a function of perceived sexual attraction between the victim and perpetrator, then male victims may be blamed more in acquaintance and date rape scenarios because they are more likely to be described or perceived as homosexual. Indeed, when sexual orientation is varied along with victim gender, homosexual male victims are blamed more than female or heterosexual victims of stranger rape (Wakelin & Long, 2003), date rape (Gerber, Cronin, & Steigman, 2004), and child molestation (Davies, Rogers, Whitelegg, 2009). In their study of a stranger rape with a male perpetrator, Wakelin and Long (2003) found that homosexual men and heterosexual women were both blamed significantly more than heterosexual men and homosexual women. They concluded that it was the perceived potential sexual attraction between the perpetrator and the victim, rather than gender role deviation or participants' homophobic attitudes that predicted victim blame (Wakelin & Long, 2003). Davies and colleagues (2009) found the same blame attribution pattern towards the victim of an incest molestation incident. In their study, male victims were blamed more than female victims in general, and homosexual boys were blamed more than either lesbian girls or heterosexual boys (Davies, Rogers, Whitelegg, 2009). Clearly, when the gender and sexuality of the victim indicate the potential for sexual attraction to the perpetrator, he/she is perceived as more responsible for the incident.

Nevertheless, it is unclear if male victims are blamed more than female victims in more common incidents of rape, when perceived sexual attraction is explicit. In one study that varied both victim and perpetrator gender in a date rape scenario, Gerber and colleagues (2004) found that participants blamed male victims more than female victims, and blamed perpetrators of male rape less than perpetrators of female rape, regardless of perpetrator gender. This study indicates that male victims are perceived as more blameworthy, even when sexual attraction is held constant (Gerber, Cronin, & Steigman, 2004). However, the authors named the incident as sexual assault in the scenario, which is likely to affect the participants' rape perceptions. If blame attributions depend on the participants' perception of the incident as sex, not rape or violence, then naming the incident as a crime restricts respondents' perception of the event within the boundaries defined. It is unknown how victim gender affects rape perceptions in common incidents of rape that are not named as such. Furthermore, as the studies that vary victim gender

do not also vary other elements of the rape incident such as level of resistance and victimperpetrator relationship, it is unknown how these extra-legal factors affect victim and perpetrator blame differently in male and female rape. The current study intends to fill these gaps by investigating victim and perpetrator blame attributions in acquaintance and date rape scenarios that vary by victim gender and level of resistance while holding the potential sexual attraction between victim and perpetrator constant.

# The Effect of the Juror Role on Rape Perceptions

The rape perception literature described above is inherently linked to research on jury deliberations. As jurors are drawn from the general population, it is reasonable to assume that they will be influenced by the same factors that influence lay persons when attributing blame in rape cases. Indeed, some rape perception studies specifically instruct participants to review scenarios as if they were members on a jury in order to measure the effects of extra-evidentiary factors—including victim and perpetrator race, victim attractiveness, the victim's sexual history or victim-perpetrator relationship, and victim's resistance—on victim and perpetrator blame attributions (Bieneck & Krahé, 2011; Deitz *et al.*, 1982; Ellison & Munro, 2013; Eyssel & Bohner, 2011; Field, 1979; Villemur & Hyde, 1983. Such studies clearly demonstrate that mock juror characteristics, including gender, rape myth acceptance, gender attitudes, and extra-legal factors such as issues of resistance, and victim-perpetrator relationship, affect their perceptions of victims and perpetrators (Ellison & Munro, 2013; Eyssel & Bohner, 2011; Hammond, Berry, & Rodriguez, 2011; Howard, 1984a,b; Villemur & Hyde, 1983).

Some authors have suggested that rape myths function as cognitive schema used to facilitate complex information processing (Berger *et al.*, 2008; Bieneck & Krahé,

2011; Krahé, Temkin, & Bieneck, 2007). Schematic processing occurs when new information is interpreted based on generalizations and stereotypes in order to save mental resources. When evidence in rape cases is processed schematically-such as defining rape as sex if it does not match the "real rape" stereotype, or using rape-asfantasy myths to interpret a perceived lack of resistance as consent—it often results in attributions of blame based on extra-legal factors (Bieneck & Krahé, 2011; Eyssel & Bohner, 2011; Krahé et al., 2008). In contrast, data-driven processing requires careful examination of the evidence on a case by case basis and is less prone to biases related to preexisting attitudes and experiences, including those imposed by endorsement of rape myths and traditional gender roles. While one might expect jurors to engage in datadriven processing when making determinations of defendant guilt or innocence, research indicates that they are prone to engage in schematic processing. In their qualitative review of a mock jury deliberation in a performed ex-intimate partner rape, Ellison and Munro (2013) noted that jurors often focused on extra-legal factors and regularly drew on rape myths to interpret ambiguous evidence in light of these factors. For example, some jurors focused on the victim's past sexual relationship with the alleged perpetrator in order to explain why the medical exam was inconclusive, suggesting that the couple may have regularly enjoyed rough sex, which could account for some vaginal injuries but did not indicate rape. Similarly, Villemur and Hyde (1983) noted that the most common reasons mock jurors gave for a not guilty verdict after "reasonable doubt" (30 respondents) were "victim did not resist" (32 responses), "victim did [or did not] ask for ID" (30 responses), and "victim not too upset" (8 responses). The endorsement of rape

myths by these mock jurors is evident in both the focus on the victim's behavior generally, and the specific (extra-evidential) behaviors emphasized.

Clearly, (mock) jurors are prone to schematic processing, drawing on rape myths not only to interpret evidence, but to support their determinations of guilt or innocence. What is unknown is if jurors depend more, or less, on rape myths and schematic processing than non-jurors, when forming opinions about victim and perpetrator blame. Krahé, Temkin, and Bieneck (2007) found that when mock jurors in their rape perception study were expected to explain their verdict and sentencing decisions, they were less likely to depend on schematic processing of evidence when making those decisions. Even without such an accountability instruction, it may be that the sense of duty inherent in the juror role encourages jurors to rely less on stereotypes and myths in interpreting case information. Furthermore, highlighting that sense of duty may decrease the employment of schematic processing, and by such the effect of extralegal factors, on attributions of victim and perpetrator blame. Therefore, the final goal of this study is to investigate how the juror role influences blame attributions. Does the juror role, which includes an expected duty to determine truth based on evidence and facts, mitigate the influence of extra-legal factors, rape myth acceptance, and gender role attitudes on victim and perpetrator blame attributions?

### THE CURRENT STUDY

The current study addresses four research questions and, in doing so, attempts to fill gaps in the extant literature. First, *do victim-perpetrator relationship, level of resistance, and rape myth acceptance have the same effect on rape perceptions when scenarios reflect more common, though less stereotypical, rape experiences*? Unlike most rape perception studies that use unrealistic and ecologically invalid rape scenarios, the current study measures participant perceptions of scenarios that more closely resemble common rape experiences. Because most rapes among adolescents and young adults involve alcohol consumption (Grubb & Turner, 2012; Krebs *et al*, 2007; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2002), both victim and perpetrator intoxication is held constant, while victim-perpetrator relationship and level of resistance vary. Similarly, in all the scenarios used in this study victims engage in precipitative behavior (foreplay) that may be common in acquaintance (party) and intimate partner (date) rapes. Based on the literature reviewed above, I begin with three predictions regarding female rape:

Hypothesis 1: Female victims will be blamed more, and perpetrators blamed less, when the victim resists verbally, than when she resists verbally and physically.Hypothesis 2: Female victims will be blamed more, and perpetrators blamed less, when the victim and perpetrator are described as dating, than when they are described as acquaintances.

**Hypothesis 3**: Female victim blame will increase, and perpetrator blame will decrease, as participant FRMA increases, even after controlling for incident and participant characteristics.

Second, what is the effect of MRMA on perceptions of more typical rape scenarios, and do FRMA and MRMA affect female and male rape perceptions in the same way? As past research on male rape perceptions are even more likely than female rape perception studies to use stereotypical scenarios that match the "real rape" myth, the current study investigates the effect of MRMA, victim-perpetrator relationship, and level of resistance on attributions of victim and perpetrator blame in male rape scenarios that
are more common or typical. Based on the overlapping myths and related attitudes of MRMA and FRMA (Melanson, 1999; Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999), I expect victim and perpetrator blame attributions to follow the same trend in male rape as in female rape. However, due to the cumulatively negative effect of male rape myths and gender expectations associated with male rape, I expect MRMA will have an even greater negative impact on blame attributions in male rape than FRMA has on blame attributions in female rape.

Hypothesis 4: Male victims will be blamed more, and perpetrators blamed less, when the victim resists verbally than when he resists verbally and physically.Hypothesis 5: Male victims will be blamed more, and perpetrators blamed less, when the victim and perpetrator are described as dating, than when they are described as acquaintances.

**Hypothesis 6**: Male victim blame will increase, and perpetrator blame will decrease, as participant MRMA increases, even after controlling for incident and participant characteristics.

**Hypothesis 7**: The effect size of MRMA on victim and perpetrator blame attributions in male rape will be larger than the effect size of FRMA on blame attributions in female rape.

Third, *what is the effect of victim gender on victim and perpetrator blame attributions, when sexual attraction is emphasized in both male and female rape?* Past literature investigating the effect of victim gender on rape perceptions often used atypical stranger rapes that failed to control for the victim's potential sexual attraction to the perpetrator (Howard, 1984a,b; Perrott & Webber, 1996; Schneider, Soh-Chiew Ee, Aronson, 1994). The few studies that investigate both victim gender and victim sexual orientation, report that victims who could be potentially sexually attracted to the male perpetrator—heterosexual women and homosexual men—are blamed more than victims who are not perceived to be sexually attracted to the perpetrator (Davies, Rogers, & Whitelegg, 2009; Sleath & Bull, 2010; Wakelin & Long, 2003). However, it is unclear if male victims are blamed more than female victims when sexual attraction is controlled or how victim gender affects blame attributions in more typical rapes. The current study investigates the effect of victim gender on perceptions of rapes that vary in level of victim-perpetrator attraction and amount of foreplay constant across all the scenarios. Due to the compounding nature of male rape myths and gender expectations on male rape perceptions, one might expect that, when sexual attraction is controlled, male victims are blamed more than female victims.

**Hypothesis 8**: Victims will be blamed more, and perpetrators less, when victims are male, even after controlling for other incident characteristics and participant characteristics and gender attitudes.

Furthermore, given traditional masculinity expectations that define men as physically fit, aggressive, and able to protect themselves from harm (Davies & Rogers, 2006, Howard, 1984a,b), it is likely that victim gender may moderate the effect of victim's resistance on victim and perpetrator blame attributions.

**Hypothesis 9**: The effect of victim resistance on blame attributions will be greater when the victim is male than when the victim is female, indicated by a significant interaction between victim gender and level of resistance.

Finally, *what is the effect of the juror role on male and female rape perceptions?* Many studies find that mock jurors use schematic, rather than data-driven, processing to interpret evidence in rape cases, and that extra-legal factors and juror attitudes, including victim-perpetrator relationship, level of resistance, RMA and gender attitudes affect victim and perpetrator blame attributions. However, none of these studies measure mock juror reactions to male rape, and none compare mock jurors to non-jurors. The current study compares juror and non-juror blame attributions in both male and female rape to determine if the juror role affects blame attributions, and type of information processing participants used to inform decisions. I expect that the juror role increases the tendency toward data-driven processes, thereby decreasing the effects of extra-legal factors and participant attitudes on blame attributions.

**Hypothesis 10**: Victims will be blamed more, and perpetrators less, in the nonjuror condition than in the jury condition, even after controlling for incident characteristics and participant characteristics and gender attitudes.

**Hypothesis 11**: The effect of extra-legal factors and gender attitudes on blame attributions will be greater among non-jurors than jurors, indicated by significant interactions between jury membership and a) victim gender; b) level of resistance; c) victim-perpetrator relationship; and d) gender attitudes (total GAI score).

#### METHODS

The current study used a 2 (level of resistance: high or low) x 2 (victimperpetrator relationship: acquaintance or dating) x 2 (victim gender: male or female) x 2 (jury membership: juror or non-juror) vignette design to measure the effects of incident characteristics blame attributions.

### The Sample

Participants were 701 students enrolled in on-campus undergraduate courses at Arizona State University. The majority (82.44%) were between 18 and 22 years old. Most were female (59.6%) and heterosexual (85.7%). Less than two percent identified as neither male nor female, and only 11.0% identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or some other sexual orientation. Just over half the participants identified as White (52.5%), followed by 37.4% Hispanic, 8.7% Black, and 12.1% other (including 5.1% Asian, 4.3% American Indian or Alaskan Native, 1.4% Hawaiian or Pacific Islander). A large majority (77.2%) had heard about the Obergefell v. Hodges (2015) decision and 75.6% agreed with the decision, while 7.4% disagreed and 15.6% were unsure. Almost 23 percent of the participants acknowledged that they had been sexually victimized at some point in their lives, while 71.8% had never been victimized and 4.1% were unsure. (See Table 1 for summary of sample characteristics). Even though the sample is not generalizable to the greater US population, it is still relevant to the question at hand. Risk of both rape victimization and perpetration is highest in the 18-25 age group and college campuses and affiliated housing are notorious hotspots for rape (Krebs *et al.*, 2007; Rickert & Wiemann, 1998). Nevertheless, these crimes are rarely reported or investigated, largely due to the attitudes and beliefs of the victims, perpetrators, and their peers (Du Mont, Miller, & Myhr, 2003; Heath, Lynch, Fritch, & Wong, 2013; Krebs et al., 2007). Therefore, it is relevant to understand what this group thinks about rape, rape victims, and rape perpetrators.

## Variables and Measures

Dependent Variables. Victim blame (Victim Blame) was measured with four items adapted from Berger's et al. (2008) study of prospective lawyers' reactions to rape cases. Participants responded to items on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree). The questions were 1) "Victim is to blame for the incident." 2) "Victim could have avoided the incident." 3) "Victim had control over what happened." and 4) I feel sorry (or sad) for *Victim*" (reverse coded), where *Victim* is replaced by the victim's name in the scenario. The scores were summed, averaged, and standardized for each participant so that effect sizes of the independent variables could be compared. Higher scores indicate more blame, and the scale has a moderate level of internal consistency (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .65$ ). While the alpha level for this scale is on the lower end acceptability (Henson, 2001; Murphy & Davidshofer, 1991; Peterson, 1994), some authors suggest that high alpha levels reflect item redundancy more than scale reliability (Boyle, 1991; Peterson, 1994). The scale of victim blame in this study was adapted from the scale of complainant blame that Berger and colleagues (2008) developed to study schematic decision making of prospective lawyers in Germany. In their study, the scale produced an alpha range between 0.73 and 0.83, indicating good internal consistency for their sample. As alpha has been found to be robust to variation in research design, the lower alpha in the current study may reflect more heterogeneity among the sample, rather than a lack of reliability (Peterson, 1994). Furthermore, the scale has good face validity, measuring a range of blame-related constructs, and the relatively low alpha may be due to the small number of items and low number of response categories (Peterson, 1994).

As with victim blame, *Perpetrator blame* (Perpetrator Blame) was measured with five items adapted from Berger and colleagues (2008). Participants responded to items on a 4-point Likert scale. The questions were 1) *Perpetrator* is to blame for the incident." 2) *"Perpetrator* had control over what happened." 3) *"Perpetrator* thought *victim* consented to have sex with him" (reverse coded). 4) *"Perpetrator* ought to be held criminally liable for rape." and 5) *"Perpetrator"* should be punished for his actions in the incident" where "Perpetrator" and "victim" are replaced with the perpetrator and victim's name in the scenarios. The scores were summed, averaged, and standardized for each participant so that effect sizes of the independent variables could be compared. Higher scores indicate more blame, and the scale has a moderate level of internal consistency (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .75$ ).

