Theses and Dissertations

5-2017

Context Matters: Evaluating Social Judgments of Acquaintance Rape Myths

Michelle E. Deming
University of South Carolina

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd

Part of the Sociology Commons

CONTEXT MATTERS: EVALUATING SOCIAL JUDGMENTS OF
ACQUAINTANCE RAPE MYTHS

by

Michelle E. Deming

Bachelor of Arts
University of North Carolina at Wilmington, 2007

Master of Arts
University of North Carolina at Wilmington, 2009

_____

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in

Sociology

College of Arts and Sciences

University of South Carolina

2017

Accepted by:

Shelley A. Smith, Major Professor

Douglas L. Anderton, Committee Member

Suzanne C. Swan, Committee Member

Jason L. Cummings, Committee Member

Cheryl L. Addy, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

The objectives of my dissertation are to: 1) determine the social psychological factors affecting rape myth judgments and, 2) develop an instrument that utilizes realistic social contexts to measure acquaintance rape myth adherence among undergraduate students. The Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMA; McMahon and Farmer 2011; Payne et al. 1999) was used to create acquaintance rape vignettes using factorial surveys (Rossi and Anderson 1982). I manipulated factors known to be associated with victim-blame such as alcohol, a previous sexual relationship, if the woman is dressed provocatively, the type of relationship (e.g., acquaintance versus friend), if the woman verbally protested, and if the woman physically resisted. Using Qualtrics© software, I developed an online survey and recruited introductory sociology students to participate in this research producing an average of 835 vignettes for statistical analyses. Key findings indicate that after controlling for all of the situational variables, the most significant factors related to victim-blame are the respondents' sexual history and sexual consent (i.e., if the woman verbally and physically protested). This finding is critical as it suggests that even after the "Yes Means Yes" initiative (*Affirmative Consent Standard*), sexual consent is still constructed using verbal and physical cues of non-consent. This research has implications for informing our understanding of the causal factors contributing to the experiences of rape and sexual assault and the pervasiveness of false ideologies that blame women for their sexual victimization.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

After four decades of research, sexual violence is still a significant problem for women on college campuses across America. Findings from the National College Women Sexual Victimization Survey (NCWSV) indicate that "the risk of rape victimization during any given academic year is about 1 in 40 female students" (Fisher et al. 2010:179). It is estimated that 20-25% of college women will be sexually assaulted in college (Fisher, Cullen, and Turner 2000) and 19.0% experienced forced oral, anal, or vaginal intercourse (i.e. rape) (Gross, Winslett, Roberts, and Gohm 2006).

The subjective experiences of acquaintance rape rarely become defined as rape because of rape myths and cultural supports that blame the victim. Rape myths are culturally held ideologies that blame women for their sexual victimization (Payne et al. 1999). Rape myth adherence is the degree to which individuals endorse these commonly held beliefs. Rape myths perpetuate false ideologies about how rape happens, whom rape happens to, who the perpetrators are, and what constitutes rape. Rape myths serve to normalize and justify sexual violence against women. Rape myths suggest that women provoke their own sexual assault by the types of clothing they wear, their demeanor, by being alone, drinking, and being out at night (Payne et al. 1999). Broad definitions of rape include acts of attempted rape with elements of verbal and physical coercion, yet

these often lead to vague definitions and classifications of rape that are not universally or consistently defined among student populations (Fisher et al. 2000; Gidycz et al. 1995; Hines 2007; Johnson et al. 1997; Kahn, Jackson, Kully, Badger, and Halvorsen 2003; Potts and Wenk 2002). Rape is legally defined as:

> Any completed or attempted unwanted vaginal, oral, or anal penetration through the use of physical force (such as being pinned or held down, or by the use of violence) or threats to physically harm, and includes times when the victim was drunk, high, drugged, or passed out and unable to consent (Walters et al. 2013:9).

Most researchers utilize survey methodology to understand rape myth acceptance on a broader social scale. However, there is still a significant amount of research that needs to be conducted to understand acquaintance rape myth adherence on a cultural level. More specifically, mythology research is missing an examination of rape myths that underscores the methodological differences in responses when individuals are presented with rape myth statements versus realistic acquaintance rape contexts. To date, few researchers have explored the complexity of rape myths in ambiguous sexual assault contexts and the social construction of rape using qualitative research designs when the perpetrator is someone known to the victim and alcohol is present (Burt and Albin 1981; Chasteen 2001; Deming et al. 2013; Frith 2009; Harned 2005; Littleton, Tabernik, Canales, and Backstrom 2009; Madriz 1997; McMahon 2007).

The present study is specifically designed to address the methodological issues in large scale surveys to advance rape myth research. The aims of this research are (1) to assess rape myth adherence using descriptive vignettes and, (2) to introduce a new measure to assess rape myth adherence among college men and women. This new measure uses the factorial survey approach by Rossi and Anderson (1982) that uses four modified subscales of the updated IRMA (McMahon and Farmer 2011; Payne et al

2

1999). While current methods of rape myth acceptance include survey instruments and vignette techniques, they are limited in measuring myths about rape when the perpetrator is known to the victim in recognizable contexts and when several rape myths co-occur in a single setting. The goal of this research is to explore the complexity, multidimensionality, and pervasiveness of ambiguous acquaintance rapes depicted in social contexts to assess social judgments of rape myth acceptance using randomized vignettes.

This research adds to existing literature by constructing a rape myth instrument that (a) removes the term *rape* from the rape myth instrument and (b) specifically addresses myths surrounding ambiguous acquaintance rape by using methods to measure social judgments and attributions of victim-blame in realistic social contexts that are relatable to college populations by including situations that capture non-verbal social cues of non-consent (Adams-Curtis and Forbes 2004). While other researchers have used vignettes (Hockett, Saucier, and Badke 2016) to measure social judgments of rape, they are limited by only using a few situational variables derived from police reports (Frese et al. 2004). This research study is the first to use vignettes with multiple factors present to explore the extent of rape myth endorsement while modifying of existing rape myth scales. Rape myths are pervasive and affect men's and women's perceptions of sexual assault experiences. Yet, as scholars, we still do not know the extent to which college women and men adhere to rape myths when situations represent realistic and ambiguous social contexts (Edwards, Turchik, Dardis, Reynolds, and Gidycz 2011). There is a critical need for further exploration of the cultural supports for rape and an assessment of current rape myth measures and the development of new tools that measure rape myths

and capture complex acquaintance rape experiences. This research has implications for informing our understanding of culturally pervasive rape myths, why victims do not report, and why women are not believed when they report instances of acquaintance rape by introducing methods that mimic realistic social contexts.

The dissertation is organized as follows: the present (first) chapter introduces the project. In the second chapter, theoretical perspectives are discussed to explain our rape-prone society and cultural supports for victim-blaming. In the third chapter, the social constructionist perspective of rape is explained in detail, including cultural norms and myths about rape. In the fourth chapter, the limitations of current rape myth surveys and methods are discussed. In the fifth chapter, I discuss the contextual variables in the vignettes and the hypotheses. In the sixth chapter, I outline the data and methods. In chapter seven, I outline the findings of my dissertation. In chapter eight, I discuss the results in detail and the theoretical implications of my findings. And finally, in chapter nine, I conclude by focusing on the broader implications of my research.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES OF RAPE

In this chapter, I discuss the theoretical perspectives used to understand the

pervasiveness of gendered sexual violence and the prevalence of rape myth acceptance[1].

I begin with discussing contemporary feminist theories and theories that incorporate

hegemonic masculinity. Next, I discuss the social learning theory of rape. These specific

theoretical perspectives are used to create a comprehensive chapter describing how

feminist theory, gender (hegemonic masculinity), and social learning theory create a

climate in which sexual violence is condoned (and even normalized) in this culture. I

included these theoretical arguments because of their practical applications within the

field toward reducing gendered sexual violence and norms regarding gendered behavior.

2.1 FEMINIST THEORY OF RAPE

Feminist theory has long held the tradition of recognizing gender inequality in the

United States and it quickly became the theoretical tool to explain rape (Brownmiller

1975; Ellis 1989). Feminism is a theory of power (hooks 2000; MacKinnon 1982) and

has been used to explore the social inequality between men and women that affects the

way they interact sexually and men's abuse of power (Chasteen 2001; Ellis 1989; hooks

2000). Feminists argue that rape is motivated by violence and power, not sex

(Brownmiller 1975; Chasteen 2001). While violence against women is not a new

---

[1] I specifically use developed theories of rape that have practical applications to dismantling structural
supports that normalize and condone sexual violence against women.

phenomenon, sexual assault has become a widely visible social problem due to the feminist anti-rape movement (Brownmiller 1975; Chasteen 2001; hooks 2000). Brownmiller's (1975) landmark book, *Against Our Will* exemplified the stories of women's experieces of sexual violence. The feminist movement challenged assumptions regarding the definition of rape, causes, and consequences which has created a culture in which rape is largely visible in popular, academic, and legal discourses (Chasteen 2001). Feminist discourse broadened the understanding of rape by including date rape and marital rape and recognized that perpetrators are often known to victims (Brownmiller 1975).

While the political agenda of the feminist movement was to provide services to victims (Mardorrosian 2002), it simultaneously created a culture that inadvertently blames women for their sexual victimization and much of the theorizing and research on male violence specifically focuses on women. Mardorrosian (2002) argues that the root of male sexual violence has been to examine the lives and experiences of women, but in her experience she found many types of women who experienced rape and their perceived victimization differed so greatly that the root of male sexual violence cannot be found from the common characteristics and experiences of women; they must be researched and theorized using the experiences of men.   Mardorossian argues that these approaches have dominated the ways in which we address the approaches to sexual violence in contemporary culture (2002:747).

In light of this argument, Mardorossian worked toward developing a new feminist theory that specifically addresses rape and sexual assault by understanding that women's experiences are affected by the "intersecting and conflicting discourses" through which

the world is shaped (2002:747). She argues that "feminist theory" positions women who have experienced rape as "victims" and criticizes it for assuming that women have similar psychological make-ups or their perceptions of rape scripts are the same. Mardorossian (2002:753) problematizes feminist theory and rape:

1) It implies that women who do get raped do not in fact strategize prior to the rape and therefore that their rape necessarily signifies their submission to the role of the victim.
2) Focusing on women's reactions or lack thereof during an attack necessarily takes the focus off the rapist—and places it—along with the "responsibility" for the outcome on this scripted action—on women and women alone.

In addition, McPhail (2015) calls for a new feminist theory that bridges theory and informs the work of practitioners in the field. McPhail (2015:8-9) argues that rape is a complex act and that relying on a single feminist theory limits feminists' understanding of rape. Therefore, she knits together five feminist theories to create a comprehensive theory of rape, called the "Feminist Framework Plus." Her inclusion of these five tenets is intended to construct a single theoretical perspective. These include:

1) The understanding that rape is a sexual act, upon sexual bodies and with consequences for the survivor. And, as a sexual act, rape is on the same continuum as normative heterosexuality, with the focus on male sexual domination and female submission.
2) There are multiple motives for rape that include revenge, sexual gratification, power and control, and performing masculinity.
3) Recognizing the importance of understanding rape at the political level while also acknowledging the specificity of rape at the bodily level. The theory acknowledges rape as a political, aggregate act whereby men as a group dominate and control women as a group, but also as a very personal, intimate act in which the body of a single person is violated by another person.
4) An emphasis on the intersections of identities and oppression. Each of these social categories has specific and particular ramifications (rape is not experienced the same for everyone). These social categorical intersections of the victim and perpetrator, such as race and class, are important at the political, personal, and historical levels. The absence of this concept front and center in a feminist theory of rape creates a default rape victim as white, cisgender, heterosexual, upper-class, and able-bodied.

5) The last component is recognizing the level of harm to the survivor. The two primary results of the Feminist Framework Plus are that it can better theoretically account for a range of rape motivations and dynamics unaccounted for by the single-factor theory of the radical/liberal feminist lens, including gang rape, and the rape of men by men.

In conclusion, by bringing together the limitations of current feminist theories and proposed models for a unified theory, it becomes possible to underscore other theoretical perspectives that address the prevalence of violence against women.

2.2 THEORIES OF MASCULINITY

It is through feminist theory that we can begin to theorize about gender, and more specifically, theories of masculinity. Current theories of masculinity strive to move beyond a single causal theory of rape (McPhail 2015). However, Connell (1987) argues that all masculinities need to be understood in terms of a single pattern of power. The theory proposes that men's motivations to rape are located in their attempts to achieve masculinity. The theory of masculinity recognizes that men exist within cultural hierarchies and that they have different levels of power located in the intersections of social class, race, and sexual orientation. This theory also recognizes that some men rape out of feeling powerless rather than feeling powerful (McPhail 2015).

Hegemonic masculinity refers to the normative expectation in society of performative masculinity that requires men to maintain dominance, and that power is maintained through the subordination of women (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005; Smith, Parrott, Swartout, and Tharp 2015). One mechanism to maintain dominance over women is through sexual aggression (Smith et al. 2015). One of the most visible signs of performative masculinity is aggression and if an individual's "manhood" is questioned— this is the easiest and most effective behavior that realigns gender identity with the tenets

of hegemonic masculinity (Kimmel 2000; Smith et al. 2015). Hegemonic masculinities are constructed in such a way that they do not have to correspond to the lives of actual men (Connell and Messershcmidt 2005). However, these models of masculinity propose solutions to problems of gendered relations by expressing cultural ideologies, desires, and fantasies that assist in constructing the relations between men and women (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005).

Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) argue that masculinity is fluid and not fixed and therefore can change over time (Chafetz 1997, 1999; Goffman 1977; Lucal 1999; Ridgeway and Correll 2004; West and Fenstermaker 1995; West and Zimmerman 1987). However, the central tenents of masculinity are rooted in displaying dominance and aggression. Scholars of masculinity (Kimmel 2008) examined the nature of men's aggression towards sexuality and the cultural understanding that when a woman says "no" this is often becomes translated into "try harder" to achieve sexual conquests. The very nature of these sexual scripts creates a climate in which women's sexual autonomy is not respected (Kimmel 2008), and thus becomes socially learned and normalized.

2.3 SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY OF RAPE

Social learning theory (Ellis 1989) examines the socialization process by which sex and violence become inextricably linked and how they affect men's treatment of women through cultural scripts, norms, attitudes, gender roles, and rape myths. Albert Bandura (1978) argued that a unified theory of aggression must explain the process in which patterns are developed, the mechanisms that contribute to aggressive behavior, and the mechanisms that sustain aggression.

Ellis (1989) proposes that individuals are taught through the socialization process the appropriate actions for their genders regarding their expected behaviors in society and that gendered violence is normative. It is through the frequent and repeated displays of violence towards women through gendered aggression, mass media, and the adherence to rape myths that produces a tolerance where these acts of violence are deemed as less offensive due to repeated exposure (Ellis 1989). This socialization process, through cultural norms, often has contradictory views of women (Robinson, Gibson-Beverly, and Schwartz 2004). These discrepancies reflect attitudinal perceptions about sexuality and how women should present themselves in society (Ellis 1989). The social learning theory of rape allows for the explanation by which sex and rape become linked and transformed into mechanisms that perpetuate a rape-prone culture in which sexual violence against women is normalized and perpetuated.

Social learning theorists (Bandura 1978; Ellis 1989) argue that violence is socially learned and transmitted through three central institutions: 1) the family, 2) the subculture, and 3) mass media. In Bandura's (1978:15) extensive work on the effects of television and mass media, he determined it can have at least four different effects: 1) it has an affect on behavior, 2) it also depicts few social sanctions associated with aggressive behavior, 3) it normalizes sexual violence, and 4) it teaches methods to rationalize aggressive behavior. Over time, the accumulation of these messages in the mass media normalizes violence and shapes sexual ideologies and interactions of heterosexual individuals. In addition, sexual violence is learned by 1) producing and reproducing

images of rape scenes, 2) continually associating violence and sexuality, 3) perpetuating commong rape myths, and finally 4) normalizing violence against women (Ellis 1989:12).

In conclusion, each of these theories outlined above address specific components of a unified theory of rape. Together they address the power relations between men and women, tenets of hegemonic masculinity, and the ways in which these become reproduced in the larger culture and in the interactions of individuals. While feminist theory has problematized rape—the focus has been soley on the victims of rape and not the perpetrators. By including theories of masculinity and social learning theory, we are then able to include the perpetrators of sexual violence and a culture that condones violence against women. Until we dismantle the structural supports (i.e. larger power relations, depictions of gender), we will not be able to address the violence that occurs within the sexual interactions of men and women.

CHAPTER 3

RAPE MYTHS AND THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF ACQUAINTANCE RAPE

In this chapter, I begin by discussing the social construction of rape and rape myths in the United States. I then discuss how cultural rape scripts lead to definitions of rape that are wide spread. Last, I discuss how sexual scripts, heteronormative sexuality, and the term *rape* contribute to the understanding of rape within this culture.

Individual definitions and interpretations of rape and sexual assault vary (Chasteen 2001), and experiences are complicated by culturally held ideologies and myths about women's sexuality (Donovan 2007). Rape myths are fluid and in flux with changing perceptions, yet these myths are pervasive and affect women's perceptions of their sexual assault experiences. These myths are connected to the "cultural rape script" by implying that only "young, white, sexually promiscuous women get raped; and that rape primarily occurs at night, outdoors, by a (Black) stranger, who uses a lethal weapon" (Fonow, Richardson, and Wemmerus 1992:112).

Real experiences of acquaintance rape are often ambiguous because they include alcohol consumption (where the woman may feel responsible because she was drinking) and the rape occurs indoors, with acquaintances, and in familiar places. Adhering to rape myths and rape scripts narrows the definition of rape and decreases the likelihood that victims will acknowledge incidents as rape (Burt 1980; Estrich 1987; Payne et al. 1999; Peterson and Muehlenhard 2004; Ryan 2011). Rape scripts are beliefs about how rape

happens, and whom rape happens to that are consistent with the "stranger in the bushes myth" (Harris 2011:52).

Believing in rape myths gives women the misconception of the types of assault they are most likely to encounter (Hickman and Muehlenhard 1997; Levine-MacCombie and Koss 1986; Pain 1997; Rader, May, and Goodrum 2007; Schwartz and Dekeseredy 1997). This ideology is consistent with the common rape myths of "men don't usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away," "rape happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control," and "many so-called rape victims are actually women who had sex and 'changed their mind' afterwards" (Payne, Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1999).

The adherence to rape mythology not only harms college women in justifying their alleged experiences of sexual assault, by allowing them to believe that, "women provoke rapes", "healthy women can resist rape" and "good girls don't get raped" (Johnson, Kuck and Schander 1997; Madriz 1997); these myths also allow men to be relinquished as perpetrators of sexual assault and rape.

Myths provide a way of making "sense in a senseless world" (May 1991:15; Ryan 2011). Additionally, rape myths affect the perceptions of individuals to whom women disclose their experiences of sexual victimization. In a recent study of 237 first and second-year college women and men, Aronowitz, Lambert, and Davidoff (2012) measured sexual knowledge and rape myth acceptance using the IRMA short-form scale (Payne et al. 1999). Findings indicate men had a significantly higher rate of rape myth endorsement than women (Aronowitz et al. 2012) and 41.0% believed that if a woman is

13

raped while she is drunk, she is partly to blame (Aronowitz et al. 2012). These findings

support theories of rape myth adherence.

3.1 CULTURAL RAPE SCRIPTS

A cultural rape script is the way in which "legitimate" rape is perceived to occur;

the ideology of this script is centered on a rape experience in which rape occurs outside,

at night, when the women is alone, and is raped by a stranger (Brownmiller 1975; Ryan,

2011; Pineau 1989; Peterson and Muehlenhard 2004). This is what Estrich (1987) termed

"real rape" or "legitimate rape"; these are cases in which the women's accounts of assault

are believable and unquestioned. As a result of these factors, rape is defined by many

people only when behaviors fall within the narrow confines of the traditional rape script.

Although many college women are aware of acquaintance rape, people tend to doubt the

validity of a rape unless it falls within this context (Peterson and Muehlenhard 2004).

These cultural beliefs imply that women subtly invite sexual victimization by

assuming "she was asking for it" or "all women secretly want to be raped" (Bletzer and

Koss 2004). Traditional patriarchal views of femininity (e.g. virginity and respectability)

"have been seen as effectively disqualifying the 'experienced' and the 'misbehaved' from

claiming or achieving real victim status, including lesbians, sex trade workers,

psychiatrized women, low-income women, hitchhikers, and those who frequent

nightclubs, and/or who have been drinking" (DuMont, Miller, and Myhr 2003:469).

Cultural rape scripts often involve acts that are extremely violent and rarely

involve someone the victim knows or had a previous sexual relationship with (Littleton

2011). Littleton (2011) also states that if acquaintance rape is not perceived as rape

because they are not violent or the woman is relatively physically unharmed by the event,

14

then they may also believe that the incident may be more similar to a sexual script than a script of rape. Sexual scripts are ideologies that depict sexual interactions following culturally produced, predictable and learned scripts that define acts that count as sex (Frith 2009). Results also indicate that a woman's intoxication level is a factor in deciding if the incident was rape (Adams-Curtis and Forbes 2004). Rape myth adherence often relies on enforcing the myth of stranger rape and is most likely influenced by cultural rape scripts (Littleton 2011).

3.2 SEXUAL SCRIPTS, HETERONORMATIVE SEXUALITY, AND THE TERM RAPE

Cultural sexual scripts dictate the kinds of activities that are expected to typically take place during a sexual encounter (Frith 2009). Heteronormative sexuality is when heterosexuality is constructed as the type of sexual behavior that is expected and normalized within U.S. culture. How rape is defined in this culture is closely linked to the construct of sex in American culture. Definitions of sexuality are male-centered and many definitions of "real" sex relate only to penile-vaginal intercourse (Frith 2009). Culturally, men are the initiators of sex and women are the gatekeepers; women are responsible for limiting sexual encounters and saying "no" (Frith 2009). This double standard of subtle sexist beliefs is resilient (Bohner et al 2009:21) and perpetuates a culture that supports and tolerates sexual violence against women.

Individual perceptions of coercion and sexual consent often rely on the social construction of sexuality in this culture as well as individual perceptions of sexual consent (Muehlenhard and Kimes 1999). While universities across the nation have implemented programs and interventions to address sexual violence (Coker, Cook-Craig,

15

Williams, Fisher, Clear, Garcia, and Hegge 2011), most individuals consider forced or coerced sex as rape, but "other sexual behaviors such as clitoral stimulation are not considered important enough to count as sexual violence" (Muehlenhard and Kimes 1999:240).

In Harris's (2011) study, she addressed women's labeling strategies of their rape experiences. She noted that many of the women's experiences did not fit neatly into the rape/not rape dichotomy and many women did not label their experiences as rape. The term utilized by the women in her study to describe rape incidences was *nonconsensual sex* (Harris 2011). It is evident that the definition of sexual consent varies because sexual consent and how consent is negotiated is a social construct (Edwards et al. 2011). The meaning of verbal and physical cues of non-consent varies from individual to individual. Therefore, researchers who measure prevalence rates of rape have adjusted the way they measure rates by intentionally excluding the term *rape* from their instruments (Fisher et al 2000; Koss and Oros 1982; Koss et al. 2007; Tjaden and Thoennes 2006). However, rape myth researchers are still utilizing measures that include the term *rape* on several items of their instruments (Burt 1980; McMahon and Farmer 2011; Payne et al. 1999). Rape myth researchers have not made the transition to purposely exclude the term *rape* in order to capture incidences and behaviors that that meet the legal definition of rape. The term *rape*, and the label of *rape victim*, imply that the action must match the cultural script of rape. A cultural rape script is the way in which a culture conceptualizes a rape experience (i.e. stranger, alone, at night, with a weapon). The National College Women Victimization Survey (NCWVS) survey (Fisher et al. 2000) used a comprehensive methodology employing the widely used Sexual Experiences Survey (SES) in which

respondents are asked behavior-specific questions (Koss and Oros 1982; Koss et al. 2007) as well as asking the respondents if they consider their experiences to be rape. Specifically, the SES avoids using terms such as rape because this legal term is subjectively defined and "poorly understood" and uses behaviorally specific descriptions of unwanted sexual experiences and "tactics or behaviors used by perpetrators to compel sex acts against consent" (Koss et al. 2007:357).

In conclusion, the construction of rape and what constitutes *legitimate* or *real* rape in this culture relies heavily on rape myths, rape scripts, sexual scripts and heteronormativity, and the term *rape*. This construction of rape allows women to misperceive their sexual assault experiences and mislabel them and relinquishes the perpetrator from the responsibility of rape. (Abbey et al. 2004; Anderson, Simpson-Taylor, and Hermann 2004; Bartoli and Clark 2006; Crocker 2002; Disch et al. 2000; Forbes, Jobe, White, Bloesch, and Adams-Curtis 2005; Johnson et al. 1997; Littleton and Axsom 2003; Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994; Madriz 1997; Masters, Norris, Stoner, and George 2006; Nayak et al. 2003; Peterson and Muehlenhard 2004; Schwartz and DeKeseredy 1997).

CHAPTER 4

EXISTING RAPE MYTH SURVEYS AND METHODOLOGICAL LIMITATIONS

The limitations discussed in this chapter specifically focus on rape myth survey instruments and the use of vignette methodology. Initially, the limitations of the *Original* and *Updated* Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (McMahon and Farmer 2011; Payne et al. 1999) are discussed. Second, the limitations of ten scales that are currently used among researchers are examined. Rape myth scales contain single items (i.e. broad single rape myth statements) to determine the prevalence of rape myth endorsement and have been used in conjunction with vignettes to provide "real world accounts" of rape incidents. The limitations of the vignette methodology as it is currently used will be explored in detail to address both the instruments in use and the design of vignettes as justification for the instrument and vignette design used in the current study. This chapter highlights existing measures that include the term rape and how they vary regarding contextual variables affecting ambiguity and are limited in capturing acquaintance rape, type of penetration, and alcohol use.