**Independent variables.** Jury role (*Jury Member* = 1) is a dichotomous variable. Participants in the juror condition were given the definition of rape and standards of proof and instructed to answer questions about the following rape scenarios "as if you were a juror at the trials." Non-jurors were simply instructed to indicate their agreement with the vignette perception statements (See Appendix A for vignette examples). Victim gender (*Female Victim* = 1) is a dichotomous variable. Victim gender was determined by the traditionally masculine or feminine name of the victim in the vignettes and appropriate pronouns. Victim-perpetrator relationship (*Dating* = 1) is a dichotomous variable. The rape incident either occurred at the end of a party where the victim met the perpetrator (consistent with common acquaintance rape incidents), or at the end of a date between a couple that had been dating for a year (consistent with common intimate partner rape incidents). Level of resistance (*High Resistance* = 1) is a dichotomous variable with high resistance consisting of both verbal and physical resistance—"[the victim] struggled to move away, hitting his face and chest and said loudly, 'No! Stop! Don't do that!'"—compared to low, or verbal only, resistance—"[the victim] said loudly, 'No! Stop! 'Don't do that!'". See Appendix A for two vignette versions.

Male Rape Myth Acceptance (*MRMA*) is measured with an 18-item scale adapted from Melanson's (1999) Male Rape Myth Scale. The original scale includes both male and female perpetrated male victim rape so items were updated to describe myths about male perpetrator-male victim rape only. All questions were answered using a 4-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree). Response scores were summed, averaged and standardized, so that higher scores indicate higher MRMA. The scale showed good internal consistency ( $\alpha$  = .90). Female Rape Myth Acceptance (*FRMA*) is measured with a 17-item scale adapted from the Short Form of the Illinois Rape Myth Scale (Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999). This scale measures typical myths and beliefs about male perpetrator-female victim rape. Some wording was updated to reflect more commonly used words and phrases. All questions were answered using a 4-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree). Response scores were summed, averaged, and standardized so that higher scores indicate higher FRMA. The scale showed good internal consistency ( $\alpha$  = .89).

Gender attitudes were measured using five subscales from the Gender Attitude Inventory (Ashmore, Del Boca, & Bilder, 1995), including Traditional Gender Attitudes (*Gender Attitudes*,  $\alpha = .87$ ), Acceptance of Female Sexual Initiative (*Female Initiative*,  $\alpha = .87$ ), Acceptance of Female Casual Sex (*Female Sex*,  $\alpha = .83$ ), Condemnation of Homosexuality (*Homophobia*,  $\alpha = .89$ ), and Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence (*Interpersonal Violence*,  $\alpha = .86$ ). The last scale measuring attitudes toward interpersonal violence was updated from the original scale to reflect gender neutral victims, but always male perpetrators of violence. The condemnation of male homosexuality scale only used items related to male homosexuality, and updated those related to female homosexuality where relevant. One item from the condemnation of homosexuality subscale was found to be double-barreled and confusing for respondents and was dropped. The four remaining items yielded a higher alpha for this subscale, indicating that the scale had good internal consistency, even with fewer items. All questions were answered using a 4-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree). Items for each scale were summed and averaged, with higher scores indicating more traditional attitudes about gender and sexual relationships.

**Control Variables**. Age, race, and gender have consistently been linked to level of RMA among both college and community samples (Burt, 1980; Suarez & Gadalla, 2010). Participants wrote in their *Age* (Age), and indicated their race/ethnicity by choosing one or more of seven categories. These categories were collapsed into four dichotomous variables, *White* (White = 1), *Black* (Black = 1), *Hispanic* (Hispanic = 1) and *Other Race* (Asian, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, and/or Other=1). Because participants could indicate more than one racial category, all four groups are included as controls in the analysis. Participant gender was collapsed from six categories into two dichotomous variables *Male* (Male=1) and *Other Gender* (Transgender, Androgynous, Intersex, and/or Other=1), using *Female* as the reference category. Sexual orientation was also collapsed from seven categories (Heterosexual, Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Asexual, Queer, and Other) into a dichotomous variable *Heterosexual* (Heterosexual=1).

Some scholars have found that victims of rape have higher levels of RMA (Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004), while others have found a negative relationship between sexual victimization and RMA (Hockett, Saucier, & Badke, 2015; Turchik *et al.*, 2009). In this study, Sexual Victimization was measured with the question "Have you ever been forced or coerced to engage in unwanted sexual activity with anyone, including someone you know?" with possible responses including "Yes," "No," and "I don't know." Responses were transformed into the dichotomous variables *Rape Victim* (Rape Victim=1) and *Confused Victim* (Confused Victim=1) with *Nonvictim* as the reference category.

Finally, agreement with gay marriage was assessed with the question "Do you agree with the Supreme Court decision in *Obergefell v. Hodges* that same sex marriage is a constitutional right?" with possible responses including "Yes," "No," and "I don't know." Responses were split into two dichotomous variables, *Marriage Agree* (Marriage Agree=1) and *Marriage Unsure* (Marriage Unsure=1), with *Marriage Not Agree* as the reference category. This variable controls for the more general social climate in which attitudes about gender roles develop. Research so far has demonstrated the ubiquitous nature of RMA among criminal justice personnel (Du Mont, Miller, & Myhr, 2003; Feldman-Summers & Palmer, 1980; Heath *et al.*, 2013; Minch, & Linden, 1987; Page, 2008; Spohn, Beichner, & Davis-Frenzel, 2001; Stewart, Dobbins & Gatowski, 1996) college samples (Bieneck & Krahé, 2011; Estrich, 1987; Harrison, Howerton, Secarea, & Nguyen, 2008; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983), and the general public (Ellison & Munro,

2013; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2013), but few studies have situated their analyses within the context of recent social changes. One major legal reform in gender politics is the recent Supreme Court decision *Obergefell v. Hodges* (2015), which guarantees gay marriage as a constitutional right, thereby legitimizing homosexual relationships and nontraditional gender roles. It is important to control for the effects that this change in the larger social climate may have on the level of RMA among participants and their blame attributions. **Procedure** 

# A study protocol was submitted along with relevant materials to the Institutional Review Board at Arizona State University, and approval was received in Spring 2016. During the first few weeks of the Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 semesters, professors teaching undergraduate courses in a variety of departments were contacted to request their students' participation in the study. After gaining permission from professors and organizing a time to meet during class, the topic and format of the study was announced to classes varying in size from 12 to 400 students. Eight survey versions that varied by jury membership, victim gender, and level of resistance were randomly distributed to eligible students who then indicated consent to participate by completing the selfadministered paper/pencil questionnaire. There was no incentive to complete the survey, and no penalty for refraining. Each consenting participant read two vignettes describing rape incidents common among college students, one between acquaintances and one between a couple who had been dating for a year (See Appendix A for two vignette examples). Following each vignette, participants responded to questions assessing victim and perpetrator blame. They then completed the MRMA or FRMA scales and five gender attitude scales, all answered on a 4-point Likert scale (1 =strongly disagree, 2 =

disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree). The survey ended with questions about demographic information, attitudes toward gay marriage, and sexual assault victimization experiences. The whole instrument took between ten and twenty minutes to complete.

Seven hundred thirteen surveys were returned. Of these, 12 were missing all the responses to one or both victim and perpetrator blame scales or more than 25 percent of all the survey items and were dropped from further analyses. Of the 701 surveys remaining, 30.84% had one or more items missing from one of the independent variable measures. Little's MCAR test was used to assess the distribution of missing values and was not significant (chi-squared = 10621.426, DF = 15107, Sig. = 1.000), indicating that the data were missing completely at random. Nevertheless, multiple imputation was used to replace the missing values. Thirty imputations were calculated and the imputed models did not differ substantively from the sample with complete data. The following results are reported based on the multiple imputation models.

### RESULTS

# **Preliminary Analyses**

Initial analyses examined the distribution of participant blame attributions, rape myth acceptance, and gender attitude scores (see Table 2 for summary of scale characteristics). Overall, participants tended to have low levels of victim blame and high levels of perpetrator blame (see Figure 1 for distribution of victim blame and Figure 2 for distribution of perpetrator blame). Nevertheless, nearly four percent of individuals agreed or strongly agreed that the victim was to blame for the incident, and over 50 percent agreed or strongly agreed that the victim could have avoided the incident. Perpetrator blame scores were more skewed than victim blame scores, with more than 95 percent agreeing or strongly agreeing that the perpetrator was to blame for incident, had control over what happened, should be held criminally liable and should be punished for his actions. However, nearly four percent disagreed that he should be held criminally liable for rape, and over three percent disagreed that he should be punished for his actions. See Table 3 for distribution of responses to victim and perpetrator blame items.

Participants also exhibited low levels of male and female rape myth acceptance (see Figure 3 for distribution of MRMA and Figure 4 for distribution of FRMA). The mean MRMA score was 1.607 (SD=.44), indicating that, overall, participants tended to disagree with myths about male rape. Nevertheless, every item received at least some endorsement. Nearly a third agreed or strongly agreed that "Many men claim rape when they have consented to homosexual relations but have changed their minds afterward," while almost two percent disagreed that "it is a terrible experience for a man to be raped." See Table 4 for distribution of responses to MRMA items.

FRMA was even lower than MRMA, and less variable, indicated by a mean of 1.494 (SD=.40). Still, every item was endorsed by some participants. While fewer than one percent agreed that "If the rapist doesn't have a weapon, you really can't call it rape," over 30 percent agreed or strongly agreed that "Rape happens when a man's sex drive gets of control." See Table 5 for distribution of responses to FRMA items.

Finally, like rape myth acceptance, most respondents had egalitarian gender views (See Figures 5-9). Participants tended to exhibit moderately traditional Gender Attitudes (mean=2.34, SD=.54), but were relatively unaccepting of Female Sexual Initiative (mean=1.69, SD=.45), Female Casual Sex (mean=1.68, SD=.60), and Homosexuality (mean=1.67, SD=.73). Participants tended not to accept Interpersonal Violence

(mean=1.58, SD=.40). See Table 6 for distribution of responses to Gender Attitude Inventory subscale items.

# **Primary Analyses**

Each participant read two vignettes, so due to the clustered nature of the data vignettes nested within participants—mixed level models with random intercepts were used to assess the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables, while controlling for participant characteristics and attitudes. To account for possible mediation effects, variables were entered into the models in stages, starting with the independent variable of interest, followed by incident characteristics (where relevant), participant characteristics, gender attitudes, and interaction terms (where relevant). All tests for significance are based on the standard alpha level of .05. Results addressing each hypothesis are discussed below.

**Perceptions of Female Rape.** Hypothesis 1 predicted that female victims would be blamed more, and perpetrators blamed less, when the victim resists verbally than when she resists verbally and physically. This hypothesis was not supported (see Table 7). Even though the final models were significant for both *Victim Blame* (F=14.09, p<.001) and *Perpetrator Blame* (F= 5.15, p<.001), the results indicated that *High Resistance* was not significantly associated with either *Victim Blame* (B=.044, SE=.08, p>.05) or *Perpetrator Blame* (B=.101, SE=.09, p>.05) in female rape. However, victim and perpetrator blame attributions were predicted by acceptance of interpersonal violence and feminine sexual initiative. Higher *Interpersonal Violence* was associated with more *Victim Blame* (B=.439, p<.001) and less *Perpetrator Blame* (B=-.346, p<.001) in female rape. Likewise, higher *Female Initiative* was associated with more *Victim Blame*  ( $\beta$ =.106, p<.05) and less *Perpetrator Blame* ( $\beta$ =-.209, p<.01). None of the other participant characteristics or attitudes predicted victim or perpetrator blame attributions.

Hypothesis 2, which predicted that female victims would be blamed more, and perpetrators blamed less when the victim and perpetrator were dating than when they were acquaintances, was partially supported (see Table 8). The final models were significant for both victim blame (F=15.39, p<.001) and perpetrator blame (F=5.98, p<.001), and the final results indicated that victim-perpetrator relationship predicted both victim and perpetrator blame attributions in female rape, though not as predicted. As expected, perpetrators were blamed less in scenarios in which the victim and perpetrator were dating ( $\beta$ =-.186, *p*<.001). However, contrary to expectations, respondents also blamed victims less in dating scenarios ( $\beta$ =-.211, p<.001).

Hypothesis 3, which predicted that female victim blame would increase, and perpetrator blame would decrease, as participant FRMA increased, was supported (see Table 9, Figure 10). The final models were significant for both victim blame (F=15.71, p<.001) and perpetrator blame (F=6.94, p<.001), and the results indicated that female rape myth acceptance predicted both victim and perpetrator blame in female rape, in the expected way, even after controlling for incident characteristics, participant characteristics, and gender attitudes scales. Participants with higher *FRMA* blamed the victim more ( $\beta$ =.280, p<.001) and the perpetrator less ( $\beta$ =-.366, p<.001). *Victim Blame* was also predicted by *Dating* ( $\beta$ =-.211, p<.001). *Perpetrator Blame* was also predicted by *Dating* ( $\beta$ =-.186, p<.001).

**Male Rape Perceptions.** The results for male rape perceptions match those of female rape perceptions. Hypothesis 4, which predicted that male victims would be

blamed more, and perpetrators blamed less, when the victim resists verbally, than when he resists verbally and physically, was not supported (see Table 10). Even though the final models were significant for both victim blame (F=15.85, p<.001) and perpetrator blame (F=10.76, p<.001), the final results showed that level of resistance was not statistically significantly associated with either *Victim Blame* (B=.077, SE=.07, p>.05) or *Perpetrator Blame* (B=.003, SE=.08, p>.05). However, *Victim Blame* was predicted by *Interpersonal Violence* (B=-.464, p<.001), and *Perpetrator Blame* was predicted by *Gender Attitudes* (B=.112, p<.05), *Female Initiative* (B=-.124, p<.05), *Interpersonal Violence* (B=-.421, p<.001), *Marriage Agree* (B=-.379, p<.05), and *Marriage Unsure* (B=-.587, p<.01).

Hypothesis 5 predicted that male victims would be blamed more, and perpetrators blamed less when the victim and perpetrator were dating than when they were acquaintances, and was partially supported (see Table 11). As was the case in female rape perceptions, the final models were significant for both victim blame (F=16.33, p<.001) and perpetrator blame (F=11.80, p<.001), and the final results indicated that victim-perpetrator relationship predicted both victim and perpetrator blame attributions in male rape, though not as expected. As predicted, respondents blamed perpetrators less in scenarios in which the victim and perpetrator were dating ( $\beta$ =-.175, p<.001). However, contrary to expectations, respondents also blamed victims less in scenarios in which he was dating the perpetrator ( $\beta$ =-.154, p<.001). *Victim Blame* was also predicted by *Interpersonal Violence* ( $\beta$ =-.469, p<.001), while *Perpetrator Blame* was predicted by *Gender Attitudes* ( $\beta$ =-.112, p<.05), *Female Initiative* ( $\beta$ =-.124, p<.05), *Interpersonal* 

*Violence* (β=-.421, *p*<.001), *Marriage Agree* (β=-.379, *p*<.05), and *Marriage Unsure* (β=-.588, *p*<.001).

Hypothesis 6, which predicted that male victims would be blamed more, and perpetrators blamed less, by participants with high MRMA was supported (see Table 12, Figure 11). The final models were significant for both victim blame (F=16.74, p<.001) and perpetrator blame (F=12.13, p<.001), and the final results indicate that male rape myth acceptance predicts both victim and perpetrator blame in female rape, in the expected way, even after controlling for incident characteristics, participant characteristics, and gender attitudes scales. Participants with high *MRMA* blamed victims more (B=.296, p<.001) and perpetrators less (B=-.297, p<.001) than respondents with low *MRMA*. *Victim Blame* was also predicted by *Dating* (B=-.153, p<.001) and *Interpersonal Violence* (B=-.291, p<.001), while *Perpetrator Blame* was predicted by *Dating* (B=-.175, p<.001), *Gender Attitudes* (B=.148, p<.001), *Interpersonal Violence* (B=-.247, p<.001), *Age* (B=-.026, p<.05), *Heterosexual* (B=.288, p<.05), *Marriage Agree* (B=-.350, p<.05), and *Marriage Unsure* (B=-.511, p<.01).