4.1 MEASURING RAPE MYTH ADHERENCE: SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Scales measuring rape myth acceptance incorporate victim-blame for non-consensual sexual contact that relinquish men from the responsibility of rape (Burt 1980; Payne et al. 1999; McMahon and Farmer 2011). In a meta-analysis of rape myths, Suarez

and Gadalla (2010) determined that of all the measures used, the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMA) is the most psychometrically sound instrument for measuring rape myth acceptance. The IRMA identifies a single rape myth construct with seven subscales: *She asked for it*; *It wasn't really rape*; *He didn't mean to*; *She wanted it*; *She lied*; *Rape is a trivial event*; and *Rape is a deviant event* (Payne et al. 1999). However, the IRMA is not the most widely used instrument (Suarez and Gadalla 2010). To date, the most widely used instrument is Burt's (1980) Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMA), yet it is not equivalent to the IRMA (Adams-Curtis and Forbes 2004; Bohner, Eyssel, Pina, Siebler, and Viki 2009; Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1995; Suarez and Gadalla 2010).

Current rape myth instruments do not distinguish between stranger and acquaintance rape and are designed to only measure rape myth acceptance on a single dimension. The instruments are not designed to capture complexities when several rape myths occur simultaneously (multiple dimensions) and they fail to assess rape myths in realistic social contexts (e.g. it is not uncommon to see a young woman dressed seductively, drinking, and flirting with a man). Without capturing these realistic contexts, we are not able to measure the complexity of rape myth acceptance.

4.2 ILLINOIS RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE SCALE (IRMA)

The IRMA (Payne et al. 1999) measures rape myth acceptance under a general rape myth construct with seven subscales. While the IRMA (Payne et al. 1999) is psychometrically sound, it is limited in measuring myths associated with ambiguous rape experiences even though it has been slightly updated to adjust for colloquial phrases and now includes alcohol statements (McMahon and Farmer 2011). Additionally, Payne et al. (1999) developed a short form (IRMA-SF) which contains 20-items (four items from

19

the subscale *She asked for it*; three items from *Rape is a deviant event*; two items from *It wasn't really rape*; *He didn't mean to*; *She wanted it*; and *Rape is a trivial event* and three negatively worded filler items).

Sample statements from the IRMA include: *If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control*; *If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say it was rape;* and *If the rapist doesn't have a weapon, you can't really call it rape*.

4.3 UPDATED ILLINOIS RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE SCALE

In an updated version of the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMA), McMahon and Farmer (2011) recognized four culturally relevant subscales from the original seven outlined by Payne et al. (1999). These subscales are: *She asked for it*; *He didn't mean to*; *It wasn't really rape*; and *She lied*. They also modified the terminology on several subscales from the original IRMA (Payne et al. 1999) to capture rape myths because the language used in the original scale is "necessarily time and culture bound" (Payne et al. 1999:61); however, McMahon and Farmer (2011) modified the language used in each item yet failed to exclude the term *rape*.

For example, a single item from the original IRMA scale (Payne et al. 1999) is written as, *if a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control*. McMahon and Farmer's (2011) updated version of this item states, *if a girl is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control*. The term *rape* itself has significant social meaning and may not capture the experiences of acquaintance rape, attributions of blame, and rape myth adherence (Edwards et al. 2011; Koss and Oros 1982). As stated previously, the

term rape is closely linked to the rape script. If *rape* is perceived to capture instances in which the perpetrator is a stranger, then the instrument containing this term cannot distinguish between types of rape and address myths surrounding acquaintance rape (Payne et al. 1999).

In the Updated IRMA, McMahon and Farmer (2011) modified phrases from the original IRMA to include relevant terminology and alcohol contexts. For example, an item on original IRMA (Payne et al. 1999) states: *A lot of girls lead a guy on and then cry rape* was changed to *A lot of girls lead a guy on and then have regrets* (McMahon and Farmer 2011). McMahon and Farmer (2011) added an additional subscale, *He didn't mean to do it* that now incorporates two factors: excusing the male perpetrator and the role of intoxication. For example, the subscale includes items such as, *Guys don't usually intend to force sex on a girl, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away* (from the original IRMA Payne et al. 1999), and also includes: *If a guy is drunk, he might rape someone unintentionally*; and *It shouldn't be considered rape if a guy is drunk and didn't realize what he was doing* (McMahon and Farmer 2011).

4.4 RAPE MYTH INSTRUMENTS

To illustrate the rape myths instruments currently in use, ten measures were selected that specifically incorporate items that capture the construct of victim-blame and statements that relinquish men of the responsibility of rape (See Appendix A). For example, the scale: Attitudes Towards Rape developed by Feild (1978) contains items such as *If a woman is going to be raped, she might as well relax and enjoy it*. The Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Burt 1980) uses statements such as: *Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rape if she really wants to* (Flood 2008). The Rape Empathy Scale

21

(Deitz et al. 1982; Deitz et al. 1984) includes statements such as: *If a man rapes a sexually active woman, his actions would not be justified by the fact that she chooses to have sexual relations with other men*. Additionally, the General Scales of Attitudes Towards Rape (Larsen and Long 1988) include the statement: *Some women at least secretly want to be raped.* The Attitudes Towards Rape Victims Scale (Ward 1988) states: *A woman who goes out alone at night puts herself in a position to be raped.* Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) developed The Rape Myth Scale: *When a woman is raped, she usually did something careless to put herself in that situation*. The Date and Acquaintance Rape Scale (Walsh et al. 1997) also includes statements of victim-blame such as: *Women often accuse men of rape because they are angry at the men for some other reason*. The Scale for the Identification of Acquaintance Rape Attitudes (Humphrey 2001; Farmer and McMahon 2005) includes statements such as: *When a rape happens on a date, it is usually because the woman sends mixed messages to the man about what she wants sexually.* The Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression Scale (Gerger et al. 2007): *Alcohol is often the culprit when a man rapes a woman.* Lastly, The Rape Attitudes and Beliefs Scale (Burgess 2007) includes rape myth statements such as: *If a woman willingly gets drunk, then she is raped—she is more responsible for what happened to her than if she decided not to drink.*

In conclusion, many of these rape myth measures differ in their reliability and construct validity of the instruments (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994; Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1995; Suarez and Gadalla 2010). These scales vary in their rape myth constructs and include dimensions of overall hostility towards women and the construct of *Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence*. This proposes that small levels of violence are

acceptable in intimate partnerships (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1995; Suarez and Gadalla 2010). Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) report Burt's (1980) instrument is confounded with "hostility towards women" which is the "critical antecedent to rape myth acceptance" (708). These rape myth constructs are complex and may not directly address victim blame and men's responsibility for rape. They may also include *Adversarial Sexual Belief Scales* which imply that women are sly, manipulative, and cunning (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1995).

4.5 MEASURING RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE: VIGNETTE METHODOLOGY

The vignette methodology originally outlined by Rossi and Anderson (1982) has been widely used in assessing rape myth judgments. The use of vignettes is utilized to explore attitudes, beliefs, and norms regarding life (Hughes and Huby 2002). They are especially useful for indirectly assessing attitudes regarding sensitive research topics (Schoenberg and Ravdal 2000). However, even after the introduction of vignettes used to assess rape myth acceptance, many of the vignettes contain limited information such as police reports to determine sentencing judgments and are paired with existing rape myth scales. Oftentimes police reports only capture the beginning of the scenario and end without explicit detail regarding the encounter which is critical in determining social judgments about acquaintance rape (Frese et al. 2004; Krahé 1991; Krahé, Temkin, and Bieneck 2007; Krahé and Temkin 2009). Frese et al. (2004) were critical of the depictions used in rape scenarios. While they were attempting to represent common rape scenarios in vignettes, they contained a limited amount of descriptive details. Unfortunately, the less descriptive the vignette is in containing ambiguous contextual

information, the use of individual interpretations potentially biases the information present because of a lack of relative detail (Frese et al 2004).

Researchers have traditionally manipulated three to four situational variables affecting higher victim blame including: *victim/perpetrator intoxication* (Ellison and Munro 2009; Franklin 2010; Grubb et al. 2012; Harrison et al. 2008; Hockett et al. 2016; Krahé 1988; Loiselle et al. 2007; Maurer et al. 2008; Sims et al. 2007; Vandiver et al. 2012; Ward et al. 2012*), type of relationship between the perpetrator and the victim* (Tamborra et al. 2014), *victim respectability* (Harrison et al. 2008; Tamborra et al. 2014), *type of rape (stranger vs. date)* (Frese et al. 2004; Grubb et al. 2008), *resistance type* (Black et al. 2008; Franklin 2010; Sims et. al 2007), *victims' clothing* (Ellison and Munro 2009; Johnson et al. 2000; Maurer et al. 2008; Vandiver et al. 2012), *appropriate gender roles* (Grubb et al. 2012; Harrison et al. 2008; Johnson et al. 2000; Krahé 1988), *use of physical force* (Franklin 2010), *use of verbal coercion* (Franklin 2010), and *consent* (Loiselle et al. 2007; Tamborra et al. 2014). While existing vignette studies that measure rape myth acceptance do manipulate several contextual variables such as victim dress, victim resistance, and victim reputation, they are still unable to measure adherence to acquaintance rape myths because the vignettes used in research are often paired with existing rape myth scales such as the RMA, IRMA, ARVS, AMMSA which clearly utilize the term rape.

Burt and Albin (1981) argued that researchers conducting this type of research should incorporate cultural contexts and create methodological designs that create opportunities to address the complexities in acquaintance rape experiences. In real rape perceptions, observers have much more information that can be used to make their

judgments (Frese et al. 2004) and the vignette techniques should incorporate the subtle realistic nuances within an acquaintance rape encounter.

In conclusion, it is clear that each of the twelve instruments described above contribute to the literature on normative judgments and the adherence to rape myths. All of the scales use the term *rape* and each of the scales are measured within a single dimension (i.e. single statements). Because of this, many of these rape myth measures are limited in capturing the nuances of acquaintance rape experienced by college women and the myths surrounding victim-blame when the perpetrator is someone known to the victim among other situational variables.

CHAPTER 5

SITUATIONAL AMBIGUITY IN VIGNETTES:

CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES, RAPE MYTH ITEMS, AND HYPOTHESES

This chapter outlines the development of the Ambiguous Acquaintance Rape

Myth Scale (AARMS) instrument. I specifically address the 11 items used in the

instrument and the rationale for their inclusion as well as pilot study data. I also discuss

in detail the ten contextual variables in the vignettes that were derived from the updated

Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMA, McMahon and Farmer 2011) to create

situational ambiguity. And finally, I discuss the hypotheses for each of the contextual

variables within the vignettes. The inclusion of these variables are organized by four

subscales: "she asked for it," "he didn't mean to," "it wasn't really rape," and "she lied."

The vignettes designed for my dissertation research are intended to create

situationally ambiguous rape scenarios that mimic realistic social contexts (see Appendix

B). It is important to measure the adherence to rape myths using contexts that are

recognizable to student populations. Rape occurs in many different social contexts

(Madriz 1997; Nayak et al. 2003; Potts and Wenk 2002) and many college women have

experienced behaviors that can legally be defined as rape. However, they often do not

seek treatment or services because they do not label these violations as "rape" and do not

want to be perceived as victims (Hamby and Koss 2003). Many women do not label their

experiences as rape because they do not fit the cultural rape script, these accounts of rape

become defined as normative and the definition of rape becomes further skewed (Deming

et al. 2013; Koss 1985; Peterson and Muehlenhard 2004). Unacknowledged rapes differ from "acknowledged rapes" (i.e. rape scripts) because they are less likely to involve physical force or threats of force and forceful resistance from the victim that often results in injury (Fisher, Cullen, and Turner 2000).

Beliefs about rape, the types of women rape happens to, the definition of rape, and the social contexts in which rape occurs are relative to our understanding of how rape is defined in this culture. Findings demonstrate that employing rape myths to understand complex and confusing situations of an acquaintance rape experience is a common mechanism used by college women and is the dominant mode of assessing rape experiences that are ambiguous and not easily definable (Anderson et al. 2004; Burt 1980; Deming et al. 2013; Madriz 1997; Payne et al. 1999; Schwartz and Dekeseredy 1997). How acquaintance rape is conceptualized and defined relies on prevalent norms surrounding sexual behavior. In prior research, findings revealed that when college women have peers who experience instances of acquaintance rape, and when the experiences commonly occur, they stated they were less likely to label them as sexual assault or rape (Deming et al. 2013). These individuals, whether they are family, friends, peers, or mentors, may use rape myths to help make sense of the rape by justifying it ("she wanted it") or even denying that it happened ("she lied" or "he got too sexually carried away") (Burt 1980; Madriz 1997; McMahon and Farmer 2011; Payne et al. 1999; Schwartz and Dekeseredy 1997). Therefore, this dissertation specifically addresses the contextual variables that contribute to rape myth judgments (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994; McMahon and Farmer 2011; Payne et al. 1999).

The contextual variables included in the vignettes were derived from four subscales of the updated IRMA. In the original (Payne et al. 1999) and updated IRMA (McMahon and Farmer 2011), each of the rape myth items are conditional statements. For the purpose of this study, the conditions were removed from each item and manipulated in each of the vignettes. For example, a single rape myth item states, "if a girl is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control" (McMahon and Farmer 2011). This specific item is modified to say "she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control" and the alcohol context is manipulated in the vignette from least ambiguous (sober) to most ambiguous (drunk). The survey is designed to assess the effects of alcohol consumption, victim blame, a known perpetrator, the presence of a previous sexual relationship, and verbal as well as physical cues of non-consent on rape myth adherence.

5.1 AMBIGUOUS ACQUAINTANCE RAPE MYTH SCALE (AARMS)

This section discusses the instrument used in this dissertation to measure rape myth endorsement when paired with situationally ambiguous vignettes. I discuss the development of the AARMS and the rationale for the inclusion of each statement present in the instrument. Prior to conducting the survey in my dissertation, a pilot study was administered during my Sociology of Sex Roles class during the summer 2013. Students received three randomized vignettes to rate using a 5-point Likert scale. Students were asked to track how long each vignette took to complete (completion of each vignette was between 3-5 minutes). No demographic data was collected and the findings were used during the course discussion on gendered violence.

The initial Ambiguous Acquaintance Rape Myth Scale (AARMS) contained 16

items from the 22 items outlined in the updated IRMA (McMahon and Farmer 2011).

Six of these items were removed for redundancies and the remaining 16 items were pilot

tested producing n=48 vignettes for statistical analysis. Using Stata©, an intra-class

coefficient (ICC) was conducted on each item to determine the level of correlation among

both individual and group level responses. The ICC was used as a mechanism to assess

reliability within vignettes (Shrout and Fleiss 1979). This statistical tool was specifically

used to remove or reword any redundancies in the final version of the AARMS. Six out

of the 16 items were highly correlated (Table 5.1) and were either reworded or removed[2]

because the rape myth statements in the AARMS should not be correlated in order to

assess variance of the manipulated variables within the vignettes. Therefore, the final

AARMS instrument containsed 11 final items used in this study.

5.2 CONTEXTUAL FACTORS

In this section, I discuss in detail the necessity of creating situationally ambiguous

vignettes that mimic realistic acquaintance rape scenarios. Contextual factors are used to

create scenarios in which several victim-blame items co-occur that mimic realistic social

---

[2] The statements: (1) "non-consensual sex probably did not happen in this situation if she doesn't have bruises or marks" was removed from further analysis because the statement itself reflects the cultural script of rape (i.e., stranger rape); (2) "it shouldn't be considered non-consensual sex in this situation if he didn't realized what he was doing" was changed to "in this situation, he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual;" (3) "he might have unintentionally pushed himself on her in this situation" was changed to "in this situation he unintentionally pushed himself on her;" (4) "she can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it and then regretted it" was changed to "in this situation, she can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it;" (5) "in this situation she might use accusations of non-consensual sex to get back at him" was changed to "in this situation, she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him;" and (6) "his sex drive got out of control" was collapsed into the statement "he got too sexually carried away." In addition, the statements, "she didn't fight back in this case so you so you can't say it was non-consensual sex," "she didn't verbally protest so it can't be considered non-consensual sex in this setting," were collapsed into the statement: "in this case she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened" and "if she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation, she just has emotional problems" were removed from further analysis.

settings. This component is critical in our understanding of how rape is conceptualized and victim blame is attributed when respondents are asked to assess rape myth judgments when the vignettes are similar to their own experiences of rape and sexual assault. I argue that it is necessary to include rape scenarios that are situationally ambiguous. Ambiguity occurs on a continuum ranging from least ambiguous (acquaintance, sober, no previous sexual history etc.) to most ambiguous (boyfriend, both parties are drunk, prior sexual relationship etc.) (see Appendix D). In this study, several rape myth variables are depicted in a single context to capture the multi-dimensionality of rape myths. Each of the factors chosen to be present in the vignettes are based on the inclusion of these contextual factors within the IRMA, alcohol contexts, heteronormative sexual scripts, and rape scripts. It is predicted that variables associated with situational ambiguity will have a greater effect on the rape myth decision in the survey instrument

5.3 "SHE ASKED FOR IT"

Research indicates that women who engage in sexual activities with men, are alone with them, and are dressed provocatively are often labeled as "leading men on" or "asking for it" (Frith 2009). When women who "ask for it" experience sexual assault, their accounts of non-consent are perceived as less genuine (Deming et al. 2013; Madriz 1997). In addition, findings recognize that college women routinely use alcohol and that its use is positively correlated with higher incidences of rape (Abbey et al. 2004; Brownmiller 1975; Koss et al. 1988) and that alcohol is frequently used by men as a weapon to turn "no" women into "yes" women (Benson et al. 2007; Davis et al. 2004; Hayes, Abbot, and Cook 2016; Schwartz and DeKeseredy 1997). These alcohol-related

Table 5.1: Intraclass Correlation Coefficient

Rape Myth Statements	ICC Individual	ICC Average
In this scenario she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.	.1887	.4110
It is her own fault if she claimed she experienced non-consensual sex in this situation.	.0788	.2042
In this case she should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.	.2231	.4628
She didn't fight back in this case so you can't say it was non-consensual sex.	.1327	.3146
Non-consensual sex probably did not happen in this situation if she doesn't have bruises or marks.	.4915**	.7435**
He might have unintentionally pushed himself on her in this situation.	.4936**	.7452**
It shouldn't be considered non-consensual sex in this situation if he didn't realize what he was doing.	.5143**	.7606**
In this case she wasn't clear about saying no so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.	.1475	.3418
She didn't verbally protest so it can't be considered non-consensual sex in this setting.	.0430	.1188
She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it and then regretted it.	.4418**	.7036**
In this situation she might use accusations of non-consensual sex to get back at him.	.4469**	.7079**
She can't claim non-consensual sex happened because she led him on and then regretted it in this case.	.1683	.3778
If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation, she just has emotional problems.	.1533	.3520
If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.	.2085	.4414
His sex drive got out of control.	.2801*	.5386*
He got too sexually carried away in this scenario.	.1919	.4161

*Significant at .05 **Significant at .01

sexual assaults contribute to college women's inability to identify sexual experiences as rape (Schwartz and DeKeseredy 1997); and unfortunately, women are perceived as more socially responsible if they are drinking and rape occurs (Deming et al. 2013).

The updated IRMA (McMahon and Farmer 2011:77) includes six statements within this subscale. The statements are:

1. If a girl is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.
2. When girls go to parties wearing slutty clothes, they are asking for trouble.
3. If a girl goes to a room alone with a guy at a party, it is her own fault if she is raped.
4. If a girl acts like a slut, eventually she is going to get into trouble.
5. When girls are raped, it's often because the way they said "no" was unclear.
6. If a girl initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a guy assumes she wants to have sex.

These six statements were collapsed into four statements:

1. If she claims non-consensual sex happened, it was because she was unclear.
2. In this case she should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.
3. In this scenario, she is asking for trouble.
4. In this scenario she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.

The specific contextual variables that were removed from the updated IRMA and manipulated within the vignettes were: if the woman initiates kissing, if the woman is alone with the man, if the woman is drunk, and if the woman is dressed provocatively. It is expected that the conditions manipulated within the vignettes will have significant effects on victim-blame (i.e., rape myth scores). Therefore:

Hypothesis 1: Whether or not the woman initiates kissing will have a significant effect on rape myth adherence.
Hypothesis 2: Whether or not the woman is alone with the perpetrator will have a significant effect on rape myth adherence.

Hypothesis 3: The woman's attire will have a significant effect on rape myth adherence.

Hypothesis 4: The woman's level of alcohol consumption will have a significant effect on rape myth adherence.

5.4 "HE DIDN'T MEAN TO"

This subscale refers to the cultural myths that imply some acquaintance rapes occur as a result of men not knowing the woman is not consenting (O'Byrne, Hansen, and Rapley 2008), there was a miscommunication due to alcohol consumption (Deming et al. 2013), or men are unable to control their sexual arousal (Peterson and Muehlenhard 2004). When alcohol is present in a sexual assault scenario, men who were drinking are held as less responsible (Stormo et al. 1997) and men are encouraged to binge drink (Hayes, Abbott, and Cook 2016). In addition, men are perceived as having sex drives that are beyond their control (Deming et al. 2013).

The updated IRMA (McMahon and Farmer 2011:77) includes 6 items within this subscale. These items include:

1. Guys don't usually intend to force sex on a girl, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.
2. Rape happens when a guy's sex drive gets out of control.
3. When guys rape, it is usually because of their strong desire for sex.
4. If a guy is drunk, he might rape someone unintentionally.
5. It shouldn't be considered rape if the guy was drunk and didn't realize what he was doing.
6. If both people are drunk, it can't be rape.

The 6 items were collapsed into three statements:

1. In this situation, he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.

2. In this scenario, he got too sexually carried away.
3. In this situation he unintentionally pushed himself on her.

The specific item that was removed from the Updated IRMA (McMahon and Farmer 2011) and was manipulated within the vignettes was the man's alcohol level. It is expected that:

> *Hypothesis* 5: The man's level of alcohol consumption will have a significant effect on rape myth adherence.

5.5 "IT WASN'T REALLY RAPE"

Research indicates that most rapes occur with someone known to the victim (Koss and Oros 1982). In a single study, Hickman and Muehlenhard (1997) reported that rates of acquaintance rape were as high as 28.1% for college women and of those women, 84.6% have had some type of previous relationship to the assailant. In addition, when sexual strategies are verbally coercive or involve digital penetration they may be perceived as less threatening (Deming et al. 2013; Fisher et al. 2010; Peterson and Muehlenhard 2004). In the absence of physical force, a woman may not perceive the incident as rape simply because the perpetrator used his finger or only stuck his penis in once or twice (not counting as full intercourse) (Peterson and Muehlenhard 2004). Women could also be perceived as culpable simply because they were not physically forced to engage in unwanted sexual behavior (or if they first consented and then changed their mind). Women are also expected to actively resist rape by using both physical and verbal resistance types (Ullman 2007). Physical resistance is perceived as non-consent (Ullman 2007).

If women do not engage in physical resistance (e.g., pushing, shoving, slapping or

hitting) or verbally protest (e.g., saying "no" or "stop"), the woman is often viewed as

culpable in the alleged rape and perceived as wanting it.

The updated IRMA (McMahon and Farmer 2011) contains five items within this

subscale:

1. If a girl doesn't say 'no' she can't claim rape.
2. If a girl doesn't physically resist sex—even protesting verbally—it can't be considered rape.
3. If a girl doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say it was rape.
4. A rape probably did not happen if the girl has no bruises or marks.
5. If the accused 'rapist' doesn't have a weapon, you really can't call it rape.

These items were collapsed into a single item:

1. In this case she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.

The contextual variables that are manipulated within the vignettes are: the relationship to

the perpetrator, whether or not they have had previous sex, the type of penetration, and

whether or not the woman physically resisted and verbally protested were manipulated as

contextual variables within the vignettes. Therefore, it is expected that:

Hypothesis 6: The relationship to the perpetrator will have a significant effect on rape myth adherence.
Hypothesis 7: The presence of a previous sexual relationship will have a significant effect on rape myth adherence.
Hypothesis 8: The type of penetration will have a significant effect on rape myth adherence.
Hypothesis 9: Whether or not the woman verbally protests will have an effect on rape myth adherence.
Hypothesis 10: Whether or not the woman physically resists will have an effect on rape myth adherence.

5.6 "SHE LIED"

The final items within the last subscale were not directly hypothesis tested. While

these items are not directly tested in this study, they address stereotypical beliefs about

women indicating that they are manipulative, sly, and cunning (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994; Payne et al. 1999) which contribute to the overall construct of victim-blame. Within this subscale, McMahon and Farmer (2011:77) derived five relevant items in the updated IRMA. The items are:

1. A lot of times, girls who say they were raped agreed to have sex and then regretted it.
2. A lot of times, girls who say they were raped often led the guy on and then had regrets.
3. Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at guys.
4. A lot of times, girls who claim they were raped have emotional problems.
5. Girls who are caught cheating on their boyfriends sometimes claim it was rape.

These items were collapsed into three statements used in the AARMS instrument. They are:

1. In this situation she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.
2. In this situation she can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.
3. She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.

In this chapter, I discussed at length the rationale and inclusion of the contextual variables used in this study as well as the statements included in the AARMS. The contextual variables as well as the survey instrument attest to the importance of creating situationally ambiguous vignettes to measure rape myth endorsement that are relatable to college populations. They also attest to the methodological importance of including several contextual variables addressing the multidimensionality of rape myths

CHAPTER 6

DATA AND METHODS

This chapter outlines the data and methods used in this study. I begin by describing the data and the sample. Next, I discuss the development of the AARMS scale and the creation of the ambiguous acquaintance rape myth vignettes using factorial surveys. Then, I explain how I used a series of statistical analyses to determine which contextual variables were used in the vignettes. Each of these components are described in detail below.

6.1 DATA

An online survey containing 300[3] randomized vignettes were accessible to undergraduate students using Qualtrics© software. Students were presented with a series of three vignettes (see Appendix C for survey instrument) producing roughly 835[4] vignettes for statistical analyses.

6.2 SAMPLE

A convenience sample of 287 undergraduate students at a large Southeastern university enrolled in Introductory Sociology courses in the Spring 2015 semester were

---

[3] Using a power calculation (.80) to adjust for clustered data in Stata© at the .01 alpha level, it was determined that a total sample size of 270 vignettes were necessary to conduct the current study.