Hypothesis 7, which predicted that the effect size of MRMA on victim and perpetrator blame attributions in male rape would be larger than the effect size of FRMA on blame attributions in female rape, was not supported (see Table 13, Figure 12). Paternoster *et al.*'s (1998) test for comparing regression coefficients was used to determine if the effect of male rape myth acceptance on blame attributions in male rape was greater than the effect of female rape myth acceptance on blame attributions in female rape. The effects of *MRMA* (from table 9) and *FRMA* (from table 12) were not statistically significantly different for either *Victim Blame* (Z=.178, p<.05) or *Perpetrator Blame* (Z=.650, p<.05).

**Victim Gender.** Hypothesis 8, which predicted that victims would be blamed more, and perpetrators less, when victims were male, was partially supported (see Table 14, Figure 13). Although the final models were significant for both victim blame (F=27.20, p<.001) and perpetrator blame (F=14.14, p<.001), results indicated that victim gender had a statistically significant effect on victim blame, but not perpetrator blame. As expected, female victims were blamed less than male victims (B=-.134, p<.05) and this effect was statistically significant. However, the perpetrators of female rape were not blamed statistically significantly more than perpetrators of male rape, although the effect of victim gender on perpetrator blame approached statistical significance and in the expected direction (B=.110, *SE*=.06, p<.1. *Victim Blame* was also associated with *Dating* (B=-.181, p<.001) and *Interpersonal Violence* (B=.444, p<.001), while *Perpetrator Blame* was associated with *Dating* (B=-.180, p<.001), *Gender Attitudes* (B=.084, p<.05), *Female Initiative* (B=-.157, p<.001), and *Interpersonal Violence* (B=-.381, p<.001).

Hypothesis 9, which predicted that the effect of victim resistance on blame attributions would be greater for male victims than female victims, was not supported (see Tables 14, Model 5). The interaction between victim gender and level of resistance was not statistically significantly associated with either *Victim Blame* ( $\beta$ =-.020, *SE*=.10, *p*>.05) or *Perpetrator Blame* ( $\beta$ =.076, *SE*=.07, *p*>.05).<sup>5</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Furthermore, calculating the total expected blame in each scenario based on the predicted effect sizes indicates that high resistant males are blamed the most, and low resistant females blamed the least, which contradicts expectations (see Table 15). However, the level of blame for perpetrators does follow the expected pattern, with perpetrators of low resistant male rape being blamed the least, followed by high resistant males, low resistant females, and high resistant females (see Table 16). These results should be

**Jury Membership.** Hypothesis 10, which predicted that victims would be blamed more, and perpetrators less, in the non-juror condition than in the jury condition, was not supported (see Table 17, Figure 14). Even though the final models were statistically significant for both *Victim Blame* (F=25.92, p<.001) and *Perpetrator Blame* (F=13.63, p<.001), *Jury Membership* did not statistically significant affect either *Victim Blame* (B=-.013, *SE*=.05, *p*>.05) or *Perpetrator Blame* (B=.089, *SE*=.06, p>.05). However, *Victim Blame* was predicted by *Female Victim* (B=-.132, p<.05), *Dating* (B=-.181, p<.001), and *Interpersonal Violence* (B=.439, p<.001), while *Perpetrator Blame* was predicted by *Dating* (B=-.180, p<.001), *Gender Attitudes* (B=.085, p<.01), *Female Initiative* (B=-.160, p<.001), and *Interpersonal Violence* (B=-.379, p<.001).

Hypothesis 11, which predicted that jury membership would moderate the effect of extra-legal factor and gender attitudes on victim perpetrator blame attributions, indicated by significant interactions between a) jury membership and victim gender; b) jury membership and level of resistance; c) jury membership and victim-perpetrator relationship; and d) jury membership and gender attitudes (total GAI score), was also unsupported (see Table 17, Model 5). None of the interactions between *Jury Membership* and *Female Victim, High Resistance, Dating*, or the combined Gender Attitude Inventory scales were statistically significant associated with either victim or perpetrator blame. See Table 18 for a summary of supported and unsupported hypotheses; see Figures 15 and 16 for effects of all variables on victim and perpetrator blame.

interpreted carefully however, as the only statistically significant coefficient, including the intercept, is *Female Victim*.

#### DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was threefold: to investigate the effect of victim resistance, victim-perpetrator relationship, and victim gender on individuals' perceptions of rape incidents that are common among college students; to compare the effects of incident characteristics and participant characteristics on male and female rape perceptions; and to investigate how jury membership may increase or decrease the tendency toward schematic processing relative to lay persons. Interestingly, none of the incident characteristics investigated in this study had the predicted effect on rape perceptions, indicating that more common rape scenarios (acquaintance and datingpartner rape that involve alcohol and foreplay) may be perceived differently than the more stereotypical rape scenarios (stranger rape involving injury) commonly used in the rape perception literature. Also contrary to expectations, jury membership does not affect rape perceptions. Nevertheless, the findings show that respondents perceive male and female rape in much the same way. That is, the same incident characteristics and participant attitudes that affect victim and perpetrator blame in female rape also affect victim and perpetrator blame in male rape.

As expected, rape perceptions are influenced by extra-legal factors and participant attitudes. Victim-perpetrator relationship, victim gender, female and male rape myth acceptance, and participant attitudes all predicted victim and perpetrator blame. However, not all findings were consistent with past literature. While most studies on rape perceptions use scenarios that are more consistent with the real rape stereotype than the common experiences of either victims or college students, the current study investigated participant perceptions of more typical rape incidents. The findings of this

study indicate that perceptions of common rape scenarios differ from those of more stereotypical scenarios. The most notable inconsistency is that the victim's resistance had no effect on rape perceptions. Victims who resisted verbally were not blamed any more or less than victims who resisted both verbally and physically, nor was perpetrator blame affected by the level of victim resistance.

It is tempting to conclude that victim resistance no longer influences people's perceptions of rape, or that resistance is less relevant in perceptions of typical rape scenarios in which the level of force used tends to be lower than in stereotypically violent rapes. Such a result could reflect a cultural shift in the "real rape" stereotype, facilitated by instrumental changes in the legal definition, that recognizes the prevalence of low-force acquaintance and intimate partner rapes (U.S. Department of Justice, 2015). However, many participants in the current study endorsed rape myths that emphasize the importance of victim resistance, indicating that these myths persist.

On the one hand, the amount of foreplay the victim engaged in before resisting may have diminished the relative importance of this resistance. Some authors have found that not only the level of resistance but also the timing of resistance influences victim and perpetrator blame (Kopper, 1996; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983). It may be that resistance onset is more important than resistance level when victims engage in a lot of consensual sexual activity before resisting. Indeed, if participants endorse the uncontrollable male sex drive myth, then the type or amount of resistance may not matter to perpetrator blame, because they believe that, once aroused, men cannot be held accountable for their actions (Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999; Walker, 1997). Likewise, the endorsement of female precipitation myths and rape-as-fantasy myths propose that engaging in

foreplay implies consent and that victims can enjoy forced sex, making the victim's resistance irrelevant to victim blame once he/she has engaged in some sexual activity (Amir, 1971; Edwards, Bradshaw, & Hinsz, 2014; Estrich, 1987).

Alternatively, the presence of alcohol and the emphasis on the victim's intoxication in all the scenarios may have minimized the importance of his/her resistance on blame attributions. In recent years, the recognition of incapacitation rapes as a serious problem, especially among college students, may have shifted the salience of alcohol away from issues of victim credibility toward its use as a weapon by perpetrators (Krebs et al., 2007). One study found that victims were blamed less, and perpetrators blamed more, when perpetrators exploited the victim's intoxicated state than when he used force, in ex-partner rape, but not acquaintance rape, suggesting that victim intoxication, resistance, and the victim-perpetrator relationship all interact to influence rape perceptions (Berger et al., 2008). Other studies show that victim and perpetrator blame depends on the level of both victim and perpetrator intoxication, so that intoxicated victims are blamed more than sober victims when the perpetrator is also intoxicated, but not when he is sober (Grubb & Turner, 2012). In the current study, the victim's intoxication may have minimized his/her perceived responsibility for the incident, while the perpetrator (who also drank alcohol but was not described as drunk) may have been perceived as taking advantage of the victim's intoxicated state while lacking the "protection" afforded by his own intoxication. If intoxicated victims are not expected to resist, or if their resistance is expected to be less effective than that of sober victims, than their intoxication in this study may have minimized the relative importance of level of resistance on victim and perpetrator blame. Indeed, the relatively high level of

perpetrator blame and low level of victim blame across all resistance levels seems to show that participants perceived the perpetrator as very blameworthy, and the victim as blameless, regardless of amount of resistance exhibited.

If resistance is not a determining factor of perceived victim or perpetrator blame in rape, then prosecutors should be able to effectively and successfully prosecute rapes in which evidence of resistance is lacking. It may be that intoxication, even if it does not reach the point of incapacitation, may be enough to minimize the perceived victim's responsibility to resist effectively or at all. While in the past, victim intoxication often reflected issues of victim credibility, the findings of the current study suggest that victim intoxication may be more relevant to perceptions of perpetrator responsibility if he is perceived as having taken advantage of the victim's intoxicated state (Grubb & Turner, 2012). Future research should investigate the relationship between alcohol and rape perceptions, especially the interactions between victim and perpetrator intoxication and victim resistance.

Likewise, future research should address the relationship between resistance level and timing. Given the plethora of studies that found a statistically significant effect of victim resistance on rape perceptions and the endorsement of resistance-related rape myths by participants in the current study, it seems unlikely that victim resistance has no effect on victim and perpetrator blame attributions. Rather, it may be that amount and type of resistance is moderated by resistance timing and other incident characteristics, including victim intoxication. Whatever the reason that victim resistance did not impact victim and perpetrator blame in this study, these findings indicate that people do not define rape based solely on the presence or amount of victim resistance. Police and

prosecutors should not be so quick to dismiss cases of low violence acquaintance and intimate partner rape based on concerns of victim credibility and convictability. Furthermore, the high level of perpetrator blame across all scenarios indicates that people can, and do, hold perpetrators accountable for rape, even when the victim is intoxicated and the level of resistance is low.

The effect of the victim-perpetrator relationship on victim blame is also unexpected and inconsistent with past research. Many studies have shown that victims are blamed more as the level of intimacy between the victim and perpetrator increases (Berger et al., 2008; Krahé, Temkin, & Bieneck, 2007; Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderup, 2000). However, in the current study, victims are blamed less in scenarios in which they had been dating the perpetrator, than in the acquaintance rape scenarios, regardless of victim gender or level of resistance, and this effect was both statistically significant and substantially large relative to other effects in the models. While the significance level is in part related to the study design (victim-perpetrator relationship was the only within-participant factor), the unexpected finding is difficult to explain. In their study of prospective lawyers' perceptions of rape scenarios, Berger and colleagues (2008) found that victim-perpetrator relationship (stranger, acquaintance, or ex-partner) interacted with type of coercive method (alcohol or force) used by the perpetrator. In their study, when force was used, victim blame followed the usual linear trend so that victims of stranger rape were blamed the least followed by victims of acquaintance rape, and then ex-partner rape. However, when the perpetrator exploited the victim's intoxicated state, victims of acquaintance rape were blamed the most, while

victims of stranger and ex-partner rape received equally low levels of blame (Berger *et al*, 2008).

In the current study, the effect of victim-perpetrator relationship on victim blame is more consistent with the latter findings (incapacitation rape) than the former (forcible rape). It appears that the effect of victim-perpetrator relationship on victim blame is moderated more by the presence of alcohol than the presence of force or resistance. Indeed, the effect was consistent across all scenarios, regardless of the level of resistance or victim gender, suggesting that when both force and alcohol are present in the incident, alcohol is more salient than force. Future research should investigate the relationship between alcohol, victim resistance, and victim-perpetrator relationship further, by varying the level of intoxication of both victim and perpetrator along with other incident characteristics.

This finding implies that victims who are raped by their boyfriends may be blamed less than current literature suggests, depending on other incident characteristics, especially the presence of alcohol. This has important implications for many victims, because victim blaming has been shown to be a barrier to reporting (Frazier & Haney, 1996; Krebs *et al.*, 2007; Wolitzky-Taylor *et al.*, 2011). If victims can expect to receive more sympathy than blame for these incidents, they may be more inclined to report them to the police or seek help for physical and psychological injuries (Krebs *et al.*, 2007). Furthermore, as Krebs and colleagues (2007) reported in the Campus Sexual Assault Study that over 40 percent of incapacitation rapes involved current or ex- dating partners, but only two percent of incapacitation rape victims reported the incidents to police, it is particularly important to facilitate reporting among this group.

One possible explanation for the result is the storyline of the vignettes themselves. While the acquaintance rape occurred at the residence of the perpetrator, the rape between the dating couple occurred in the victim's home. It is possible that participants perceived the dating victim as having less control over the incident or being less able to avoid the incident than the acquaintance victim. The difference in location of the rape event may have influenced the way that participants attributed blame to victims in these scenarios.

Even though respondents blamed victims less in the dating-partner rape than in the acquaintance rape scenario, which was unexpected, they also blamed perpetrator less when the victim and perpetrator were dating, which is consistent with past literature (Berger et al., 2008; Krahé, Temkin, & Bieneck, 2007; Sleath & Bull, 2010). This finding implies that victim and perpetrator blame are not two sides of the same coin. That is, victim blame is not diametrically opposed to perpetrator blame. This is important because the expectations of perceived victim credibility (victim blame) and perpetrator convictability (perpetrator blame) that influence police and prosecutors' decisions to process rape cases may not be linked so linearly. The current study indicates that potential jurors may blame perpetrators of acquaintance rape more than perpetrators of intimate partner rape, even if they also blame acquaintance rape victims more than intimate partner victims. Practitioner expectations about the effect of victim credibility on perpetrator convictability, and the decisions that result from these expectations, may be misguided. Clearly both victim and perpetrator blame are complex constructs that depend on many more factors, of which the victim-perpetrator relationship is only one.

While the incident characteristics investigated in this study did not have the expected effects, many of the participants' attitudes did. Both male and female rape myth acceptance were positively associated with victim blame and negatively associated with perpetrator blame. These effects were statistically significant and substantially large in all the relevant models, indicating that rape myth acceptance has a negative impact on victims, regardless of gender. Furthermore, even though participants tended to have slightly higher MRMA (mean=1.607, SD=.44) than FRMA (mean=1.49, SD=.40), there was no statistically significant difference in the effect sizes of male and female rape myth acceptance on victim or perpetrator blame, indicating that they have similar effects on rape perceptions in both male and female rape. This finding supports Davies and colleagues' (2012) suggestion that male and female rape myth acceptance are part of a single attitudinal construct. Clearly, both FRMA and MRMA increase victim blame and decrease perpetrator blame by focusing attention on the victim's behavior and characteristics, and future research may benefit from a gender-neutral rape myth acceptance scale that combines elements from both the IRMA and MRMS (Payne, Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1999; Melanson, 1999).

However, while many items in the male and female rape myth scales overlap conceptually, these items do not show the same level of endorsement by participants. For example, less than three percent of the sample agreed or strongly agreed that "if a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say that it was rape," while over 10 percent endorsed the statement "Any healthy man can successfully resist a rapist if he really wants to," and nearly a third of the sample agreed or strongly agreed that "The extent of a man's resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped." Similarly,

participants were more likely to endorse statements related to the "victims lie" myth in the male rape myth scale than in the female rape myth scale.<sup>6</sup> In the current study, the different endorsement rate of conceptually similar myths in the male and female rape myth scales could be due to differences in the subsamples that responded to them. Due to time constraints, participants did not respond to both scales and so scores on the FRMA and MRMA cannot be compared directly. Nevertheless, the survey instrument was randomly distributed to participants so there is no reason to believe that subsamples differ significantly from each other, and comparison of subsample demographic characteristics supports this claim (see Table 1). Furthermore, Davies, Gilston, & Rogers, (2012) found that FRMA and MRMA were highly correlated, so that individuals in their sample who endorsed many male rape myths also endorsed many female rape myths. Therefore, it seems more likely that different rape myths are implicated in perceptions of male and female rape, which leads to the same general effect on victim and perpetrator blame attributions, but through different mechanisms.