[4] Sample size (vignettes) ranged from 829-842. Some judgments included multiple responses on a single AARMS item, those responses were recoded as missing. The data reflect those respondents who rated two or more vignettes (respondents who only completed a single vignette were recoded as missing). If respondents are limited to a single vignette to rate, it limits the power of the factorial survey design to infer causality (Ludwick et al. 2004).

solicited to participate in an online survey titled, *Sexual Relationships and Dating among College Students* for extra credit in their course. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 35, the majority of students (66.1%) were between the ages of 18 and 19 years old. The majority of respondents were female (66.9%) and 33.1% were male. Most of the participants were white (83.5%), 9.8% were African American, and 6.7% self-identified as another racial group. Most participants were heterosexual (96.5%) while 3.5% labeled themselves as Gay, Lesbian, or other. The majority of respondents were first-year students (52.8%), 31.1% were second-year students, 11.5% were third-year students, and 4.6% were fourth year. The majority of respondents were non-members of Greek life (63.2%) and 36.8% were members of either a Fraternity or Sorority. Participants were also asked their dating history and if they had engaged in sexual intercourse. Of the sample, 85.7% had dated someone and 76.9% had engaged in sexual intercourse (Table 6.1).

6.3 FACTORIAL SURVEYS

Factorial survey methods were used to design realistic vignettes to assess social judgments about rape and rape myths (Rossi and Anderson 1982). This method allowed for the systematic data collection of rape myth social judgments by capturing the multidimensionality of rape myths as they occur in realistic social contexts. This methodological tool is well-suited for topics where contextual factors affect social judgments (Taylor 2006). One of the common threads in rape myth research is the complexity of attributions of blame that depend on several contextual variables (Sleed et al. 2002). Factorial surveys come closer to capturing the complexities that occur in real life decision making (Taylor 2006) and allow researchers to determine the variance of

each factor affecting the decision. This approach presents a tool for assessing rape myth adherence in contexts that are recognizable to student populations.

In order to capture realistic social contexts, the content of the vignette and the measure used to assess judgment must be ambiguous. Of course there should be no ambiguity as to what constitutes "real" rape. However, while the legal systems are clear in the definition of non-consensual sex—these legal definitions are often individually defined within cultural rape scripts, stereotypes, and normative beliefs that affect how rape is defined on a cultural level (Krahé 1991). The vignettes include contextual behaviors indicative of sexual relationships between men and women that often rely on behavioral cues in which consent isn't explicit (Adams-Curtis and Forbes 2004) and the prevalence of victim-blame is a function of ambiguous cues within the vignette (Frese et al. 2004). Sexual relationships are much more complex especially in the context of a known perpetrator and alcohol consumption.

Vignettes were designed to specifically assess the determinants of social judgments (Ludwick and Zeller 2001; Ludwick et al 2004; Wallander 2009) aimed at eliciting broader contextual factors and socially held stereotypes, beliefs, and norms (Finch 1987; Sleed, Durrheim, Kriel, Solomon, and Baxter 2002). The use of vignettes creates a "medium through which to go beyond the discussion of individual life situations and toward the generation of responses on a social level" (Schoenberg and Ravdal 2000:65). "The factorial survey permits a larger range of factors to be studied than the more familiar factorial experiment, thus coming closer to capturing the complexities of real decision making" (Taylor 2006:1196).

Table 6.1: Demographic Characteristics

Demographics	N (%)
Sex	
Male	95 (33.10)
Female	192 (66.90)
Age	
18-19	189 (66.08)
20-21	81 (28.32)
22+	16 (5.59)
Race	
White	238 (83.51)
Black/African American	28 (9.82)
Other Racial Group	19 (6.67)
Sexual Orientation	
Heterosexual	276 (96.50)
Gay/Lesbian/Other	10 (3.50)
Year in College	
First Year	151 (52.80)
Second Year	89 (31.12)
Third Year	33 (11.54)
Fourth Year	13 (4.55)
Greek Life	
Member Sorority/Fraternity	105 (36.84)
Non-Member Sorority/Fraternity	180 (63.16)
Dating History	
Engaged in Dating Relationship	246 (85.71)
Never Engaged in Dating Relationship	41 (14.29)
Sexual History	
Engaged in Sexual Intercourse	220 (76.92)
Never Engaged in Sexual Intercourse	66 (23.08)

There are several advantages to using this methodological approach (Wallander 2009) compared to experimental methods. Experimental designs often simplify the social judgment under study and they are often too complex to determine which factors are more influential when there are multiple factors under study (Taylor 2006). Factorial surveys are both externally and internally valid. They are externally valid because they are more generalizable due to the complexity of real life social contexts and internally valid because they incorporate the inherent properties such as randomization found in experimental methods (Ludwick et al. 2004; Taylor 2006). Factorial designs combine the benefits of random sampling found in experimental designs, and the properties of survey research (Atzmüller and Steiner 2010; Hox et al. 1991; Ludwick et al. 2004). This research design provides a robust measurement tool by creating scenarios that randomly assign all levels of the manipulated conditions (contextual variables), and as such, each category has an equal probability of being selected (Ludwick and Zeller 2001; Ludwick et al 2004).

Respondents received three vignettes to rate using the AARMS (Taylor 2006). The number of factors (independent variables) present in vignettes is normally 5-10 (Taylor 2006). This study contains ten factors for analysis. The factors in the vignettes are virtually independent from each other (Taylor 2006:1196). The judgments (i.e. rape myth items) provided by individual respondents are considered dependent variables and the dimensions within the vignette are independent variables (Wallander 2009).

The common criticism of factorial surveys is whether or not the unit of analysis is the respondent or the actual vignette (Hox et al. 1991; Ludwick et al. 2004; Rossi and Anderson 1982; Taylor 2006; Jasso 2006). In fact, the unit of the analysis is the vignette (Ludwick et al. 2004; Rossi and Anderson 1982; Taylor 2006). Ludwick and colleagues (2004) report that multicollinearity or orthogonality of the independent variables is not an issue and can be easily assessed by performing a zero-order correlation matrix. Ludwick et al. (2004) also report that studies using a Monte Carlo simulation produces identical regression slopes for both independent data and data in which 50% of the variance is affected by dependency (Ludwick et al 2004:232).

6.4 VIGNETTE FACTORS AND DIMENSIONS

Each vignette was designed to realistically represent rape in a college setting, complete with familiar places and circumstances. In this section, the vignette template is explained in detail as well as the rationale for the inclusion of the factors in each of the vignettes. In addition, the dependent variables (rape myth items) that will be analyzed will be described in this study.

Vignettes were created using factors (i.e. IRMA conditional items, cultural rape scripts, the term rape, sexual scripts, and alcohol contexts) that contribute to situational ambiguity in a subjective rape experience. The independent variables under study in this research design will include socio-demographic information such as race/ethnicity, age, sex, year in college, involvement in university activities, relationship status, sexual preference, and prior sexual history.

The factors present in each vignette were randomly assigned and randomly generated (Ludwick et al. 2004; Rossi and Anderson 1982; Taylor 2006) using a random

number generator. In this study, there were ten manipulated factors in each vignette (Appendix 1a): three with three levels and seven with two levels. This gives a total of 3^3 x 2^7= 3,456 possible vignettes (Taylor 2006; Wallander 2009). Each dimension was presented to respondents in order to ensure equal response sets for each factor represented in the population of vignettes creating a "balanced" set of measured variables (Atzmüller et al. 2010).

Vignette Template:

> Before the beginning of the school year, a young woman goes to a party with a few acquaintances to start off the new semester. When she arrives, there are a lot of people there. A little while later, she sees [REL PERP]. They talk for a bit, but then, she leaves to go to the bathroom. When she opens the bathroom door, [ALONE], [INITIATE]. [ALC PERP]. [ALC VIC]. [PRSEX PERP]. [VIC DRESS]. They continue kissing and it starts to go further. He starts touching her breasts and they keep kissing. Afterwards, he starts lifting up her skirt and moves her underwear. [VNONC VERB]. He says, "It's okay." [PEN TYPE]. [VNONC BEH]. He does it for a little while longer until they are interrupted; she quickly fixes her clothing and goes back downstairs to the party.

Sample Vignette:

> Before the beginning of the school year, a young woman goes to a party with a few acquaintances to start off the new semester. When she arrives, there are a lot of people there. A little while later, she sees [an acquaintance]. They talk for a bit, but then, she leaves to go to the bathroom. When she opens the bathroom door, [he walks in], [she initiates by kissing him]. [He is tipsy]. [She is drunk]. [They have had a previous sexual relationship]. [She is dressed provocatively]. They continue kissing and it starts to go further. He starts touching her breasts and they keep kissing. Afterwards, he starts lifting up her skirt and moves her underwear. [She verbally protests]. He says, "it's okay." [He puts his finger in her vagina]. [She doesn't physically resist]. He does it for a little while longer until they are interrupted; she quickly fixes her clothing and goes back downstairs to the party.

6.5 VARIABLES

Ten independent variables were included as factors that were manipulated within each vignette: (a) the dimensions of the relationship to the perpetrator are measured at

43

three levels (acquaintance, friend, boyfriend); (b) the dimension of whether or not the victim is alone with the perpetrator is measured at two levels (alone, not alone); (c) the dimensions of who initiated the encounter are measured at two levels (he initiates kissing, she initiates kissing); the use of alcohol by both the (d) perpetrator and the (e) victim are measured at three levels (sober, tipsy, drunk); (f) the dimensions of previous sexual history with the perpetrator are measured at two levels (they have not had a previous sexual relationship, they have had a previous sexual relationship); (g) the dimensions of verbal non-consent are measured at two levels (she verbally protests and she doesn't verbally protest); (h) the dimensions of penetration are measured at two levels (penis-vaginal, digital-vaginal); (i) the dimensions of behavioral non-consent are measured at two levels (she physically resists and she doesn't physically resist); and (j) the dimension of victim's dress is measured on two levels (she is not dressed provocatively and she is dressed provocatively).

CHAPTER 7

FINDINGS

This chapter focuses on the statistical analyses and results conducted on the socio-demographic and contextual factors in the vignettes and AARMS items. I used sequential model fitting to assess the most significant factors related to rape myth acceptance (see Appendix E). The discussion begins with (a) average rape myth acceptance scores; (b) tests of significance on rape myth acceptance by the respondents' sex and sexual history; (c) factor analysis results; (d) rape myth acceptance scores regressed on the single factor score of victim-blame; (e) the overall findings from hypotheses testing; (f) the final models used for analysis and interpretation; and (g) main effects and interactions of selected socio-demographic characteristics and contextual variables. The final models are organized by individual items categorized by the rape myth subscales: "she asked for it," "he didn't mean to," "it wasn't really rape," and "she lied." Each analysis is interpreted according to the subscale.

7.1 RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE: AVERAGE SCORES

For both males and females, the highest and lowest average scores are in the same subscale, "he didn't mean to" reflecting some discrepancy among respondents' beliefs regarding men's culpability in the vignettes. The highest average score among all of the

AARMS statements is, "in this scenario, he got too sexually carried away" and the lowest is, "in this scenario, he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual" (Table 7.1). This finding attests to the cultural understanding that men get too sexually carried away when they are aroused. It is also consistent with previous literature indicating that overall rape myth scores tend to excuse the perpetrator from the responsibility of rape rather than outright blame the victim.

7.2 RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE SCORES: SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

In this section, I discuss the socio-demographic characteristics affecting rape myth judgments. I include the average scores of rape myth acceptance by respondents' sex and then the average scores of respondents' sexual history. Finally, I include tests of significance to determine if respondents' sexual history has a significant effect compared to respondents' sex.

7.3 AVERAGE RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE SCORES BY RESPONDENTS' SEX

The findings from the average scores between males and females are consistent with previous literature (Table 7.2). On average, males tend to have higher rape myth acceptance scores than females. The average scores (among females) were expected. In my previous research, I found that women were more likely to relinquish the perpetrator from the responsibility of rape than outright blame the women for sexual assault (Deming et al. 2013).

7.4 AVERAGE RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE SCORES BY RESPONDENTS' SEXUAL HISTORY

The overall findings from this analysis indicate that respondents' who have had sexual intercourse are more likely to accept rape myths than those who have not had

Table 7.1: Average Rape Myth Acceptance Scores

Rape Myth Statements	N	Mean (SD)	Scale Responses (%)				
			1	2	3	4	5
She Asked for It							
If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.	829	2.59 (1.24)	191 (23.04)	258 (31.12)	127 (15.32)	206 (24.85)	47 (5.67)
In this case she should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.	833	2.84 (1.26)	148 (17.77)	238 (28.57)	110 (13.21)	276 (33.13)	61 (7.32)
In this scenario she is asking for trouble.	833	2.36 (1.13)	216 (25.93)	299 (35.89)	148 (17.77)	146 (17.53)	24 (2.88)
In this scenario, she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.	842	2.91 (1.22)	142 (16.86)	202 (23.99)	129 (15.32)	326 (38.72)	43 (5.11)
He Didn't Mean To							
In this scenario, he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.	837	1.95 (0.90)	290 (34.65)	359 (42.89)	132 (15.77)	49 (5.85)	7 (0.84)
In this scenario, he got too sexually carried away.	837	3.62 (1.05)	31 (3.70)	111 (13.26)	168 (20.07)	366 (43.73)	161 (19.24)
In this situation, he unintentionally pushed himself on her.	836	2.48 (1.06)	146 (17.46)	344 (41.15)	167 (19.98)	158 (18.90)	21 (2.51)
Note: Individuals responded to items using a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). Higher scores indicate greater acceptance of rape myths.							

47

Table 7.1: Average Rape Myth Acceptance Scores Cont.