Indeed, some literature has found that participants attribute more behavioral blame to male victims and more characterological blame to female victims (Anderson, 1999; Howard, 1984a,b). The blame scale used in this study did not intend to measure such complexities in the victim blame construct, so variation in the behavioral and characterological blame attributed to male and female victims in this study is unknown. Nevertheless, the overall effect of male and female rape myth acceptance on male and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Nearly a third of the sample agreed or strongly agreed that "Many men claim rape when they have consented to homosexual relations but have changed their minds afterward," while only 22% agreed or strongly agreed that "Rape accusations are often used [by women] as a way of getting back at men," and less than 10% agreed or strongly agreed that "A lot of women lead a man on and then try to cry rape."

female victim blame seems to be the same, even if the underlying constructs or myths that cause victim blame may differ by victim gender. Future research should compare participants' levels of FRMA and MRMA directly, as well as the effects of FRMA on perceptions of male rape and MRMA on perceptions of female rape, in order to investigate the utility and validity of a combined male and female rape myth scale.

*How* rape myth acceptance affects male and female victim blame—and whether the blame attributed to victims is behavioral or characterological—may be less practically important than overall level of rape myth acceptance when predicting rape perceptions, especially among potential jurors. Indeed, regardless of the statements endorsed or the gender of their subjects, higher rape myth acceptance predicted more victim and less perpetrator blame. Still, understanding how men and women are blamed differently for their victimizations is important for improving the public's perception of rape victims. Responses to victims, especially by criminal justice and medical practitioners, may improve if the relevant rape myths they endorse are adequately addressed. Likewise, rape prevention programs that seek to reduce rape perpetration and victimization by debunking rape myths should be careful to address myths that relate more specifically to men, as female rape myths are not exhaustive.

While past research tended to investigate perceptions of either male rape or female rape, this study looked at both in order to compared participants' perceptions of male and female rape directly. Furthermore, investigating the participant and incident characteristics in more ecologically valid scenarios facilitates the generalizability of findings to common rape experiences of many college students. Overall, the findings in this study show more similarity than difference in perceptions of male and female rape.

Level of resistance, victim-perpetrator relationship, and male and female rape myth acceptance have the same effects on victim and perpetrator blame in the male and female rape, respectively. This suggests that many of the incident characteristics and participant attitudes that influence perceptions of female rape also influence perceptions of male rape. This finding has practical implications for the processing of male rape cases. It may be that the effects of "real rape" characteristics (level of resistance/victim-perpetrator relationship) are consistent across variations in "real victim" characteristics (victim gender).

Nevertheless, some participant characteristics that affected perceptions of male and female rape differently are worth noting. First, while acceptance of interpersonal violence predicted more victim blame in both male and female rape and predicted less perpetrator blame in male rape only, it did not affect blame of perpetrators of male rape. Similarly, higher endorsement of traditional gender attitudes predicted less female victim blame but was not associated with male victim blame. Finally, acceptance of female sexual initiative was negatively associated with perpetrator blame in female rape, but not male rape. It makes sense that attitudes toward female sexual behavior would be less relevant to perceptions of male rape than female rape. What is more surprising is that traditional gender attitudes have no effect on male victim blame and a positive effect on perpetrators of male rape. One might expect that, because male victims in this study violated heteronormative gender expectations by the fact of their sexuality, they would be blamed more by individuals who endorse traditional gender roles, while the perpetrators would be blamed less (Anderson, 2004; Howard, 1984b; Kassing, Beesley, & Frey, 2005;

Wakelin & Long, 2003). However, the results seem to indicate that the perpetrators of male rape are blamed for gender role violations while male victims are not.

Several demographic characteristics also affected perceptions of blame in the male and female rape models differently. Respondents who were younger, not heterosexual, and who agreed with or were unsure about same sex marriage were less likely to blame perpetrators in male rape but not female rape, while those who were white and those who were male were more likely to blame the perpetrator in female rape but not male rape. In the case of victim blame, whereas respondents who were white were less likely to blame the victim in female rape, no demographic characteristics predicted victim blame in male rape. Although a complete discussion of these specific effects is beyond the scope of the current study, what is important to note is that different factors affect perceptions of male and female rape, even when the characteristics of the incidents are the same. Differences in the intra-class correlation between the male and female rape models supports this claim. While the amount of variation in perpetrator blame that is accounted for by participant characteristics does not differ substantially between male (ICC=.554) and female (ICC=.589) rape, participant characteristics account for more of the variation in female victim blame (ICC=.490) than male victim blame (.383). That is, male victim blame seems to be more influenced by incident characteristics than participant characteristics or attitudes. Clearly, male and female rape are perceived differently, and these differences are not simply due to differences among participants.

Indeed, victim gender may account for some of the differences in the male and female rape models. When all victims were compared, victim gender was statistically significant. Male victims are blamed more than female victims even when their level of sexual attraction to the perpetrator remains constant. This result is consistent with expectations. However, it is unclear exactly why men are blamed more. It is particularly interesting that homophobia is not the primary cause of male victim blame, as condemnation of homosexuality was not significantly associated with victim or perpetrator blame in in any of the models. This finding is inconsistent with many studies that identified significant positive associations between participant homophobia and male victim blame (Anderson, 2004; Davies, Gilston, & Rogers, 2012). Likewise, it is not an issue of resistance, because, even though endorsement of resistance myths was greater on the MRMA scale than FRMA scale, neither level of resistance nor the interaction between resistance and victim gender affected victim or perpetrator blame. This suggests that the higher level of blame attributed to male victims is neither the result of participant homophobia nor violation of the masculine gender role (resistance).

Rather, it seems that homosexual men are blamed more like heterosexual women than heterosexual men. Instead of the behavioral blame that is typically attributed to male victims (in studies of male stranger rape) it may be that men perceived as being attracted to the perpetrator (that is, homosexual) are blamed more characterologically than heterosexual men who are unlikely to be perceived as attracted to the male perpetrator (Anderson, 1999; Howard, 1984a,b). The perceived sexual attraction to the perpetrator may influence the type of blame attributed to victims more than their actual gender (Anderson, 1999; Doherty & Anderson, 2004; Wakelin & Long, 2003). Once sexual attraction is assumed, expectations about men generally and homosexual men specifically—especially stereotypes relating to high sex drive and promiscuity—are even more likely than feminine gender stereotypes to influence participants' perceptions of

rape incidents as consensual sex. Victim gender then may influence victim and perpetrator blame attributions more through gender stereotypes about sexual attraction, sexual interest, and promiscuity than gender role violation. Indeed, in a study that varied both victim gender and victim sexuality, Wakelin and Long (2003) found that gay men and heterosexual women were blamed more than heterosexual men or lesbian women when raped by a male stranger, suggesting that victim blame depends more on the perceived sexual attraction to the perpetrator than homophobia or gender role violations. Once sexual attraction is perceived, the rape event is understood in terms of normal sexual relations. In this way, male (homosexual) victims are blamed more than female victims not because homosexual men violate male gender expectations more than female victims violate female gender expectations but because gender stereotypes suggest that homosexual men, even more than heterosexual women, are always sexually interested, easily sexually aroused, and "can enjoy sex even if it is being forced upon [them]" (Melanson, 1999). These stereotypes about homosexual men increase the tendency to perceive rape as sex, which in turn, increases the perceived responsibility of the victim for the incident.

The effect of victim gender on perpetrator blame was not statistically significant, indicating that, contrary to expectations, perpetrators of male rape are not blamed any more or less than perpetrators of female rape. It is difficult to interpret this finding, as past studies investigating the effect of victim gender on perpetrator blame have mixed results. Some research shows that, in incidents of stranger rape, perpetrators are blamed more when victims are male than when victims are female (Howard, 1984a; Schneider, Soh-Chiew Ee, & Aronson, 1994). These findings should be interpreted with caution in

light of more recent research emphasizing the importance of perceived sexual attraction between the victim and perpetrator on victim blame attributions (Doherty & Anderson, 2004; Wakelin & Long, 2003). In the stranger rape scenarios used in these studies, the sexual orientation of neither the victim nor the perpetrator was mentioned.

In another study that used a stranger rape but varied the victim's gender and sexual orientation, perpetrators were blamed less when victims were gay males than when they were lesbian females of heterosexual males but differences in perpetrator blame of gay male rape versus heterosexual female rape were not discussed (Wakelin & Long, 2003). The current study presented incidents that were most consistent with Gerber and colleagues (2004), who presented participants with a date rape scenario in which potential sexual attraction could be held constant but the inferred sexual orientation of victim and perpetrator varied along with their genders. These authors found that perpetrators were blamed more when victims were female than when victims were male, a finding that was hypothesized in the current study, but not supported. Interestingly, they also found that when the victim was male, female perpetrators were blamed more than male perpetrators. It seems that perpetrator blame is affected by victim gender via perceived sexual attraction *and* sexual orientation.

Stereotypes suggesting that homosexual men are even more sexually motivated than heterosexual men, may interact with the "uncontrollable male sex drive" myth, minimizing gay men's responsibility for forcing sex on their partners. However, the gender role deviance exhibited by homosexual male perpetrators may also increase their perceived blame. While Wakelin & Long (2003) showed that perceived sexual attraction was more important than homophobia or gender role deviance in predicting victim blame,

the relationship between these factors and perpetrator blame requires further investigation. Future research should vary the sexual orientation and gender of both victims and perpetrators to determine how homophobia, gender role deviance, and perceived sexual attraction affect perpetrator blame.

Although it is difficult to interpret this finding within the context of extant literature, the implications for the reporting and processing of rape cases in the criminal justice system is clear. If perpetrator blame, and by extension perpetrator convictability is not influenced by victim gender, then police and prosecutors should be more inclined to treat cases of male rape like cases of female rape. An increase in processing of male rape cases could help debunk the myth that men cannot be raped and provide more legitimacy to the claims of male rape victims. This could embolden male victims to report incidents to law enforcement or seek medical help for physical and psychological injuries, which in turn, could highlight male rape as a serious social problem, and improve the social response to male victims. In this way, changing how criminal justice practitioners respond to male victims of rape could have widespread social benefits.

The final goal of this study was to investigate the effect of the juror role on victim and perpetrator blame attributions. Many authors have demonstrated that individuals' decisions and perceptions are influenced by schematic processing, in which they interpret new stimuli based on pre-formed, broad knowledge structures (Berger *et al.*, 2008; Eyssel & Bohner, 2011). In response to rape, many studies have shown that people tend to employ rape myths as cognitive schemas to help interpret and categorize case information and evidence when determining victim and perpetrator blame (Berger *et al.*, 2008; Eyssel & Bohner, 2011; Krahé, Temkin, & Bieneck, 2007). However, jurors are expected to

rely on data-driven processing, in which judgements of perpetrator guilt and culpability are based on evidence specific to the case at hand (Berger *et al.*, 2008). Krahé and colleagues (2007) found that introducing an accountability requirement increased participants' reliance on data driven processing in determinations of perpetrator liability and victim blame in a rape scenario. While many studies have shown that (mock) jurors are influenced by a variety of extra-legal factors in rape case decision-making (Ellison & Munro, 2013; Feild, 1980; Olsen-Fulero & Fulero, 1997; Villemur & Hyde, 1983), the current study suggested that the duty inherent in the juror role may minimize the tendency toward schematic processing among lay persons.

This hypothesis was not supported. Jury membership did not significantly affect victim or perpetrator blame attributions. Nor did the juror role moderate the effect of extralegal factors or attitudes on rape perceptions. This finding indicates that jurors blame rape victims and perpetrators in the same way as lay persons. As such, the potential jurors' characteristics and attitudes, especially their rape myth acceptance and gender expectations, are likely to influence their decisions in rape cases, despite the expectation that they will rely on evidentiary factors alone.

This finding can be interpreted in a number of ways. Police and prosecutors are not wrong to believe that extra-legal factors affect jury decision-making. Both jurors and lay persons' judgements of victim and perpetrator blame are influenced by incident characteristics, and to the extent that these factors affect convictability, it may not be inappropriate to consider them in decisions to dismiss cases. However, as discussed above, these factors did not always have the expected effects. Results indicate that lay persons and jurors may not be as influenced by victim resistance as many prosecutors

believe. While evidentiary issues remain in proving that a rape event occurred when physical signs of resistance are lacking, the findings of this study indicate that individuals are capable of recognizing non-consent even when the victim does not physically resist. Likewise, even though victims are more likely to be blamed if they are male, perpetrators of male rape were not blamed less than perpetrators of female rape. This indicates that, despite divergence from the "real rape" and "real victim" stereotypes, convictions are as likely in male rape as in female rape.

Furthermore, the generally high attribution of perpetrator blame and low level of victim blame across all scenarios, despite the presence of alcohol and foreplay, suggests that respondents (including potential jurors) attribute blame to perpetrators, even when victims engage in precipitous behavior. While the level of alcohol consumption and foreplay engaged in before the rape was constant, which prevented direct examination of their effects on victim and perpetrator blame, engagement in foreplay and victim intoxication did not automatically eliminate perpetrator blame. Most individuals correctly perceived that a crime had taken place and felt that the perpetrator should be punished for his actions, suggesting the victim's intoxication and engagement in consensual foreplay was not perceived as an automatic invitation to sexual intercourse. Furthermore, over 89 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed that the "[perpetrator] thought [the victim] consented to have sex with him," indicating that most respondents recognized when consensual sexual activity shifted into sexual violence, most believed that the perpetrator perceived this as well, and most held him accountable for rape accordingly. Therefore, certain indicators of victim credibility, including drinking alcohol and engaging in foreplay, may not be as relevant to convictability as previously
believed. Practitioners influenced by trickle-down concerns with victim credibility and convictability should recognize that individuals can, and do, correctly attribute blame to perpetrators of sexual assault, even when incidents and victims are inconsistent with the "real rape" and "real victim" stereotypes.

Nevertheless, the findings of this study indicate that the (mock) juror role does not influence victim or perpetrator blame attributions, nor does it decrease the effect of extralegal factors or rape supportive attitudes on participants' judgements of blame. Individuals who are influenced by extra-legal factors outside the courtroom will be equally influenced by these factors as jurors. As such, lawyers should be cognizant of who is included in juries because jurors' attitudes are likely to bias their interpretation of evidence and judgements of perpetrator culpability. Rape myth acceptance and gender attitudes of potential jurors can, and should, be measured during the jury selection process in order to remove individuals whose biases are especially like to direct their attention toward extra-legal factors. While findings also show that jurors may not be influenced by the extra-legal factors that many police and prosecutors assume will affect their judgements of perpetrator culpability, or that these factors may influence juror judgements in unexpected ways, jurors nevertheless are prone to schematic processing, despite their inherent duty to remain impartial.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS

While the current findings support some, but not all, of the predictions informed by the extant research, the study makes some important contributions to the rape perception literature. First, it provides new insights into how people attribute blame to victims of sexual assault. As the first of its kind, this study found that male victims of sexual assault are not only at risk of being blamed for their own victimizations, but are blamed even more than female victims. Fear that they will be blamed, especially by persons working in the criminal justice system, may hinder rape reporting (Du Mont, Miller, & Myhr, 2003; Heath, Lynch, Fritch, & Wong, 2013; Krebs *et al.*, 2007). Although prevalence rates do indicate that women are more likely to be sexually victimized than men (Krebs *et al.*, 2007; Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network, 2017), ignoring male victims in research, policy, and practice will only perpetuate the myth that men cannot be victims of rape, which is likely to increase actual or perceived male victim blaming and decrease reporting of these incidents. Therefore, it is important that victim centered policies and programs meant to improve the criminal justice system's response to rape victims do not ignore male victims in their training and practice.

Second, while it is clear that rape perceptions are influenced by a variety of incident and participant characteristics, the effects of extra-legal factors on blame attributions were not entirely consistent with expectations. In the present study, level of resistance did not predict either victim or perpetrator blame, victim-perpetrator relationship (i.e., dating) was negatively associated with both victim and perpetrator blame, and the effect of victim gender on perpetrator blame was inconclusive. Nevertheless, despite some differences related primarily to participant characteristics and attitudes, perceptions of male and female rape seem to follow the same trends. Interestingly male and female rape myth acceptance have the same effects on perceptions of male and female rape, respectively, though the mechanism through which they do so may differ.

68

Finally, this study contributes to the literature on jury decision-making in rape cases. It seems that, despite an inherent obligation to focus on the evidence when making judgements about perpetrator culpability, individuals do not leave their biases at the door when they enter to courtroom as jurors. Incident characteristics and individual attitudes that affect victim and perpetrator blame attributions among lay persons will also affect the blame attributions of jurors, and criminal justice practitioners should address these potential when preparing and processing rape case.

The current study has some important limitations that future research should address. First, the findings may not be generalizable to non-student populations or other forms of sexual violence. The convenience sample used in this study is relevant to the topic because rape is more common among young adults than any other age group, and approximately 25 percent of women and 6 percent of men are raped while in college (Krebs *et al.*, 2007). Nevertheless, rape myth acceptance is ubiquitous across wide and diverse segments of society and has potentially detrimental effects off campus as well as on. It is important that future research investigates the effect of incident and participant characteristics on victim and perpetrator blame attributions among nationally representative community samples and pools of potential jurors. Future research should also employ instruments and methods that minimize the amount of missing data. While tests showed that data were missing completely at random, replications that do not rely on multiple imputation to replace large amounts of missing values should be completed to validate the current study's findings.

Second, the current study investigated the effects of various extra-legal factors, including level of resistance, victim-perpetrator relationship, and victim gender, while

holding other important incident characteristics constant. Because this study used scenarios that reflect the common rape experiences of college students, the findings may not be generalizable to other types of sexual violence. Different factors may influence victim and perpetrator blame attributions in prison rape, child rape, and incest. Similarly, rape perceptions in this study may have been affected by the incident characteristics that were held constant. As discussed earlier, it is unclear how the effects of victim resistance and victim-perpetrator relationship found in this study are influenced by the emphasis on victim intoxication or perpetrator's sexual orientation. Future research should investigate the effects of these extra-legal factors in stranger rape, rape by female perpetrators, and rape in the absence of alcohol.

Finally, the findings related to the juror role should be interpreted with caution. It is possible that the jury condition used in this study did not adequately confer on participants a sense of jury membership and its inherent obligation toward impartiality. A juror condition that differentiates juror participants more clearly and accurately may produce different results. Replications should employ a more ecologically valid juror condition that aligns participants more closely with the juror role. This could include formatting vignettes to reflect police reports or court documents, including photographs of the victim and perpetrator and other evidence, or providing tape recorded "testimonies." Comparing a more ecologically valid jury condition to non-jury conditions could more accurately identify the possible effects of the juror role on rape perceptions.

In conclusion, this study shows that there is still much to learn about rape perceptions. Some of the current findings indicate that certain extra-legal factors have less impact on victim and perpetrator blame than previous literature has shown, which may be emblematic of greater changes in social perceptions of rape and rape victims. Nevertheless, the endorsement of both male and female rape myths persists. Until rape myths are eradicated, it is likely that rape and rape victims will continue to be treated differently from other types of violent crime in the criminal justice system and by society more generally. Clearly more work needs to be done to diminish both their prevalence and their impact before the instrumental changes intended by rape reform laws of the past and present can be fully realized.

		Total Sample N=701	Male Victim Subsample N=369	Female Victim Subsample N=332
Age	Mean(SD):	20.69 (4.14)	20.7 (3.75)	20.7 (4.53)
-	Missing	6 (.86)	0 (0.0)	6 (1.8)
		Frequency (%)		
Gender				
	Male	264 (37.66)	142 (38.5)	122 (36.7)
	Female	418 (59.63)	220 (59.6)	198 (59.6)
	Other Gender	11 (1.57)	5 (1.4)	6 (1.8)
	Missing	8 (1.14)	2 (.5)	6 (1.8)
Sexual Orientation				
	Heterosexual	601 (85.73)	324 (87.8)	277 (83.4)
	Other	77 (10.98)	37 (10.0)	40 (12.0)
	Missing	23 (3.28)	8 (2.2)	15 (4.5)
Race				
	White	368 (52.50)	206 (55.8)	162 (48.8)
	Hispanic	262 (37.38)	133 (36.0)	129 (38.9)
	Black	61 (8.70)	34 (9.2)	27 (8.1)
	Other	87 (12.41)	50 (13.6)	37 (11.1)
	Missing	10 (1.43)	3(.8)	7 (2.1)
Heard about Same Sex Marriage				
	Yes	541 (77.18)	294 (79.7)	247 (74.4)
	No	150 (21.	73 (19.8)	77 (23.2)
	Missing	10 (1.43)	2 (.5)	8 (2.4)
Agrees with Same Sex Marriage				
	Yes	530 (75.61)	283 (76.7)	247 (74.4)
	No	52 (7.42)	29 (7.9)	23 (6.9)
	Doesn't Know	109 (15.55)	55 (14.9)	54 (16.3)
	Missing	10 (1.43)	2 (.5)	8 (2.4)
al Assault Victimization	-			
	Yes	160 (22.83)	90 (24.4)	70 (21.1)
	No	503 (71.75)	258 (69.9)	245 (73.8)
	Doesn't Know	29 (4.14)	18 (4.9)	11 (3.3)
	Missing	9 (1.28)	3 (.8)	6(1.8)

TABL	ES
------	----

		Number of Items	α	Mean(SD)	Minimum	Maximum
Dependent Variables	Victim Blame	4	.65	1.779 (.52)	1	4.00
	Perpetrator Blame	5	.75	3.618 (.46)	1	4.00
Independent Variables	FRMA	17	.89	1.494 (.40)	1	2.94
	MRMA	18	.90	1.607 (.44)	1	3.08
	Gender Attitudes	10	.87	2.341 (.54)	1	4.00
	Female Initiative	10	.87	1.688 (.45)	1	3.70
	Female Sex	4	.83	1.677 (.60)	1	4.00
	Homophobia	4	.89	1.675 (.73)	1	4.00
	Interpersonal Violence	9	.86	1.575 (.51)	1	3.44
	Total GAI scale	37	.93	1.835 (.40)	1	3.41

### Table 2 Attitude Scale abaractoristic

Table 3. Victim and Perpetrator Bla	me Scale I	tems and <b>F</b>	Response	Distributio	n				
	Distribution of Sample (% of 1402 responses)								
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Missing				
Victim Blame									
Victim is to blame for the incident.	73.68	22.40	2.71	1.14	.07				
Victim could have avoided the incident.	17.19	31.38	42.23	7.85	1.36				
Victim had control over the what happened.	43.15	44.22	10.70	1.36	.57				
I feel sorry (or sad) for the victim. (R)	3.78	7.28	43.44	44.79	.71				
Perpetrator Blame									
Perpetrator is to blame for the incident.	1.71	2.35	25.75	69.90	.29				
Perpetrator had control over what happened.	2.00	2.21	27.82	67.19	.78				
Perpetrator thought victim consented to have sex with him. (R)	63.20	25.39	7.63	3.14	.64				
Perpetrator ought to be held criminally liable for rape.	1.36	2.21	25.25	70.97	.21				
Perpetrator should be punished for his actions in the incident.	1.50	1.93	22.82	73.61	.14				
Note: (R) = Reverse-coded in final blame score.									

	Dis	stribution of S	ample (% o	of 368 respons	ses)
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Missing
It is a terrible experience for a man to be raped. (R)	.82	.82	19.02	78.80	.54
The extent of a man's resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped.	28.26	38.59	24.73	7.88	.54
Any healthy man can successfully resist a rapist if he really wants to.	49.73	38.86	7.61	2.45	1.36
If a man obtained an erection while being raped, it probably means that he started to enjoy it.	61.14	31.52	4.89	.54	1.90
A man can enjoy sex even if it is being forced upon him.	47.55	33.15	14.13	1.63	3.53
Most men who are raped are very upset by the incident. (R)	1.63	2.72	36.41	57.34	1.90
Many men claim rape when they have consented to homosexual relations but have changed their minds afterward.	11.14	47.55	30.16	2.72	8.42
If a man lets things get out of hand, sexually, it is his own fault if his partner forces sex on him.	59.51	29.62	7.61	1.90	1.36
Male rape is usually committed by homosexuals.	28.80	45.65	18.21	3.80	3.53
Most men who are raped are somewhat to blame for not fighting off the attacker.	58.42	28.26	9.78	1.90	1.63
A man who has been raped has lost his manhood.	63.32	25.82	7.61	1.90	1.36
Most men who are raped are somewhat to blame for not being more careful.	58.70	27.99	11.96	.54	.82
If a man told me that he had been raped by another man, I would conclude that he is homosexual.	61.68	30.98	5.71	.82	.82
Most men who have been raped have a history of promiscuity.	49.73	42.39	3.53	.54	3.80
No self-respecting man would admit to being raped.	51.90	32.07	12.23	1.63	2.17
A man who allows himself to be raped by another man is probably a homosexual.	68.21	25.27	4.35	1.36	.82
Men who parade around nude in a locker room are asking for trouble.	65.22	24.73	8.15	1.36	.54
Male rape is more serious when the victim is heterosexual than when the victim is homosexual.	58.70	28.26	7.61	3.26	2.17

#### Table 4. Male Rape Myth Acceptance Scale Items and Response Distribution

	Di	stribution of S	Sample (%	of 333 respons	ses)
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Missing
If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.	43.84	30.63	21.32	3.30	.90
Although most women wouldn't admit it, they generally find being physically forced into sex a real "turn-on."	48.65	37.24	11.41	1.50	1.20
If a woman is willing to "make out" with a guy, then it's no big deal if he goes a little further and has sex.	72.07	24.62	2.40	0.0	.90
Many women secretly desire to be raped.	81.08	15.92	2.40	0.0	.60
If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say that it was rape.	77.18	19.52	2.10	.60	.60
Men from nice middle-class homes almost never rape.	68.17	27.93	3.00	.90	0.0
Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at men.	36.64	40.24	18.62	3.00	1.50
It is usually only women who dress suggestively who are raped.	66.97	28.53	3.60	.60	.30
If the rapist doesn't have a weapon, you really can't call it rape.	89.49	10.21	.30	0.0	0.0
Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.	73.57	24.02	1.80	.30	.30
A lot of women lead a man on and then try to cry rape.	48.35	40.84	9.31	.60	.90
A woman who "teases" men deserves anything that might happen.	74.47	22.52	2.40	0.0	.60
When women are raped, it's often because the way they said "no" was ambiguous.	66.37	27.93	5.11	0.0	.60
Men don't usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.	40.24	28.83	26.13	3.00	1.80
A woman who dresses in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tries to force her to have sex.	65.77	21.92	11.11	1.20	0.0
Rape happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control.	40.54	25.83	25.23	6.31	2.10
Women are almost never raped by their boyfriends.	57.06	36.34	5.71	.30	.60

### Table 5. Female Rape Myth Acceptance Scale Items and Response Distribution

	Dist	ribution of S	ample (%	of 701 respo	nses)
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Missing
Traditional Gender Attitudes				0	
Men are more competitive than women.	11.13	35.81	42.37	42.37	1.28
Men are more adventurous than women.	16.26	54.07	25.68	2.43	1.57
Men are more egotistical than women.	9.27	37.95	42.80	7.42	2.57
Men are more arrogant than women.	8.70	38.94	42.37	7.70	2.28
Men are more sure of their abilities than women.	13.55	45.79	31.95	6.99	1.71
Men are more independent than women.	21.83	53.92	19.12	3.99	1.14
Women are more gentle than men.	6.85	25.53	55.06	11.41	1.14
Women are more gullible than men.	17.97	49.07	25.96	4.85	2.14
Women are more able than men to devote themselves to others.	14.27	42.94	31.38	8.56	2.85
Compared to men, women tend to be weak.	24.54	41.80	27.10	4.14	2.43
Accentance of Female Sexual Initiative					
I approve of a woman taking the first step to start a relationship with a man. (R)	2.00	5.42	52.21	39.51	.86
The man should always be the one to initiate sex with a woman.	39.37	54.49	3.99	.71	1.43
approve of a woman calling a man she is interested in (R)	1.28	2 43	51.07	44.08	1 14
The initiative in asking for a date should come from either the man or the woman $(\mathbf{R})$	1.00	4.28	43.79	49.93	1.00
In a relationship, the woman as well as the man should be free to initiate sexual activity. (B)	.71	4.42	42.08	52.21	.57
[annrove of a woman taking the aggressive role during sexual intercourse (R)	1.00	10.27	51.03	33.05	2 85
Women should be free to express themselves sexually $(\mathbf{R})$	57	3.00	45.08	50.64	2.05
The initiative in dating should some from the man	.57	52 21	45.00	2 71	./1
We way should take the measure rate in count him	27.07	55.21	14.84	2./1	1.5/
women snould take the passive role in courtship.	32.38	50.21	11.70	1.00	4.71
A woman should allow the man to take charge of their sexual relationship.	37.95	45.22	12.98	1.28	2.57
Women should have the same sexual freedom as men. (R)	.86	1.14	36.66	59.91	1.43
It is acceptable for a woman to have sex with a casual acquaintance. (R)	3 57	9.27	45.08	39.80	2.28
I would have no respect for a woman who engages in sexual relationships without any emotional involvement.	45.36	39.09	10.41	3.14	2.00
It is alright for a woman to have sexual intercourse with someone she knows well and likes but does not love. (R)	3.71	8.99	48.79	36.38	2.14
Condemnation of Homosexuality					
Male homosexuality is a different kind of lifestyle which should not be condemned. (R) (Dropped)	22.97	17.83	26.82	28.39	3.99
Male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in human men. (R)	5.14	11.55	40.66	38.52	4.14
Male homosexuality is a perversion.	43.08	36.23	8.27	1.71	10.70
Homosexuality is a sin.	58.92	21.83	10.70	5.71	2.85
Homosexual behavior between two men is just plain wrong.	59.77	24.54	8.70	4.14	2.85
Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence					
Most of the people who get raped have invited it in some way.	58.49	31.10	7.85	1.14	1.43
People provoke rape by their appearance.	58.06	26.53	12.55	1.14	1.71
People provoke rape by their behavior.	54.35	24.68	17.97	1.28	1.71
In most cases, when a person gets raped, he/she was asking for it.	12.18 57.40	22.68	5.14	.57	1.43
aggressor.	57.49	32.93	0.85	1.28	1.43
Most charges of domestic violence are made up by the victim to get back at his/her partner.	49.22	39.51	8.99	.43	1.85
If a person is making out, and things get out of hand, it is his/her own fault if sex is forced on him/her.	66.05	27.82	3.85	.29	2.00
In forcible rape, the victim never causes the crime. (R)	10.98	24.54	31.67	29.96	2.85
A man is sometimes justified in hitting his partner.	64.91	20.97	10.70	1.43	2.00

### Table 6. Gender Attitude Inventory Subscale Items and Response Distribution

		Victim Blameº		Perpetrator Blame <sup>o</sup>			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	
	β	β	β	β	β	β	
High Resistance	.162†	.101	.044	.022	.039	.101	
-	(.10)	(.09)	(.08)	(.10)	(.10)	(.09)	
Gender Attitudes <sup>o</sup>		· /	066			.067	
			(.04)			(.05)	
Female Initiative <sup>o</sup>			.106*			209**	
			(.05)			(.07)	
Female Sex <sup>o</sup>			.048			.033	
			(.06)			(.08)	
Homophobia <sup>o</sup>			.085			001	
1			(.06)			(.08)	
Interpersonal Violence <sup>o</sup>			.439***			346***	
. I			(.05)			(.06)	
Age		009	009		.003	.003	
5		(.01)	(.01)		(.01)	(.01)	
White		- 382*	- 209		410*	266†	
		(16)	(13)		(17)	(16)	
Hispanic		- 105	- 042		159	128	
Inspanie		(17)	(13)		(17)	(16)	
Black		- 301	- 261		311	260	
Didek		(21)	(17)		(23)	(21)	
Other Race		(.21)	005		- 020	027	
Other Race		(17)	(14)		(19)	(17)	
Male		210*	043		003	178+	
Wate		.219	043		(11)	(10)	
Other Conder		(.10)	(.09)		(.11)	(.10)	
Other Gender		000	491		.371	.309	
Hataraganual		(.37)	(.50)		(.40)	(.57)	
Heterosexuar		.039	041		.004	.033	
Mamiana Arman		(.10)	(.15)		(.18)	(.10)	
Marriage Agree		/22****	10/		.438*	.120	
		(.19)	(.20)		(.20)	(.24)	
Marriage Unsure		327	111		.239	.18/	
<b>D</b> : ()		(.21)	(.19)		(.23)	(.23)	
Rape victim		074	.002		.059	021	
		(.12)	(.10)		(.13)	(.12)	
Confused victim		.011	100		176	109	
	107	(.25)	(.21)		(.28)	(.26)	
Constant	106	.8/1*	.456	000	763†	502	
	(.07)	(.40)	(.34)	(.07)	(.43)	(.41)	
ICC			.483			.474	
N-Observations	666	654	654	666	654	654	
N-Groups	333	327	327	333	327	327	
Notes:° = Variable has been $F(Victim, Model 3)=14.09**$ rp<1, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***	standardized. Stat **; F(Perpetrator, p<.001	ndard errors in par Model 3)=5.15***	entheses. *.				