Rape Myth Statements	N	Mean (SD)	Scale Responses (%)				
			1	2	3	4	5
It Wasn't Really Rape							
In this case she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.	837	2.40 (1.14)	211 (25.21)	290 (34.65)	155 (18.52)	154 (18.40)	27 (3.23)
She Lied							
In this situation, she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.	828	2.92 (1.05)	83 (10.02)	204 (24.64)	268 (32.37)	239 (28.86)	34 (4.11)
In this situation, she can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.	837	2.24 (1.06)	229 (27.36)	329 (39.31)	147 (17.56)	116 (13.86)	16 (1.91)
She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.	837	2.37 (1.11)	209 (24.97)	291 (34.77)	175 (20.91)	139 (16.61)	23 (2.75)
Note: Individuals responded to items using a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). Higher scores indicate greater acceptance of rape myths.							

sexual intercourse[5] (Table 7.3). These findings are novel and indicate that individuals may already be experiencing levels of coercion in their sexual relationships. These findings are discussed further in the next section.

7.5 MIXED EFFECT MODELING: AARMS ITEMS REGRESSED ON RESPONDENTS' SEX (MODEL 1) AND RESPONDENTS' SEXUAL HISTORY (MODEL 2)

In this section, I discuss the novel findings from my dissertation research. Historically, sex is the most significant predictor of rape myth acceptance. While sex is significant in this study, I also found that respondents who have engaged in sexual intercourse adhere to rape myths. Therefore, I performed two analyses in which I first regressed the AARMS items on the respondents' sex (model 1) and second, I regressed the AARMS items on respondents' sexual history (model 2). I included both of these models in a single table (Table 7.4) to show a side-by-side comparison of each AARMS item.

This study is the first of its kind to ask respondents whether or not they have had sexual intercourse. These findings indicate that sexual history is a greater predictor of rape myth acceptance than sex. In fact, the respondents' sex is significant in only 5 of 11 rape myth items (Table 7.4: Model 1), while respondents who have had sexual intercourse (compared to those who have not had sexual intercourse) is significant in 8 of 11 rape myth items (Table 7.4: Model 2). Previous research indicates that while both males and females adhere to rape myths; research shows they are more likely to excuse the male than outright blame the female for her sexual victimization (Deming et al.

---

[5] With the exception of items: "in this scenario, he got too sexually carried away" and "in this situation, she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him."

Table 7.2: Average Rape Myth Acceptance Scores[6] by Sex

	Male	Female
Rape Myth Items	Mean (SE)	Mean (SE)
She Asked for It		
1. If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.	2.61 (.097)	2.61 (.067)
2. In this case she should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.	3.01 (.099)	2.75 (.076)
3. In this scenario she is asking for trouble.	2.56 (.099)	2.23 (.070)
4. In this scenario, she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.	3.02 (.099)	2.85 (.076)
He Didn't Mean To		
5. In this scenario, he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.	2.13 (.084)	1.88 (.053)
6. In this scenario, he got too sexually carried away.	3.74 (.080)	3.52 (.063)
7. In this situation, he unintentionally pushed himself on her.	2.56 (.090)	2.41 (.066)
It Wasn't Really Rape		
8. In this case she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.	2.43 (.088)	2.40 (.066)
She Lied		
9. In this situation, she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.	3.21 (.085)	2.79 (.071)
10. In this situation, she can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.	2.26 (.079)	2.23 (.064)
11. She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.	2.44 (.087)	2.35 (.070)

---

[6] Individuals responded to items using a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). Higher scores indicate greater acceptance of rape myths.

Table 7.3: Average Rape Myth Acceptance Scores[7] by Respondents' Sexual History

Rape Myth Items	Respondent has had Sexual Intercourse Mean (SE)	Respondent has not had Sexual Intercourse Mean (SE)
She Asked for It		
1. If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.	2.68 (.063)	2.35 (.114)
2. In this case she should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.	2.96 (.067)	2.41 (.124)
3. In this scenario she is asking for trouble.	2.43 (.066)	2.01 (.111)
4. In this scenario, she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.	2.96 (.066)	2.70 (.144)
He Didn't Mean To		
5. In this scenario, he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.	2.03 (.053)	1.74 (.089)
6. In this scenario, he got too sexually carried away.	3.58 (.055)	3.64 (.120)
7. In this situation, he unintentionally pushed himself on her.	2.52 (.059)	2.28 (.120)
It Wasn't Really Rape		
8. In this case she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.	2.52 (.059)	2.03 (.101)
She Lied		
9. In this situation, she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.	2.96 (.061)	2.83 (.139)
10. In this situation, she can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.	2.33 (.058)	1.94 (.091)
11. She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.	2.48 (.062)	2.03 (.107)

[7] Individuals responded to items using a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). Higher scores indicate greater acceptance of rape myths.

2013). When I examine the findings from this analysis, it appears that those who have

had sexual intercourse in this study (both males and females) actually blame the victim

more. These findings show that the individuals in this sample may be learning rape

myths through their actual sexual experiences and they may be normalizing them. This

finding could indicate that both males and females are learning sexual scripts (i.e. women

are the gatekeepers of sexual interactions) within their early sexual experiences. The

implications of these findings are discussed further in the discussion chapter.

7.6 FACTOR ANALYSIS

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the contextual variables and the

AARMS statements. The factor analysis of the AARMS produced a single factor

"victim- blame" (Table 7.5) which accounted for 96% of the variance[8]. I used Principal

Components Analysis (PCA) in this study to confirm that although the overall structure

of the IRMA scale has been modified, the AARMS still contributes to a single factor and

all items were retained due to their theoretical significance.

7.7 MIXED EFFECT MODELING: VICTIM-BLAME

Using mixed effect models, a single factor score (victim-blame) was regressed on

the contextual variables within the vignettes (Table 7.6). The variables: "she initiates

kissing," "she does not verbally protest," and "she does not physically resist" were

positively associated with higher victim-blame. This finding indicates that women are

held responsible if they do not adhere to the social norms regarding expected gendered

behavior during sexual encounters. For example, if women initiate the first sexual

---

[8] A polychoric correlation matrix was conducted to account for the ordinal AARMS variables. After conducting the second analysis, the polychoric correlation matrix produced two factors, however the second factor only accounted for 12% of the variance.

Table 7.4: Mixed Effect Modeling: AARMS Items Regressed on Respondents' Sex and Respondents' Sexual History

Rape Myth Items	Model 1	Model 2
	Male	Participant Had Sexual Intercourse
She Asked for It		
If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.	.0016	.3045*
In this case she should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.	.2535*	.5298**
In this scenario she is asking for trouble.	.3188**	.4060**
In this scenario, she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.	.1938	.2532
He Didn't Mean To		
In this scenario, he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.	.2404**	.2834**
In this scenario, he got too sexually carried away.	.2083*	-.0551
In this situation, he unintentionally pushed himself on her.	.1059	.2804*
It Wasn't Really Rape		
In this case she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.	.0617	.4914**
She Lied		
In this situation, she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.	.3383**	.1068
In this situation, she can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.	.0311	.4189**
She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.	.1093	.4398**
*p<.05, **p<.01		

contact, they are perceived as "wanting sex" and if they do not show physical or verbal signs of non-consent, they are perceived as culpable for not being clear regarding their sexual boundaries (perhaps even a "tease"). However, respondents were less likely to attribute victim-blame if the woman was drunk. This finding contradicts previous research which indicated that women were held accountable for sexual assault if they had been drinking (Deming et al. 2013). This finding demonstrates that norms regarding women's drinking behavior may have changed, however, they are still accountable for exhibiting verbal and physical cues of non-consent. These findings also may attest to the prevalence of drinking during sexual encounters that frequently occur on college campuses.

7.8 HYPOTHESES TESTING: CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES

In this section, I discuss the findings of the hypotheses that were directly tested and whether or not they were supported in the analyses. I briefly describe the general findings and I will discuss the detailed findings in the next section: "final models."

Hypothesis 1: Whether or not the woman initiates kissing will have a significant effect on rape myth adherence.

Hypothesis 1 tested the effects on rape myth acceptance when women initiate first sexual contact. This hypothesis is partially supported and was statistically significant in 7 of 11 rape myth models[9] (Tables 7.7-7.10). This finding indicates that if women initiate kissing, they are held responsible if they are raped. This specifically reflects the gender inequality present in heteronormative sexual scripts in which women are the gatekeepers of sexual behavior and responsible for setting sexual boundaries.

---

[9] With the exception of the rape myth items: "if she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation, it was because she was unclear," "he got too sexually carried away," "he unintentionally pushed himself on her," "she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him."

Hypothesis 2: Whether or not the woman is alone with the perpetrator will have a significant effect on rape myth adherence.

Hypothesis 2 tested the effects on rape myth acceptance when women are alone with the perpetrator. The AARMS items were regressed on the contextual variables and the variable, the *woman is alone with the man* was not statistically significant in the rape myth models, therefore this variable is not shown in tables 7.7-7.10. These findings show that whether or not a woman is alone with a man does not affect her culpability if sexual assault occurs. This finding also signifies that being alone with men may be normal among this sample of college students.

Hypothesis 3: The woman's attire will have a significant effect on rape myth adherence.

Hypothesis 3 tested if the woman's attire was associated with rape myth acceptance scores. This hypothesis is partially supported and was statistically significant in 2 of 11 rape myth models[10] pertaining to victim-blame (Tables 7.7-7.10). While previous studies linked women's provocative clothing to higher rape myth acceptance, the fact that this is only partially supported may show that women's provocative clothing has become normative and widely accepted without suggesting women are sexually available or "asking for it."

Hypothesis 4: The woman's level of alcohol consumption will have a significant effect on rape myth adherence.

Hypothesis 4 tested the effects of women's alcohol consumption on rape myth acceptance. The AARMS items were regressed on the contextual variables and the

---

[10] This hypothesis was only significant in the subscale, "she asked for it." The items were: "she is asking for trouble," and "she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control."

Table 7.5: Factor Analysis of Rape Myth Items (AARMS)

Rape Myth Statements	Factor Loading
She Asked for It	
If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.	.6262
In this case she should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.	.7217
In this scenario she is asking for trouble.	.6932
In this scenario, she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.	.7517
He Didn't Mean To	
In this scenario, he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.	.6430
In this scenario, he got too sexually carried away.	-.2745
In this situation, he unintentionally pushed himself on her.	.3312
It Wasn't Really Rape	
In this case she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.	.8229
She Lied	
In this situation, she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.	.2598
In this situation, she can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.	.8023
She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.	.8094
Note: 96% of the variance is explained by factor 1	

Table 7.6: Mixed Effect Modeling: Single Factor Score Regressed on Contextual Variables

Contextual Variables (Reference Group)	Victim Blame
She is Drunk (She is Sober)	-.1383*
She is Tipsy (She is Sober)	-.0674
He is Drunk (He is Sober)	.0376
He is tipsy (He is Sober)	.0493
Boyfriend (Acquaintance)	.1225
Friend (Acquaintance)	.0421
She Initiates (He Initiates)	.2051**
She Does Not Physically Resist (She Does Physically Resist)	.4912**
She is Dressed Provocatively (She is Not Dressed Provocatively)	.0206
Digital Penetration (Penile Penetration)	.0774
Alone (Not Alone)	.0424
She Does Not Verbally Protest (She Does Verbally Protest)	.5795**
Previous Sexual Relationship (No Previous Sexual Relationship)	.0266
*p<.05, **p<.01	

variables, *the woman is drunk* and the *woman is tipsy* were significant in 6 of 11 rape

myth models[11] (Tables 7.7-7.10). However, women's alcohol level is positively and

negatively associated with rape myth acceptance. These variables are negatively related

to blaming the victim, but positively related to relinquishing the perpetrator from the

responsibility of rape. These findings are discussed further in each AARMS subscale.

> *Hypothesis* 5: The man's level of alcohol consumption will have a significant
> effect on rape myth adherence.

Hypothesis 5 tested the effects of men's alcohol consumption on rape myth acceptance.

This hypothesis was only supported in 2 of the 11 rape myth models[12] (Tables 7.7-7.10).

Men's alcohol consumption is associated with relinquishing men from the responsibility

of sexual aggression. This finding indicates that if men are drinking they are not

responsible for acting sexually aggressive or for misreading sexual cues.

> *Hypothesis* 6: The relationship to the perpetrator will have a significant effect on
> rape myth adherence.
> *Hypothesis* 7: The presence of a previous sexual relationship will have a
> significant effect on rape myth adherence.

Hypothesis 6 tested the effects of the women's relationship to the perpetrator and

hypothesis 7 tested the effects of a previous sexual relationship on rape myth acceptance.

Both variables were regressed on the AARMS items and were not significant. Both

hypotheses were not supported in the rape myth models (Tables 7.7-7.10). These

findings are novel as they reveal that gradations of the relationship between the victim

and perpetrator regarding acquaintance rape are not indicative of higher rape myth

---

[11] With the exception of the rape myth items: "if she claims she experienced non-consensual sex happened in this situation, it was because she was unclear," "she is asking for trouble," "he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual," "he unintentionally pushed himself on her," and "she can't say she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it."
[12] This hypothesis is supported in the models: "he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual" and "he unintentionally pushed himself on her."

acceptance. They also attest that previous sexual encounters may not be interpreted to

mean continued sexual consent for future sexual encounters among college populations.

> *Hypothesis* 8: The type of penetration will have a significant effect on rape myth
> adherence.