 Table 7. Mixed Level Model with Random Intercepts of Effect of Victim Resistance on Victim and Perpetrator Blame Attributions in Female Rape

Model 2 β 211*** (.04) 009 (.01) 371* (.16) 095	Model 3 β 211*** (.04) 066 (.04) .108* (.05) .048 (.06) .048 (.06) .440*** (.05) 009 (.01) 204 (.13)	Model 1 β 181*** (.05)	Model 2 β 185*** (.04) .003 (.01)	Model 3 β 186**** (.04) .067 (.05) 206** (.07) .033 (.08) 007 (.08) 342*** (.07) .002
β 211*** (.04) 009 (.01) 371* (.16) 095	β 211*** (.04) 066 (.04) .108* (.05) .048 (.06) .083 (.06) .440*** (.05) 009 (.01) 204 (.13)	β 181*** (.05)	β 185*** (.04) .003 (.01)	β 186*** (.04) .067 (.05) 206** (.07) .033 (.08) 007 (.08) 342*** (.07) .002
009 (.01) 371* (.16) 095	211*** (.04) 066 (.04) .108* (.05) .048 (.06) .440*** (.05) 009 (.01) 204 (.13)	181*** (.05)	185*** (.04) .003 (.01)	186*** (.04) .067 (.05) 206** (.07) .033 (.08) 007 (.08) 342*** (.07) .002
(.04) 009 (.01) 371* (.16) 095	(.04) 066 (.04) .108* (.05) .048 (.06) .083 (.06) .440*** (.05) 009 (.01) 204 (.13)	(.05)	.003 (.01)	(.04) .067 (.05) -206** (.07) .033 (.08) -007 (.08) -342*** (.07) .002
009 (.01) 371* (.16) 095	066 (.04) .108* (.05) .048 (.06) .083 (.06) .440*** (.05) 009 (.01) 204 (.13)		.003 (.01)	.067 (.05) 206*** (.07) .033 (.08) 007 (.08) 342*** (.07) .002
009 (.01) 371* (.16) 095	(.04) .108* (.05) .048 (.06) .440*** (.05) 009 (.01) 204 (.13)		.003 (.01)	(.05) 206** (.07) .033 (.08) 007 (.08) 342*** (.07) .002
009 (.01) 371* (.16) 095	(.05) .048 (.06) .083 (.06) .440*** (.05) 009 (.01) 204 (.13)		.003 (.01)	206** (.07) .033 (.08) 007 (.08) 342*** (.07) .002
009 (.01) 371* (.16) 095	(.05) .048 (.06) .083 (.06) .440*** (.05) 009 (.01) 204 (.13)		.003 (.01)	(.07) .033 (.08) 007 (.08) 342*** (.07) .002
009 (.01) 371* (.16) 095	.048 (.06) .083 (.06) .440*** (.05) 009 (.01) 204 (.13)		.003 (.01)	.033 (.08) 007 (.08) 342*** (.07) .002
009 (.01) 371* (.16) 095	(.06) .083 (.06) .440*** (.05) 009 (.01) 204 (.13)		.003 (.01)	(.08) 007 (.08) 342*** (.07) .002
009 (.01) 371* (.16) 095	(.06) .440*** (.05) 009 (.01) 204 (.13)		.003 (.01)	007 (.08) 342*** (.07) .002
009 (.01) 371* (.16) 095	(.08) .440*** (.05) 009 (.01) 204 (.13)		.003 (.01)	342*** (.07) .002
009 (.01) 371* (.16) 095	(.05) 009 (.01) 204 (.13)		.003 (.01)	(.07) .002
009 (.01) 371* (.16) 095	(.03) 009 (.01) 204 (.13)		.003 (.01)	.002
(.01) 371* (.16)	(.01) 204 (.13)		(.01)	.002
371* (.16)	204 (.13)		(.01)	( 01)
(.16)	(.13)		111*	(.01)
- 095	(.15)		(17)	.270
	020		(.17)	(.10)
095	039		(18)	(16)
308	(.13)		308	(.10)
(21)	(17)		(23)	(21)
(.21)	009		- 017	(.21)
(17)	(14)		(10)	(17)
223*	(.14)		004	181+
(10)	(09)		(11)	(11)
- 706*	- 498+		563	372
(37)	(30)		(40)	(37)
051	- 036		007	066
(16)	(13)		(18)	(16)
- 734***	- 175		433*	107
(19)	(20)		(20)	(24)
- 336	- 118		236	171
(21)	(19)		(23)	(23)
081	000		.056	026
(.12)	(10)		(.13)	(.12)
.009	101		177	113
(.25)	(.21)		(.28)	(.26)
1.021**	.583†	.101†	652	360
(.40)	(.34)	(.06)	(.43)	(.41)
× /	.512			.614
654	654	666	654	654
327	327	333	327	327
	(.21) 081 (.12) .009 (.25) 1.021** (.40) 654 327 . Standard errors ator, Model 3)=5.	(.21) (.19) 081000  (.12) (.10)  .009101  (.25) (.21)  1.021** .583†  (.40) (.34)  .512	(.21) (.19) (.19) (.19) (.19) (.12) (.10) (.009101 (.25) (.21) (.10) (.25) (.21) (.40) (.34) (.06) (.512 (.40) (.34) (.06) (.512 (.40) (.34) (.06) (.512 (.40) (.34) (.06) (.512 (.40) (.34) (.06) (.512 (.40) (.34) (.06) (.512 (.40) (.34) (.06) (.512 (.40) (.34) (.06) (.512 (.40) (.34) (.06) (.512 (.40) (.34) (.06) (.512 (.40) (.34) (.06) (.512 (.40) (.34) (.06) (.512 (.40) (.34) (.06) (.512 (.40) (.34) (.06) (.34) (.06) (.34) (.06) (.34) (.06) (.34) (.06) (.34) (.06) (.34) (.06) (.34) (.34) (.06) (.32) (.34) (.34) (.06) (.34	(.21) (.19) (.23

 Table 8. Mixed Level Model with Random Intercept for the Effect of Victim-Perpetrator

 Relationship on Victim and Perpetrator Blame Attributions in Female Rape

		Victim I	Blame <sup>o</sup>		Perpetrator Blame <sup>o</sup>					
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4		
	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β		
FRMA <sup>o</sup>	.551***	.548***	.504***	.280***	428***	435***	464***	366***		
	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)	(.06)	(.04)	(.04)	(.05)	(.08)		
High Resistance		.045	.042	.037		.125	.104	.115		
		(.08)	(.08)	(.07)		(.09)	(.09)	(.09)		
Dating		213***	211***	211***		181***	186***	186***		
		(.04)	(.04)	(.04)		(.05)	(.04)	(.04)		
Gender Attitudes <sup>o</sup>				089*				.097*		
				(.04)				(.05)		
Female Initiative <sup>o</sup>				.079				174**		
				(.05)				(.07)		
Female Sex <sup>6</sup>				.054				.025		
** 1.1.0				(.06)				(.08)		
Homophobia				.088				004		
				(.06)				(.08)		
Interpersonal				.252***				103		
Violence				(.06)				(.09)		
Age			.003	004			008	005		
XX71			(.01)	(.01)			(.01)	(.01)		
white			354**	260*			.383*	.332*		
TT::-			(.13)	(.13)			(.16)	(.15)		
Hispanic			11/	0//			.109	.1/3		
D11-			(.14)	(.15)			(.10)	(.16)		
Власк			289°	2917			.301	.300		
Other Deee			(.17)	(.17)			(.20)	(.20)		
Other Race			004	065			.139	.113		
Mala			(.14)	(.14)			(.17)	(.17)		
Male			049	080			.231.	.227.		
Other Conder			(.09)	(.08)			(.10)	(.10)		
Other Gender			380	364			.290	.249		
Hotorogovugl			(.51)	(.29)			(.30)	(.30)		
Heterosexuar			.004	033			.030	.043		
Marriaga Agraa			(.13)	(.12)			(.10)	(.13)		
Maillage Agree			(16)	(20)			(19)	(24)		
Marriage Unsure			- 118	- 019			049	069		
Marriage Onsure			(17)	(19)			(20)	(23)		
Rane victim			- 073	- 011			059	- 003		
Rupe vieum			(10)	(10)			(12)	(12)		
Confused victim			- 230	- 169			046	- 018		
Confused victim			(21)	(20)			(25)	(25)		
Constant	- 028	056	518	409	011	040	- 255	- 212		
Constant	(04)	(06)	(34)	(33)	(04)	(07)	(39)	(40)		
ICC	(.01)	(.00)	(.5.1)	490	(.0.1)	(,)	(.57)	589		
N-Observations	666	666	654	654	666	666	654	654		
N-Groups	333	333	327	327	333	333	327	327		
Notes:° = Variable h	as been stand	ardized. Stand	lard errors in	parentheses						
F(Victim, Model 4)=	=15.71***; F(	Perpetrator, M	odel 4)=6.94	***.						

 Table 9. Mixed Level Model with Random Intercepts for the Effect of Female Rape Myth

 Acceptance on Victim and Perpetrator Blame Attributions in Female Rape

	Victim Blame <sup>o</sup>			Р	e°	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β	β	β	β	β
High Resistance	.115	.146†	.077	031	069	.003
	(.10)	(.09)	(.07)	(.09)	(.09)	(.08)
Gender Attitudes <sup>o</sup>			.026			.112*
			(.04)			(.04)
Female Initiative <sup>o</sup>			.016			124*
			(.05)			(.05)
Female Sex <sup>o</sup>			.074			091
			(.05)			(.06)
Homophobiaº			.015			.018
			(.06)			(.06)
Interpersonal Violence <sup>o</sup>			.464***			421***
			(.05)			(.05)
Age		.014	.011		021†	020†
		(.01)	(.01)		(.01)	(.01)
White		088	.002		.022	064
		(.13)	(.11)		(.13)	(.11)
Hispanic		.104	.058		002	.106
-		(.13)	(.11)		(.13)	(.11)
Black		120	.007		.049	069
		(.17)	(.14)		(.17)	(.15)
Other Race		.312*	.098		199	.020
		(.15)	(.13)		(.15)	(.13)
Male		.325***	.059		114	.084
		(.10)	(.08)		(.10)	(.09)
Other Gender		.432	.525		.554	.493
		(.41)	(.34)		(.42)	(.36)
Heterosexual		.006	.137		.334*	.2276
		(.16)	(.13)		(16)	(.14)
Marriage Agree		- 668***	- 172		077	- 379*
		(17)	(16)		(17)	(17)
Marriage Unsure		- 074	102		- 417*	- 587***
		(19)	(17)		(20)	(18)
Rane victim		- 079	- 021		078	- 031
tupe vietini		(11)	(09)		(11)	(10)
Confused victim		- 307	- 303†		070	059
		(21)	(17)		(22)	(18)
Constant	- 033	.059	- 263	.006	.200	494
	(.07)	(.38)	(.31)	(.07)	(.39)	(.33)
ICC	(,)	(.50)	.394	(.07)	(,)	.554
N-Observations	736	732	732	736	732	732
N-Grouns	368	366	366	368	366	366
	. 1 1: 1	300		500	500	500

 Table 10. Mixed Level Model with Random Intercept for the Effect of Victim Resistance on

 Victim and Perpetrator Blame Attributions in Male Rape

 $p \le 1. p \le 05. p \le 01. p \le 001$ 

		Victim Blam	e°	Perpetrator Blame <sup>o</sup>			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	
	β	β	β	β	β	β	
Dating	153***	153***	154***	162***	175***	175***	
	(.05)	(.05)	(.05)	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)	
Gender Attitudes <sup>o</sup>			.025			.112*	
E-m-1- Luiti-ti0			(.04)			(.04)	
Female Initiative			.016			124*	
Famala Say <sup>0</sup>			(.03)			(.03)	
Female Sex			(05)			090	
Homophobiaº			012			018	
Tomophobia			(06)			(06)	
Interpersonal Violence <sup>o</sup>			469***			- 421***	
interpersonar viorenee			(05)			(05)	
Age		.013	.010		021†	020†	
		(.01)	(.01)		(.01)	(.01)	
White		088	.002		.020	065	
		(.13)	(.11)		(.13)	(.11)	
Hispanic		.115	.063		008	.105	
1		(.13)	(.11)		(.13)	(.11)	
Black		107	.017		.041	070	
		(.17)	(.14)		(.17)	(.15)	
Other Race		.306*	.092		199	.017	
		(.15)	(.13)		(.15)	(.13)	
Male		.325***	.058		114	.083	
		(.10)	(.08)		(.10)	(.09)	
Other Gender		.425	.520		.555	.491	
		(.41)	(.34)		(.42)	(.36)	
Heterosexual		.013	.143		.327*	.225	
		(.16)	(.13)		(.16)	(.14)	
Marriage Agree		682***	182		.082	379*	
		(.17)	(.16)		(.17)	(.17)	
Marriage Unsure		103	.085		405*	588***	
<b>n</b>		(.19)	(.17)		(.20)	(.18)	
Rape victim		081	021		.079	031	
		(.11)	(.09)		(.11)	(.10)	
Confused victim		302	3017		.068	.059	
Constant	101*	(.21)	(.18)	071	(.22)	(.18)	
Constant	.1017	.238	133	.0/1	.240	.58/7	
ICC	(.05)	(.37)	(.31)	(.05)	(.39)	(.33)	
			.408			.572	
N-Observations	736	732	732	736	732	732	
N-Groups	368	366	366	368	366	366	

Table 11. Mixed Level Model with Random Intercept for the Effect of Victim-Perpetrator
Relationship on Victim and Perpetrator Blame Attributions in Male Rape

		Victim	Blame <sup>o</sup>			Perpetra	tor Blame <sup>o</sup>	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β
MRMA°	.574***	.572***	.527***	.296***	479***	479***	498***	297***
	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)	(.06)	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)	(.07)
High Resistance	( )	.069	.098	.075	× /	.007	025	.004
C		(.07)	(.07)	(.07)		(.08)	(.08)	(.08)
Dating		- 152***	- 153***	- 153***		- 163***	- 175***	- 175***
Duning		(05)	(05)	(05)		(04)	(04)	(04)
Gender Attitudes <sup>o</sup>		()	()	- 009		()	(.01)	148***
o on a of a number				(.04)				(.04)
Female Initiative <sup>o</sup>				012				096†
				(.05)				(.05)
Female Sex <sup>o</sup>				.052				068
				(.05)				(.06)
Homophobia <sup>o</sup>				013				.046
1				(.06)				(.06)
Interpersonal				.291***				247***
Violence <sup>o</sup>				(.06)				(.07)
Age			.020*	.017†			027*	026*
-			(.01)	(.01)			(.01)	(.01)
White			046	015			019	050
			(.11)	(.10)			(.12)	(.11)
Hispanic			.082	.064			.018	.098
			(.11)	(.11)			(.12)	(.11)
Black			.005	.037			071	100
			(.14)	(.14)			(.15)	(.15)
Other Race			.128	.083			029	.030
			(.13)	(.12)			(.13)	(.13)
Male			.086	.046			.112	.095
			(.08)	(.08)			(.09)	(.09)
Other Gender			.631†	.567†			.362	.447
			(.34)	(.33)			(.36)	(.35)
Heterosexual			036	.072			.369**	.288*
			(.13)	(.13)			(.14)	(.14)
Marriage Agree			284*	201			287†	350*
M . II			(.14)	(.16)			(.15)	(.17)
Marriage Unsure			048	.025			443*	511**
D :.:			(.16)	(.16)			(.17)	(.17)
Rape victim			.009	.005			004	05/
Conformation			(.09)	(.09)			(.10)	(.10)
Confused victim			227	204			006	.020
Constant	022	062	(.18)	(.17)	007	070	(.19)	(.18)
Constant	.022	.005	105	222	007	.070	(34)	.023
ICC	(.04)	(.00)	(.31)	(.30)	(.04)	(.00)	(.34)	554
				.303				.534
N-observations	736	736	732	732	736	736	732	732
N-groups	368	368	366	366	368	368	366	366
Notes:° = Variable h	as been stand	lardized. Star	ndard errors i	n parentheses	3.			
F(Victim, Model 4)=	=16.74***; F	Perpetrator, 1	Model 4)=12.	13***.				

 Table 12. Mixed Level Model with Random Intercepts for the Effect of Male Rape Myth

 Acceptance on Victim and Perpetrator Blame Attributions in Male Rape

Table 13. Comparison of Effect Sizes of MRMA and FRMA on Male and Female Rape
Perceptions.

	MRMA		FRI	Z	
	ß	SE	ß	SE	
Victim Blame	.296	.064	.280	.062	0.178
Perpetrator Blame	297	.068	366	.080	0.650
†p≤.1. *p≤.05. **p≤.01.	***p≤.001				

		V	ictim Blame	9°			Per	petrator Bla	ıme°	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β
Female Victim	051	050	070	134*	134*	.020	.020	.033	.120†	.110†
	(.07)	(.07)	(.06)	(.05)	(.05)	(.07)	(.07)	(.07)	(.06)	(.06)
Female Victim x					020					.076
High Resistance					(.10)					(.12)
High Resistance		.139*	.120†	.058	.058		005	009	.054	.054
		(.07)	(.06)	(.05)	(.05)		(.07)	(.07)	(.06)	(.06)
Dating		182***	181***	181***	181***		171***	180***	180***	180***
•		(.03)	(.03)	(.03)	(.03)		(.03)	(.03)	(.03)	(.03)
Gender				014	014				.085**	.084*
Attitudes <sup>o</sup>				(.03)	(.03)				(.03)	(.03)
Female				.056	.056				156***	157***
Initiativeo				(.04)	(.04)				(.04)	(.04)
Female Sex <sup>o</sup>				.062	.062				033	033
				(.04)	(.04)				(.05)	(.05)
Homophobia <sup>o</sup>				.058	.058				011	011
1				(.04)	(.04)				(.05)	(.05)
Interpersonal				.444***	.444***				381***	381***
Violence <sup>o</sup>				(.04)	(.04)				(.04)	(.04)
Age			.003	.002	.002			010	008	008
5			(.01)	(.01)	(.01)			(.01)	(.01)	(.01)
White			214*	094	094			.188†	.080	.079
			(.10)	(.08)	(.08)			(.11)	(.09)	(.09)
Hispanic			.013	.007	.007			.058	.096	.096
- <b>F</b> · · · ·			(.10)	(.08)	(.08)			(.11)	(.09)	(.09)
Black			202	123	124			.147	.076	.079
			(13)	(11)	(11)			(.14)	(.12)	(.12)
Other Race			217†	.047	.047			133	.020	.018
			(.11)	(.09)	(.09)			(.12)	(.11)	(.11)
Male			.281***	.009	.009			- 075	125†	125†
			(07)	(06)	(06)			(07)	(07)	(07)
Other Gender			- 196	048	049			.588*	439†	442†
			(27)	(23)	(23)			(29)	(26)	(26)
Heterosexual			.020	.034	.034			159	.146	.144
			(11)	(.09)	(.09)			(.12)	(11)	(11)
Marriage Agree			- 699***	- 163	- 163			226†	- 196	- 196
			(12)	(12)	(12)			(13)	(14)	(14)
Marriage Unsure			210	.001	.002			120	255†	- 256†
intantiage chicare			(14)	(12)	(12)			(15)	14	(14)
Rape victim			- 080	- 011	- 012			056	- 039	- 038
impo violini			(08)	(07)	(07)			(09)	(08)	(08)
Confused victim			- 187	- 248+	- 248+			- 029	010	010
Comused vieuill			(16)	(13)	(13)			(17)	(15)	(15)
Constant	024	046	563*	244	243	- 008	078	- 123	112	115
	(05)	(06)	(27)	(23)	(23)	(05)	(06)	(29)	(26)	(26)
ICC	()	(.00)	()	462	462	(.00)	(.00)	()	603	602
100				.+02	.+02				.005	.002
N-observations	1402	1402	1386	1386	1386	1402	1402	1386	1386	1386
N-groups	701	701	693	693	693	701	701	693	693	693
1, Broups	/01	/01	075	075	075	/01	/01	075	075	075

### Table 14. Mixed Level Model with Random Intercepts for the Effect of Victim Gender on Victim and Perpetrator Blame Attributions

Notes:° = Variable has been standardized. Standard errors in parentheses.  $F(Victim, Model 4)=27.20^{***}$ ;  $F(Perpetrator, Model 4)=14.14^{***}$ .

## Table 15. The Effect of Victim Gender\*Victim Resistance Interaction on Victim Blame

	Male Victim	Female Victim
High Resistance	.301	.147
Low Resistance	.243	.109

### Table 16. The Effect of Victim Gender\*Victim Resistance Interaction on Perpetrator Blame

	Male Victim	Female Victim
High Resistance	.169	.355
Low Resistance	.115	.225

<b>i</b>		V	ictim Blame	0			Pe	rpetrator Bl	ame°	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β
Jury Member	034	034	.009	012	013	.082	.083	.063	.089	.089
2	(.07)	(.07)	(.06)	(.05)	(.05)	(.07)	(.07)	(.07)	(.06)	(.06)
Jury x Female					062					003
Victim					(.11)					(.12)
Jury x High					121					.118
Resistance					(.11)					(.12)
Jury x Dating					038					018
Iumu a Candan					(.06)					(.06)
Attitude Inventory					.047					.040
Female Victim		- 051	- 070	- 13/1*	(.03)		022	034	113+	(.00) 111÷
I childle v lethin		(07)	(06)	(05)	(05)		(07)	(07)	(06)	(06)
High Resistance		.139*	(120†	.058	.057		005	010	.053	.050
ingn itesistanee		(.07)	(.06)	(.05)	(.05)		(.07)	(.07)	(.06)	(.06)
Dating		182***	181***	181***	181***		171***	180***	180***	180***
e		(.03)	(.03)	(.03)	(.03)		(.03)	(.03)	(.03)	(.03)
Gender Attitudes°		. /	. ,	015	017		. ,	. ,	.087**	.085**
				(.03)	(.03)				(.03)	(.03)
Female Initiative <sup>o</sup>				.056	.060†				157***	160***
				(.04)	(.04)				(.04)	(.04)
Female Sex <sup>o</sup>				.063	.060				034	032
** ** 0				(.04)	(.04)				(.05)	(.05)
Homosexuality				.058	.062				011	017
T ( 1				(.04)	(.04)				(.05)	(.05)
Interpersonal Violonoo				.444***	.439***				382***	3/9***
A ge			004	(.04)	(.04)			010	(.04)	(.04)
Age			(01)	(01)	(01)			(01)	008	008
White			- 214*	- 094	- 090			186†	077	077
White			(10)	(08)	(08)			(11)	(09)	(09)
Hispanic			.013	.008	.008			.056	.093	.094
F			(.10)	(.08)	(.08)			(.11)	(.09)	(.09)
Black			203	123	118			.143	.069	.067
			(.13)	(.11)	(.11)			(.14)	(.12)	(.12)
Other Race			.217†	.045	.048			128	.027	.023
			(.11)	(.09)	(.09)			(.12)	(.11)	(.11)
Male			.281***	.009	.012			075	.125†	.123†
			(.07)	(.06)	(.06)			(.07)	(.07)	(.07)
Other Gender			196	048	054			.586*	.436†	.445†
<b>TT</b> / 1			(.27)	(.23)	(.23)			(.29)	(.26)	(.26)
Heterosexual			.021	.032	.033			.165	.155	.156
Marriaga Agres			(.11)	(.09)	(.09)			(.12) 224÷	(.11)	(.11)
Marriage Agree			(12)	102	104			.2241	202	210
Marriage Unsure			- 210	001	005			- 110	- 256+	- 265*
Marriage Onsure			(14)	(12)	(12)			(15)	(14)	(14)
Rane victim			- 080	011	- 012			058	- 038	- 035
rupe neum			(.08)	(.07)	(.07)			(.09)	(.08)	(.08)
Confused victim			188	247†	242†			033	.003	.000
			(.16)	(.13)	(.13)			(.17)	(.15)	(.15)
Constant	.018	.064	.558*	.251	.225	042	.034	160	.060	.065
	(.05)	(.07)	(.28)	(.23)	(.23)	(.05)	(.07)	(.29)	(.26)	(.26)
ICC				.462	.460				.602	.601
N-observations	1402	1402	1386	1386	1386	1402	1402	1386	1386	1386
N-groups	701	701	693	693	693	701	701	693	693	693
Note:° = Variable ha	s been stand	lardized. St	andard error	s in parentl	neses.					
F(Victim, Model 4)=	=25.92***; I	(Perpetrato	r, Model 4)=	=13.63***.						
†p≤.1. *p≤.05. **p≤	≤.01. <b>***</b> p≤.	001	,							

# Table 17. Mixed Level Model with Random Intercepts for the Effect of Jury Membership on Victim and Perpetrator Blame Attributions

87

	Supported by Results			
Hypothesis	Victim Blame	Perpetrator Blame		
1. Female victims will be blamed more, and perpetrators blamed less, when the victim resists verbally, than when she resists verbally and physically.	No: no effect	No: no effect		
2. Female victims will be blamed more, and perpetrators blamed less, when victim and perpetrator are dating, than when they are acquaintances.	No: opposite effect	Yes		
3. Female victim blame will increase, and perpetrator blame will decrease, as participant FRMA increases.	Yes	Yes		
4. Male victims will be blamed more, and perpetrators blamed less, when the victim resists verbally, than when he resists verbally and physically.	No: no effect	No: no effect		
5. Male victims will be blamed more, and perpetrators are blamed less, when victim and perpetrator are dating, than when they are acquaintances.	No: opposite effect	Yes		
6. Male victims will be blamed more, and perpetrators blamed less, by participants with high MRMA.	Yes	Yes		
7. The effect size of MRMA on victim and perpetrator blame attributions in male rape is larger than the effect size of FRMA on blame attributions in female rape.	No: no difference	No: no difference		
8. Victims will be blamed more, and perpetrators less, when victims are male.	Yes	No: no effect		
9. There will be a significant interaction between victim gender and level of resistance so that victims will be blamed the most, and perpetrators blamed the least, when victims are nonresistant males, as compared to nonresistant females, resistant males, and resistant females.	No: no effect	No: no effect		
10. Victims will be blamed more, and perpetrators less, in the non-juror condition than in the jury condition.	No: no effect	No: no effect		
11. Jury membership will moderate the effect of extra-legal factor and gender attitudes on victim perpetrator blame attributions, indicated by significant interactions between a) jury membership and victim gender; b) jury membership and level of resistance; c) jury membership and victim-perpetrator relationship; and d) jury membership and gender attitudes (total GAL score)	No: no effect	No: no effect		

### Table 18. Summary of Hypotheses and Results

### FIGURES



Figure 1. Distribution of Victim Blame Scores



Figure 2. Distribution of Perpetrator Blame Scores



Figure 3. Distribution of Male Rape Myth Acceptance Scores



Figure 4. Distribution of Female Rape Myth Acceptance Scores



Figure 5. Distribution of Traditional Gender Attitude Scores



Figure 6: Distribution of Acceptance of Female Sexual Initiative Scores



Figure 7. Distribution of Acceptance Female Casual Sex Scores



Figure 8. Distribution of Condemnation of Homosexuality Scores



Figure 9. Distribution of Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scores



*Figure 10. The Effects of Female Rape Myth Acceptance on Victim and Perpetrator Blame Attributions in Female Rape.* 



*Figure 11. The Effects of Male Rape Myth Acceptance on Victim and Perpetrator Blame Attributions in Male Rape.* 



*Figure 12. A Comparison of the Effects of Male and Female Rape Myth Acceptance on Victim and Perpetrator Blame Attributions.* 



*Figure 13. The Effects of Extra Legal Factors on Victim and Perpetrator Blame Attributions.* 



*Figure 14. The Effects of Jury Membership and Extra Legal Factors on Victim and Perpetrator Blame Attributions* 



Figure 15. The Effects Incident and Participant Characteristics on Victim Blame



Figure 16. The Effects Incident and Participant Characteristics on Victim Blame

#### REFERENCES

- Abbey, A., & McAuslan, P. (2004). A longitudinal examination of male college students' perpetration of sexual assault. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 72(5), 747-756.
- Abbey, A., Zawacki, T., & Buck, P. O. (2005). The effects of past sexual assault perpetration and alcohol consumption on men's reactions to women's mixed signals. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24(2), 129-155.
- Abbey, A., Zawacki, T., Buck, P. O., Clinton, A. M., & McAuslan, P. (2004). Sexual assault and alcohol consumption: What do we know about their relationship and what types of research are still needed? *Aggression and violent behavior*, *9*(3), 271-303.
- Ackard, D. M., & Neumark-Sztainer, D. (2002). Date violence and date rape among adolescents: Associations with disordered eating behaviors and psychological health. *Child abuse & neglect*, 26(5), 455-473.
- Alderden, M. A., & Ullman, S. E. (2012). Creating a more complete and current picture: Examining police and prosecutor decision-making when processing sexual assault cases. *Violence Against Women*, 18(5), 525-551.
- Amir, M. (1971). Patterns in forcible rape (p. 52). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Anderson, I. (1999). Characterological and behavioral blame in conversations about female and male rape. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *18*(4), 377-394.
- Anderson, I. (2004). Explaining negative rape victim perception: Homophobia and the male rape victim. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, *10*(4), 43-57.
- Anderson, I., & Lyons, A. (2005). The effect of victims' social support on attributions of blame in female and male rape. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35(7), 1400-1417.
- Ashmore, R. D., Del Boca, F. K., & Bilder, S. M. (1995). Construction and validation of the Gender Attitude Inventory, a structured inventory to assess multiple dimensions of gender attitudes. *Sex roles*, 32(11-12), 753-785.
- Berger, A., Bieneck, S., Krahé, B., & Temkin, J. (2008). Prospective lawyers' rape stereotypes and schematic decision making about rape cases. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 14(5), 461-479.
- Bieneck, S., & Krahé, B. (2011). Blaming the victim and exonerating the perpetrator in cases of rape and robbery: Is there a double standard? *Journal of Interpersonal*

Violence, 26(9), 1785-1797.