Hypothesis 8 tested if the type of penetration (i.e., digital or penile) will impact rape myth

acceptance scores. The AARMS was regressed on the contextual variables and the

variable: *digital* was not significant in the rape myth models. This hypothesis is not

supported (Tables 7.7-7.10). Previous research argued that digital penetration was

viewed as "less serious" than penile penetration. This finding supports that fact that the

type of penetration does not affect rape myth acceptance scores.

> *Hypothesis* 9: Whether or not the woman verbally protests will have an effect of
> rape myth adherence.

Hypothesis 9 tested the significance of women's verbal protests on rape myth acceptance.

The AARMS items were regressed on the contextual variables and the variable: *the*

woman does not verbally protest is strongly supported and statistically significant in 9 of

the 11 rape myth models[13] (Tables 7.7-7.10). These findings are further discussed

according to the AARMS subscales.

> *Hypothesis* 10: Whether or not the woman physically resists will have an effect on
> rape myth adherence.

Lastly, hypothesis 10 tested the significance of women's physical resistance on rape myth

acceptance scores. The AARMS were regressed on the contextual variables and the

variable: *the woman does not physically resist* is strongly supported and statistically

significant in 10 of 11 rape myth models[14] (Tables 7.7-7.10).   This finding illustrates

---

[13] With the exception of the items: "he unintentionally pushed himself on her" and "she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him."
[14] With the exception of the item, "she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him."

that regardless of sexual consent initiatives (i.e. Affirmative Consent Standard) on college campuses, consent is dependent upon women to clearly show verbal and physical cues of non-consent. These findings are discussed further as they pertain to each subscale because each contextual and socio-demographic variable should be interpreted according to the overall theme of the subscale.

7.9 MIXED EFFECT MODELING: MODELS BY SUBSCALE

The aim of this dissertation was to determine which factors contribute to greater rape myth acceptance. In this section, I discuss the contextual and socio-demographic variables relevant to rape myth acceptance. Controlling for other variables, each rape myth item was regressed on contextual variables and socio-demographic characteristics. Several of the factors are significant in each of the subscales, however the results reveal differences relative to each subscale. Therefore, the results are organized by: "she asked for it," "he didn't mean to," "it wasn't really rape," and "she lied."

7.10 SHE ASKED FOR IT

Consistent with previous literature, males were significantly more likely to accept the rape myth, "she is asking for trouble" than females. However, the most significant socio-demographic variable was whether or not the respondent has had sexual intercourse. This finding is robust throughout 3 of 4 models[15] (Table 7.7). To date, this study is the first of its kind to ask respondents their sexual history; I specifically asked the respondents' sexual history to determine if their sexual history impacts their rape myth

---

[15] With the exception of the rape myth item, "she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control."

acceptance scores. This finding may reveal that heterosexual sexual relationships already involve levels of sexual coercion which may have become normalized and expected within heterosexual sexual encounters (i.e., sexual scripts).

The effects associated with the victim's alcohol consumption are unique. Previous research indicates that if victims are drunk they are more likely to be perceived as socially irresponsible and subsequently blamed for sexual assault (Abbey 2002; Deming et al. 2013; Finch and Munro 2007; Klippenstine, Schuller, and Wall 2007; Sims, Noel, and Maisto 2007; Stormo, Lang, and Stritzke 1997; Vélez-Blasini and Brandt 2000). However, this research suggests that women's alcohol consumption is negatively associated with higher rape myth acceptance indicating that if the victim is drunk, she is not held responsible for failing to realize that he wanted to have sex with her. Additionally, if she is drunk, respondents do not hold her accountable for letting things get out of control. So, to some extent, being drunk seems to exonerate the woman from getting blamed for being raped which supports the notion that cultural norms and expectations regarding drinking among college students are changing. This finding indicates that women's use of alcohol may be becoming more normative among the students in my sample.

Women who dressed provocatively were associated with higher rape myth acceptance of the items: "she is asking for trouble" and "she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control." Similarly, women who initiate first sexual contact (e.g., kissing) are associated with greater acceptance of the myths: "she should not be surprised if he assumes she want to have sex," "she is asking for trouble," and "she is somewhat

responsible for letting things get out of control." This finding suggests that individuals in this study believe that kissing is a signal for sexual intercourse.

The most statistically significant contextual variables in each of the four models was whether or not the woman verbally protested and physically resisted. Whether or not "she asked for it" is dependent upon her verbal and physical cues of non-consent. According to these findings, cultural expectations regarding women's refusal of sex is how consent is negotiated among this sample (Table 7.7).

7.11 HE DIDN'T MEAN TO

In this section, I discuss the findings from the subscale, "he didn't mean to" (Table 7.8). In this study, males were more likely to accept the myths: "he didn't realize what he was doing so it should not be considered non-consensual" and "he got too sexually carried away." Second-year students were significantly less likely to believe that "he unintentionally pushed himself on her" compared to first-year students. However, this is the only statement in which year in college is related to rape myth acceptance. This finding may be attributed to the rape awareness programs and intervention efforts on the college campus at which this study was conducted. Respondents who have had sexual intercourse were more likely to adhere to the items: "he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual" and "he unintentionally pushed himself on her." In addition, the respondents in this study were significantly more likely to adhere to the statement, "he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual" if the woman initiated the sexual

Table 7.7: Mixed Effect Modeling: She Asked For It[16]

Variables (Reference Group)	If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.	She should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.	She is asking for trouble.	She is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.
Male (Female)			.2838*	
Respondent has had Sexual Intercourse (Respondent has not had Sexual Intercourse)	.2894*	.5094**	.3745**	
She is Drunk (She is Sober)		-.1476*		-.2091**
She is Tipsy (She is Sober)				-.2087*
She Initiates (He Initiates)		.1800*	.1969**	.1988**
She Does Not Physically Resist (She Does Physically Resist)	.4648**	.5632**	.2343**	.5409**
She is Dressed Provocatively (She is not Dressed Provocatively)			.2012**	.1755**
She Does Not Verbally Protest (She Does Verbally Protest)	.6444**	.6167**	.3203**	.5884**
*p<.05, **p<.01				

63

---

[16] Non-significant socio-demographic and contextual variables are removed from the model.

Table 7.8: Mixed Effect Modeling: He Didn't Mean To[17]

Contextual Variables (Reference Group)	He didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.	He got too sexually carried away.	He unintentionally pushed himself on her.
Male (Female)	.2139*	.1932*	
Second Year (First Year)			-.2866**
Respondent has had Sexual Intercourse (Respondent has not had Sexual Intercourse)	.2548**		.2570*
She is Drunk (She is Sober)		.1947**	
He is Drunk (He is Sober)	.3216**		.2628**
He is tipsy (He is Sober)	.2955**		.2089**
She Initiates (He Initiates)	.1150*		
She Does Not Physically Resist (She Does Physically Resist)	.2060**	-.3514**	.1457*
She Does Not Verbally Protest (She Does Verbally Protest)	.3059**	-.4503**	
*p<.05, **p<.01			

;

---

[17] Non-significant socio-demographic and contextual variables are removed from the model.

encounter. This finding attests to the fact that the individuals in this study relinquish the perpetrator of "miscommunication" if the woman initiates the first sexual contact. When the victim is drunk it is positively associated with a greater belief that "he got too sexually carried away" during the sexual encounter indicating that she was unable to give verbal and physical cues of non-consent. Therefore, he was "unaware" of her protests because she was drinking and did not show signs of non-consent. However, when the man was drinking, respondents believed that, "he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual" and "he unintentionally pushed himself on her." It appears that men's alcohol consumption relinquishes them for misreading social cues or failing to recognize that they went too far.

The findings in this section also attest to the perpetrator's responsibility of rape and sexual assault as well as the distinction between *sex* and *rape*. In the second model, "he got too sexually carried away," the boundary between sex and rape depends on situational factors (Table 7.8). She does not physically resist has very strong effects in all three of the subscales. For instance, the scenario isn't rape because she didn't verbally and physically resist his sexual advances. If she did physically resist, respondents believed that the man got too sexually carried away; if he overpowered her physical resistance, it was only because of his strong desire for sex. This finding is consistent with previous literature as it implies that individuals are more likely to excuse the man for coercive sexual behavior than outright blame the victim.

Additionally, if she does not verbally protest has strong effects in 2 of 3 subscales[18] and again relates negatively to he got too sexually carried away. Respondents

---

[18] With the exception of the rape myth item, "he unintentionally pushed himself on her."

in this study believe that if the woman does not indicate her non-consent, then the man has no way of knowing the woman is not sexually interested. If she doesn't verbally protest, she is held accountable for not being clear about her sexual boundaries.

7.12 IT WASN'T REALLY RAPE

In this section, I discuss the results from the subscale, "it wasn't really rape" (Table 7.9). Those respondents who had sexual intercourse were significantly more likely to accept the myth, "in this case, she wasn't clear so she can't say non-consensual sex happened." When the woman initiated sexual contact, respondents were also more likely to accept this myth. However, if the woman was drinking, respondents were less likely to accept this rape myth. In addition, if the woman did not verbally protest or physically resist, respondents accepted that the woman wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened. This subscale addresses the social construction of rape and sexual assault. According to the respondents in this study, if women are drinking, they can't be clear about setting sexual boundaries and if women do not physically resist and verbally protest, then they are not entitled to label the event as non-consensual.

7.13 SHE LIED

In this section, I discuss in detail the findings of this subscale. While these items were not directly hypothesis tested, they address beliefs about women being prone to lie about rape (Table 7.10). Other racial groups (6.67%) were significantly more likely to accept the rape myths: "she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him" and "she can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it" compared to white respondents. However, these findings were

Table 7.9: Mixed Effect Modeling: It Wasn't Really Rape[19]

Variables (Reference Group)	In this case, she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.
Respondent has had Sexual Intercourse (Respondent has not had Sexual Intercourse)	.4830**
She is Drunk (She is Sober)	-.1628*
She is Tipsy (She is Sober)	-.2058**
She Initiates (He Initiates)	.1718**
She Does Not Physically Resist (She Does Physically Resist)	.5804**
She Does Not Verbally Protest (She Does Verbally Protest)	.6322**
*p<.05, **p<.01	

[19] Non-significant socio-demographic and contextual variables are removed from the model.

Table 7.10: Mixed Effect Modeling: She Lied[20]

Variables (Reference Group)	She might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.	She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.	She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.
Male (Female)	.3456**		
Other Race Group (White)	.4271*		.5092**
Respondent has had Sexual Intercourse (Respondent has not had Sexual Intercourse)		.4052**	.4561**
She is Drunk (She is Sober)		-.1671**	
She is Tipsy (She is Sober)	-.1352*		
She Initiates (He Initiates)		.1482*	.1843**
She Does Not Physically Resist (She Does Physically Resist)		.4648**	.4388**
She Does Not Verbally Protest (She Does Verbally Protest)		.6107**	.5226**
*p<.05, **p<.01			

---

[20] Non-significant socio-demographic and contextual variables are removed from the model.

only significant in 2 of 11 rape myth models. Previous research indicates that it is not uncommon for women to be perceived as lying about sexual violence (Edwards, Turchik, Dardis, Reynolds, and Gidycz 2011).

Respondents who had sexual intercourse were also more likely to accept the myths that the woman agreed to it or that she led the perpetrator on and then regretted it afterwards. In addition, if women were drinking, respondents were actually less likely to believe that the woman might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him and that she can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it. This finding may indicate that perceptions of women lying about rape may be changing among this sample of college students.

7.14 MAIN EFFECTS AND INTERACTIONS

In this section, I discuss the main effects and interactions of selected socio-demographic and contextual variables manipuled in the vignettes (Table 7.11). I examined: (a) respondents' sex and previous sexual history on rape myth acceptance; (b) respondents' sex and if the woman was drunk in the vignette on rape myth acceptance; and (c) respondents' sex and if the man was drunk in the vignette on rape myth acceptance.

There are strong positive main effects for those who have had intercourse on 8 of 11 rape myth items (Table 7.11) and males only have a main effect on 1 of 11 rape myth items. An interaction between males and those who have had sexual intercourse is significant on 10 of 11 rape myth items. I also examined respondents' sex and if the woman was drunk in the vignette. There are only three positive main effects for males and an interaction between males and if the woman was drunk is significant 5 of 11

subscales. Lastly, I measured respondents' sex and if the man was drunk in the vignette. Males had significant main effects on 5 of 11 rape myth items while if the man was drunk produced significant main effects on 6 of 11 rape myth items. An interaction between males and if the male was drunk in the vignette was statistically significant on 6 of 11 rape myth items.

In conclusion, each of the four subscales were discussed according to the significant socio-demographic characteristics and contextual variables. Across each subscale, the most remarkable socio-demographic factors affecting rape myth acceptance were the respondents' sex and their previous sexual history. Additionally, the contextual variables that were the most significant where whether or not the woman verbally and physically protested.