- Black, K. A., & McCloskey, K. A. (2013). Predicting date rape perceptions: The effects of gender, gender role attitudes, and victim resistance. *Violence Against Women*, 19(8), 949-967.
- Boyle, G. J. (1991). Does item homogeneity indicate internal consistency or item redundancy in psychometric scales?. *Personality and individual differences*, *12*(3), 291-294.

Brownmiller, S. (2013). Against our will: Men, women and rape. Open Road Media.

- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *38*(2), 217-230.
- Chapleau, K. M., Oswald, D. L., & Russell, B. L. (2008). Male rape myths: The role of gender, violence, and sexism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(5), 600-615.
- Campbell, R., & Johnson, C. R. (1997). Police officers' perceptions of rape: Is there consistency between State Law and individual beliefs? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12(2), 255-274.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, *16*(3), 297-334.
- Davies, M., Gilston, J., & Rogers, P. (2012). Examining the relationship between male acceptance, female rape myth acceptance, victim blame, homophobia, gender roles, and ambivalent sexism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *27*(14), 2807-2823.
- Davies, M., & Rogers, P. (2006). Perceptions of male victims in depicted sexual assaults: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 11(4), 367-377.
- Davies, M., Rogers, P., & Whitelegg, L. (2009). Effects of victim gender, victim sexual orientation, victim response and respondent gender on judgements of blame in a hypothetical adolescent rape. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 14(2), 331-338.
- Doherty, K., & Anderson, I. (2004). Making sense of male rape: Constructions of gender, sexuality and experience of rape victims. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 14(2), 85-103.
- Edwards, S. R., Bradshaw, K. A., & Hinsz, V. B. (2014). Denying rape but endorsing forceful intercourse: Exploring differences among responders. *Violence and Gender*, 1(4), 188-193.

Ellison, L., & Munro, V. E. (2013). Better the devil you know? 'Real rape' stereotypes

and the relevance of a previous relationship in (mock) juror deliberations. *The International Journal of Evidence & Proof*, 17(4), 299-322.

Estrich, S. (1987). Real rape. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

- Eyssel, F., & Bohner, G. (2011). Schema effects of rape myth acceptance on judgments of guilt and blame in rape cases: The role of perceived entitlement to judge. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(8), 1579-1605.
- Feldman-Summers, S., & Palmer, G. C. (1980). Rape as viewed by judges, prosecutors, and police officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 7(1), 19-40.
- Feild, H. S. (1979). Rape trials and jurors' decisions: A psycholegal analysis of the effects of victim, defendant, and case characteristics. *Law and Human Behavior*, 3(4), 261-284.
- Frazier, P. A. (1993). A comparative study of male and female rape victims seen at a hospital-based rape crisis program. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 8(1), 64-76.
- Frazier, P. A., & Haney, B. (1996). Sexual assault cases in the legal system: Police, prosecutor, and victim perspectives. *Law and Human Behavior*, 20(6), 607-628.
- Gerber, G. L., Cronin, J. M., & Steigman, H. J. (2004). Attributions of blame in sexual assault to perpetrators and victims of both genders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(10), 2149-2165.
- Gerger, H., Kley, H., & Bohner, G. (2007). The acceptance of modern myths about sexual aggression scale: Development and validation in german and english. *Aggressive Behavior*, 33(5), 422-440.
- Grubb, A., & Turner, E. (2012). Attribution of blame in rape cases: A review of the impact of rape myth acceptance, gender role conformity and substance use on victim blaming. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(5), 443-452.
- Gunn, R., & Linden, R. (1997). The impact of law reform on the processing of sexual assault cases. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 34(2), 155-174.
- Hammond, E. M., Berry, M. A., & Rodriguez, D. N. (2011). The influence of rape myth acceptance, sexual attitudes, and belief in a just world on attributions of responsibility in a date rape scenario. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *16*(2), 242-252.
- Harrison, L. A., Howerton, D. M., Secarea, A. M., & Nguyen, C. Q. (2008). Effects of ingroup bias and gender role violations on acquaintance rape attributions. *Sex Roles*, 59(9), 713-725.

- Henson, R. K. (2001). Understanding internal consistency reliability estimates: A conceptual primer on coefficient alpha. *Measurement and evaluation in counseling* and development, 34(3), 177-189.
- Hockett, J. M., Saucier, D. A., & Badke, C. (2015). Rape myths, rape scripts, and common rape experiences of college women: Differences in perceptions of women who have been raped. *Violence Against Women*, 22(3), 1-17.
- Hockett, J. M., Saucier, D. A., Hoffman, B. H., Smith, S. J., & Craig, A. W. (2009). Oppression through acceptance? Predicting rape myth acceptance and attitudes toward rape victims. *Violence Against Women*, 15(8), 877-897.
- Howard, J. A. (1984a). Societal influences on attribution: Blaming some victims more than others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(3), 494-505.
- Howard, J. A. (1984b). The" normal" victim: The effects of gender stereotypes on reactions to victims. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47(3), 270-281.
- Humphrey, J. A., & White, J. W. (2000). Women's vulnerability to sexual assault from adolescence to young adulthood. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 27(6), 419-424.
- Javaid, A. (2016). Male rape, stereotypes, and unmet needs: Hindering recovery, perpetuating silence. *Violence and Gender*, *3*(1), 7-13.
- Kassing, L. R., Beesley, D., & Frey, L. L. (2005). Gender role conflict, homophobia, age, and education as predictors of male rape myth acceptance. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 27(4), 311-328.
- Kassing, L. R., & Prieto, L. R. (2003). The rape myth and blame-based beliefs of counselors-in-training toward male victims of rape. *Journal of Counseling and Development: JCD*, 81(4), 455-462.
- Kaufman, A., Divasto, P., Jackson, R., Voorhees, D., & Christy, J. (1980). Male rape victims: noninstitutionalized assault. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 137(2), 221-223.
- Kopper, B. A. (1996). Gender, gender identity, rape myth acceptance, and time of initial resistance on the perception of acquaintance rape blame and avoidability. *Sex Roles*, 34(1-2), 81-93.
- Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *55*(2), 162-170.

Krahé, B., Scheinberger-Olwig, R., & Kolpin, S. (2000). Ambiguous communication of

sexual intentions as a risk marker of sexual aggression. Sex Roles, 42(5-6), 313-337.

- Krahé, B., Temkin, J., & Bieneck, S. (2007). Schema-driven information processing in judgements about rape. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 21(5), 601-619.
- Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2007). The campus sexual assault (CSA) study: Final report. *Washington, DC: National Institute* of Justice, US Department of Justice.
- Loh, C., Gidycz, C. A., Lobo, T. R., & Luthra, R. (2005). A prospective analysis of sexual assault perpetration risk factors related to perpetrator characteristics. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(10), 1325-1348.
- Melanson, P. S. K. (1999). Belief in male rape myths: A test of two competing theories. (Doctoral dissertation, Queen's University, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59, 5620.
- Minch, C., & Linden, R. (1987). Attrition in the processing of rape cases. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 29(4), 389-403.
- Mitchell, D., Hirschman, R., & Nagayama Hall, G. C. (1999). Attributions of victim responsibility, pleasure, and trauma in male rape. *Journal of Sex Research*, 36(4), 369-373.
- Monson, C. M., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Binderup, T. (2000). Does "no" really mean "no" after you say "yes"?: Attributions about date and marital rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*(11), 1156-1174.
- Murphy, K. R., & Davidshofer, C. 0. (1991). *Psychological testing: Principles and applications*.
- Mustaine, E. E., & Tewksbury, R. (2002). Sexual assault of college women: A feminist interpretation of a routine activities analysis. *Criminal Justice Review*, 27(1), 89-123.
- Norris, J., & Cubbins, L. A. (1992). Dating, drinking, and rape: Effects of victim's and assailant's alcohol consumption on judgments of their behavior and traits. *Psychology* of Women Quarterly, 16(2), 179-191.
- Olsen-Fulero, L., & Fulero, S. M. (1997). Commonsense rape judgments: An empathycomplexity theory of rape juror story making. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 3*(2-3), 402-427.
- Page, A. D. (2008). Gateway to reform? Policy implications of police officers' attitudes toward rape. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(1), 44-58.

- Paternoster, R., Brame, R., Mazerolle, P., & Piquero, A. (1998). Using the correct statistical test for the equality of regression coefficients. *Criminology*, *36*(4), 859-866.
- Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape Myth Acceptance: Exploration of Its Structure and Its Measurement Using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 33(1), 27-68.
- Perrott, S. B., & Webber, N. (1996). Attitudes toward male and female victims of sexual assault: Implications for services to the male victim. *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality*, 8(4), 19-38.
- Peterson, R. A. (1994). A meta-analysis of Cronbach's coefficient alpha. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(2), 381-391.
- Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network Website. (2017). Victims of sexual violence. Retrieved online: <u>https://www.rainn.org/statistics/victims-sexual-violence</u> (February 2017.)
- Richardson, D., & Campbell, J. L. (1982). Alcohol and rape: The effect of alcohol on attributions of blame for rape. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 8(3), 468-476.
- Rickert, V. I., & Wiemann, C. M. (1998). Date rape among adolescents and young adults. *Journal of Pediatric and Adolescent Gynecology*, 11(4), 167-175.
- Rothman, E. F., Exner, D., & Baughman, A. L. (2011). The prevalence of sexual assault against people who identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual in the United States: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 12*(2), 55-66.
- Schneider, L. J., Ee, J. S. C., & Aronson, H. (1994). Effects of victim gender and physical vs. psychological trauma/injury on observers' perceptions of sexual assault and its aftereffects. *Sex Roles*, 30(11-12), 793-808.
- Schwartz, M. D., & Pitts, V. L. (1995). Exploring a feminist routine activities approach to explaining sexual assault. *Justice Quarterly*, *12*(1), 9-31.
- Shotland, R. L., & Goodstein, L. (1983). Just because she doesn't want to doesn't mean it's rape: An experimentally based causal model of the perception of rape in a dating situation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 46(3), 220-232.
- Sleath, E., & Bull, R. (2010). Male rape victim and perpetrator blaming. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(6), 969-988.
- Spohn, S., Beichner, D., & Davis-Frenzel, E. (2001). Prosecutorial justifications for sexual assault case rejection: Guarding the "gateway to justice." Social Problems,

48(2), 206-235.

- Spohn, C., & Horney, J. (1992). *Rape law reform: A grassroots revolution and its impact*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Spohn, C., & Tellis, K. (2013). *Policing and prosecuting sexual assault: Inside the criminal justice system*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Stewart, M. W., Dobbin, S., & Gatowski, S. I. (1996). "Real rapes" and "real victims": The shared reliance on common cultural definitions of rape. *Feminist Legal Studies*, 4(2), 159-176.
- Struckman-Johnson, C., & Struckman-Johnson, D. (1992). Acceptance of male rape myths among college men and women. Sex Roles, 27(3-4), 85-100.
- Suarez, E., & Gadalla, T. M. (2010). Stop blaming the victim: A meta-analysis on rape myths. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(11), 2010-2035.
- Tasca, M., Rodriguez, N., Spohn, C., & Koss, M. P. (2013). Police decision making in sexual assault cases: Predictors of suspect identification and arrest. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(6), 1157-1177.
- Truman J. L. & Langton, L. (2015). Criminal victimization, 2014. US Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics US Department of Justice. Retrieved Online: <u>https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cv14.pdf</u> (February 2017). Revised, September 29, 2015.
- Turchik, J. A., & Edwards, K. M. (2012). Myths about male rape: a literature review. Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 13(2), 211-226.
- Turchik, J. A., Probst, D. R., Irvin, C. R., Chau, M., & Gidycz, C. A. (2009). Prediction of sexual assault experiences in college women based on rape scripts: a prospective analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 77(2), 361.
- Ullman, S. E., Karabatsos, G., & Koss, M. P. (1999). Alcohol and sexual assault in a national sample of college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *14*(6), 603-625.
- U.S Department of Justice: Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2015). *Crime in the United States, 2014: Rape addendum.* Retrieved from: <u>https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2014/crime-in-the-u.s-2014/resource-pages/rape-addendum.pdf</u> (February 2017).
- Vicary, J. R., Klingaman, L. R., & Harkness, W. L. (1995). Risk factors associated with date rape and sexual assault of adolescent girls. *Journal of Adolescence*, 18(3), 289-306.
- Villemur, N. K., & Hyde, J. S. (1983). Effects of sex of defense attorney, sex of juror, and age and attractiveness of the victim on mock juror decision making in a rape case. *Sex Roles*, *9*(8), 879-889.
- Wakelin, A., & Long, K. M. (2003). Effects of victim gender and sexuality on attributions of blame to rape victims. *Sex Roles*, 49(9-10), 477-487.
- Walker, S. J. (1997). When "no" becomes "yes": Why girls and women consent to unwanted sex. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 6(3), 157-166.
- Weiss, K. G. (2008). Male sexual victimization: Examining men's experiences of rape and sexual assault. *Men and Masculinities*, *12*(3), 275-298.
- Wolitzky-Taylor, K. B., Resnick, H. S., McCauley, J. L., Amstadter, A. B., Kilpatrick, D. G., & Ruggiero, K. J. (2011). Is Reporting of Rape on the Rise? A Comparison of Women with Reported versus Unreported Rape Experiences in the National Women's Study Replication. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(4), 807-832.

## APPENDIX A

## VIGNETTE EXAMPLES

## Rape Scenario: Juror, Male Victim, Low Resistance, Acquaintance

For the next section, please carefully read the scenarios and indicate whether you agree or disagree with the statements that follow as if you were a juror at the trials. Remember, the legal definition of rape is, "The penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without the consent of the victim." In order for the defendant to be guilty of this crime, the evidence in the case must show beyond a reasonable doubt both of the following two elements:

- 1. The defendant engaged in an act described by the definition above with the victim and
- 2. The defendant did so without the victim's consent.

On Saturday night, Matt went to a party with some friends. When they arrived at the house, David answered the door and led them to the living room where people were hanging out. Even though they had never met before, Matt thought David was cute and they began talking. David offered Matt a beer, which he drank quickly before helping himself to another. They continued to chat throughout the evening about movies, music, work, and classes. After a while, Matt decided that he was too drunk to drive home, and David said he could sleep over. They retired to his bedroom and began kissing. After kissing for a while, Matt stopped and said he just wanted to go to sleep. David ignored him and moved his hand up Matt's stomach and under his shirt. Matt said "Stop. I don't want that." David held Matt down and pushed his hand down his pants. Matt said loudly, "No! Stop! Don't do that!" Then David held him down, undressed him, and intercourse ensued.

## Rape Scenario 2: Non-Juror, Female Victim, High Resistance, Dating

For the next section, please read the scenario and indicate whether you agree or disagree with the statements that follow.

Ben and Isabel met in one of their classes and had been dating for almost a year. After their weekly date night of dinner and a movie, they were both having a good time and neither of them wanted to go home yet. They stopped at a bar by Isabel's house to continue chatting. They ordered a few rounds of drinks, talked, and danced a bit. When Isabel said she was drunk and tired, Ben agreed to walk her home. He went inside with her and they started kissing on the couch in the living room. After a while, Isabel stopped and said Ben should go. He ignored her, and kept kissing her neck and rubbed his hand over her breast. Isabel tried to push his hand away and said "Don't. Stop that!" Ben pushed Isabel down on the couch and yanked her pants off. Again Isabel said, "NO! Stop!" and struggled vigorously and slapped his face. Then Ben held down her arms, spread her legs, and intercourse followed.