Table 7.11: Main Effects and Interactions

Rape Myth Items	Main Effects and Interactions					
	Respondent Sex and Has Had Sexual Intercourse		Respondent Sex and If the Woman is Drunk in the Vignette		Respondent Sex and if the Man is Drunk in the Vignette	
	Main Effect ([a]Male [b]Has Had Intercourse)	Interaction	Main Effect ([a]Male [b]Female is Drunk)	Interaction	Main effect ([a]Male [b]Male is Drunk)	Interaction
She Asked for It						
If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.	[b].2842*	.2751*				
In this case she should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.	[b].4401**	.6947**			[a].2607*	.3337*
In this scenario she is asking for trouble.	[b].3615**	.6426**	[a].2677**	.4023**	[a].3326** [b].2107*	.4924**
In this scenario, she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.		.3749**			[a].2453*	
*p<.05, **p<.01						

Table 7.11: Main Effects and Interactions Cont.

| | Main Effects and Interactions | | | | | |
| | Respondent Sex and Has Had Sexual Intercourse | | Respondent Sex and If the Woman is Drunk in the Vignette | | Respondent Sex and if the Man is Drunk in the Vignette | |
Rape Myth Items	Main Effect ([a]Male [b]Has Had Intercourse)	Interaction	Main Effect ([a]Male [b]Female is Drunk)	Interaction	Main effect ([a]Male [b]Male is Drunk)	Interaction
He Didn't Mean To						
In this scenario, he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.	[b].2658**	.4923**	[a].1843*	.3432**	[a].1914* [b].2543**	.5789**
In this scenario, he got too sexually carried away.	[a].5342**			.3816**	[b]-.2299*	
In this situation, he unintentionally pushed himself on her.	[b].3225**	.3709**		.2930*	[b].2677**	.3352**
It Wasn't Really Rape						
In this case she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.	[b].4650**	.4969**				
*p<.05, **p<.01						

Table 7.11: Main Effects and Interactions Cont.

| | Main Effects and Interactions | | | | | |
| | Respondent Sex and Has Had Sexual Intercourse | | Respondent Sex and If the Woman is Drunk in the Vignette | | Respondent Sex and if the Man is Drunk in the Vignette | |
Rape Myth Items	Main Effect ([a]Male [b]Has Had Intercourse)	Interaction	Main Effect ([a]Male [b]Female is Drunk)	Interaction	Main effect ([a]Male [b]Male is Drunk)	Interaction
She Lied						
In this situation, she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.		.4272**	[a].3059**	.4601**	[a].4630** [b].2285*	.3959**
In this situation, she can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.	[b].3780**	.4038**				
She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.	[b].4491**	.5040**			[b].2302*	.2685*
*p<.05, **p<.01						

CHAPTER 8

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, I discuss the findings from this exploratory study. I examine the socio-demographic characteristics and contextual variables that affect rape myth acceptance scores. In addition, I discuss the findings as they relate to larger structural supports that blame women for their sexual victimization and the necessity of incorporating theories of masculinity and social learning theories as mechanisms to address larger gender relations. I conclude with a discussion on the implications for evidence based interventions on college campuses.

Results from this dissertation attest to the significant factors contributing to rape myth acceptance. Overall, rape myth adherence is relatively low, however most respondents do not *strongly disagree* with the rape myth items. There are gender effects regarding rape myth acceptance, however these effects between males and females are small. It appears that respondents believe that men do get too sexually carried away and cannot control their sexual urges, but they do not believe that he didn't realize what he was doing.

Not only is this the first study to address acquaintance rape myths, it is also the first to determine the contextual factors affecting rape myth judgments. In previous research, women were perceived as socially responsible for the outcome of rape if they

were alone with the man, had a previous sexual relationship with the perpetrator, or knew the perpetrator prior to the incident (Deming et al. 2013). However, findings from this study indicate these are not significant factors related to rape myth acceptance. Previous research suggested that digital penetration was viewed as "less serious" than penile penetration (Peterson and Muehlenhard 2004); however, in this study, the type of penetration does not affect rape myth acceptance scores.

Women's alcohol level is positively and negatively associated with rape myth acceptance. It appears that women who are drunk or who have been drinking are not blamed for being unable to set clear sexual boundaries, however men's alcohol consumption is associated with relinquishing them from the responsibility of sexual aggression. In the vignette, if the woman initiated the sexual encounter (i.e. kissing), she is viewed as acting irresponsibly and "asking for it."

The most apparent finding in this study is that respondents who have had sexual intercourse are significantly more likely to adhere to rape myths. Historically, rape myth research shows that individuals are more likely to relinquish the perpetrator from the responsibility of rape than outright blame the victim (Deming et al. 2013). However, the respondents in this study who have had sexual intercourse may be learning rape myths through their sexual experiences and outright blamed the victim in the vignettes for sexual assault. This finding illustrates that existing heterosexual sexual relationships may already involve levels of sexual coercion which may have become normalized and expected within these sexual encounters (i.e., sexual scripts).

This study is the first of its kind to address myths surrounding acquaintance rape by specifically removing the term *rape* from the instrument and replacing it with *non-*

75

consensual. Given that sexual assault training and programming is an integral part of the university in which this study took place, it is reasonable to assume that the undergraduate students who took part in this study understood the term "non-consensual" used in the AARMS scale. Although the term *rape* was specifically not used because of the connotations associated with cultural rape script, I argue students were able infer that the scenario in the vignette was problematic without using the term rape. For example, respondents were asked to rate their agreement with items such as: "if she claims non-consensual sex happened it was because she was unclear," "he unintentionally pushed himself on her," and "he got too sexually carried away." These statements were carefully considered to include scenarios that meet the legal definition of rape but remained ambiguous due to multiple manipulated contextual factors.

The undergraduate students who participated in this study are unique in the sense that they received mandatory sexual assault training, but they also participate in activities that are specific to college students (e.g. drinking, parties, etc.) that may assist in developing evidence-based interventions. In order to identify a cluster of respondents who who consistently "strongly disagreed" or "strongly agreed" with each statement in the AARMS instrument, I used clustering techniques that were statistically appropriate. However, only two females from the sample strongly agreed with each of the 11 items and nine females disagreed with each of the 11 AARMS items.

For programming purposes, I thought it would be important to examine extreme responses within each of the four subscales. These outlier responses (i.e. those who always strongly agreed with each judgment) were quite small. However, within the subscale, "she asked for it," nine respondents in this study consistently agreed with the

subscale. Six of these respondents are female, and the majority of them are white, heterosexual and all of them have had sexual intercourse. In the subscale, "he didn't mean to," only two white females who have had sexual intercourse consistently strongly agreed with the items. Interestingly, 27 respondents strongly agreed with items in the subscale, "it wasn't really rape." Fifteen of these respondents are female and the majority of both males and females are white, heterosexual, and 23 of them have had sexual intercourse. The last subscale, "she lied" only had four consistent respondents that were also predominately white, heterosexual, and the majority has had sexual intercourse. Although this clustering analysis only produced a small number of individuals who consistently strongly agreed with rape myth items, the majority of them strongly agreed that the scenario depicted in the vignette was not rape. Programming efforts need to further address situational ambiguity and the construction of rape.

Another important aspect of this study is discerning between acts that are conceptualized as "sex" and acts that are perceived as "rape." In the subscale, "he didn't mean to" is where we can see these relationships between "sex" and "rape" emerge. If she initiates by kissing and does not verbally protest and physically resist when the man pursues sex, then respondents believed that "he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual." However, respondents were less likely to believe that "he got too sexually carried away" if the woman did not verbally protest and physically resist. So, if the woman does not show signs of non-consent then it is not possible for the man to get "too sexually carried away" because it is normative that "all men want sex" and if the woman does not refuse, then the man is doing what is perceived as natural (i.e. pursuing intercourse).

This relationship between sex and rape underscores the need for a unified theory of rape that focuses on the perpetrator and not the victim. The findings from this dissertation reveal a problem with ideologies regarding sex and rape. The respondents in my study still believe that women are the gatekeepers of sexual intimacy and if women are raped, the blame still lies on them for not being clear about their sexual boundaries, except when they are drunk. The discourse concerning rape is missing the process of how sexuality and violence become intertwined and modeled by individuals as they engage in sexual relationships. These ideologies largely ignore the fact that the responsibility of explicitly negotiating sexual encounters relies on *both* men and women in order to reduce violence within these intimate settings.

What constitutes sex and rape are subjectively defined and socially constructed. This sample of undergraduate students who engage in sexual and intimate interactions with others are redefining the definitions of sex and rape. Given that this sample of undergraduate students has numerous on-campus and off-campus resources, advanced intervention mechanisms and policies would assist in educating and creating awareness within this population that specifically address larger structural supports that condone and normalize violence (e.g. media, politics, religion, etc.) and the construction of rape and sex. Until we start focusing on the processes of how individuals are learning about sexual relationships as well as the gender inequality present within heterosexual relationships, we cannot reduce victim-blame and hold perpetrators accountable for rape.

CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSION

As scholars, in order to change a rape culture, we must critically examine the structural supports and pervasive ideologies that perpetuate a culture that normalizes gender inequality and sexual coercion within heterosexual sexual relationships. While advances have been made in combating sexual assault and rape across college campuses, there is much more work that needs to be done to address prevailing attitudes of victim responsibility and sexually coercive strategies that allow perpetrators to be relinquished from the responsibility of rape.

The findings in this exploratory study are critical in understanding the social psychological factors associated with victim-blame and men's responsibility of rape. These findings are important as we move through the era of the *Affirmative Consent Standard* implying that explicit consent is necessary to engage in consensual sexual relations. Findings from this study indicate that women are still held accountable for men's behavior and men are permitted to engage in sexually aggressive strategies to obtain sexual intercourse. It is evident that behavioral cues of non-consent still define consensual sex among these undergraduate men and women in this study. This finding is critical as it reveals that initiatives need to include conversations about how to engage in consensual relations among college students. The following limitations must be

considered. First, while the unit of analysis is the vignette itself, the sample only consisted of 287 undergraduate students. In the future, studies that include a larger sample will be more generalizable to student populations. Second, each respondent was presented with a series of vignettes. While each of the vignettes were different due to randomized manipulated factors, the same series of questions were asked for each vignette. It is possible that respondents were primed and thus their judgments to each of the AARMS statements may have been affected by their earlier judgments.

Findings from this exploratory study indicate the socio-demographic characteristics and contextual variables affecting rape myth acceptance. Future studies should explore the relationship between the respondents' sexual history and their perceptions of sex and rape. Additionally, this study found that the most significant variables addressing rape myth acceptance were if the woman verbally and physically used cues of non-consent. This finding highlights the importance of creating programming initiatives that specifically address the meaning of consent and negotiation strategies to obtain consent among undergraduate men and women. These findings not only contribute to our understanding of rape and sexual assault, but they also highlight the necessity of engaging students in conversations about sexual health and forming healthy relationships.

REFERENCES

Abbey, Antonia. 2002. "Alcohol-Related Sexual Assault: A Common Problem among College Students." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 14:118-128.

Abbey, Antonia, Renee BeShears, A. Monique Clinton-Sherrod and Pam McAuslan 2004. "Similarities and Differences in Women's Sexual Assault Experiences Based on Tactics Used by the Perpetrator." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 28:323-332.

Adams-Curtis, Leah E. and Gordon B. Forbes. 2004. "College Women's Experiences of Sexual Coercion: A Review of Cultural, Perpetrator, Victim, and Situational Variables." *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 5:91-122.

Allison, Paul D. 1999. *Multiple Regression: A Primer*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Anderson, Veanne N., Dorothy Simpson-Taylor, and Douglas J. Hermann. 2004. "Gender, Age, and Rape-Supportive Rules." *Sex Roles* 50:77-90.

Aronowitz, Teri, Cheryl Ann Lambert, and Sara Davidoff. 2012. "The Role of Rape Myth Acceptance in the Social Norms Regarding Sexual Behavior Among College Students." *Journal of Community Health Nursing* 29:173-182.

Atzmüller, Christiane, and Peter M. Steiner. 2010. "Experimental Vignette Studies in Survey Research." *Methodology* 6:128-138.

Bandura, Albert. 1978. "Social Learning Theory of Aggression." *Journal of Communication* 28:12-29.

Bartoli, Angela M. and M. Diane Clark 2006. "The Dating Game: Similarities and Differences in Dating Scripts Among College Students." *Sexuality & Culture* 10:54-80.

Black, Katherine A. and David J. Gold. 2008 "Gender Differences and Socioeconomic Status Biases in Judgments About Blame in Date Rape Scenarios." *Violence and Victims* 23:115-128.

Bletzer, Keith V. and Mary P. Koss 2004. "Narrative Constructions of Sexual Violence as Told by Female Rape Survivors in Three Populations of the Southwestern United States: Scripts of Coercion, Scripts of Consent." *Medical Anthropology* 23:113-156.

Bohner, Gerd, Friederike Eyssel, Afroditi Pina, Frank Siebler and G. Tendayi Viki. 2009. "Rape Myth Acceptance: Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral Effects of Beliefs that Blame the Victim and Exonerate the Perpetrator." Pp. 17-45 in *Rape: Challenging Contemporary Thinking*, edited by M. Horvath and J. Brown. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.

Burgess, Gerald H. 2007. "Assessment of Rape-Supportive Attitudes and Beliefs in College Men: Development, Reliability, and Validity of the Rape Attitudes and Beliefs Scale." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 22:973-993.

Burt, Martha R. 1980. "Cultural Myths and Supports for Rape." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 38:217-230.

Burt, Martha R., and Rochelle Semmel Albin. 1981. "Rape Myths, Rape Definitions, and Probability of Conviction." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 11:212-230.

Brownmiller, Susan. 1975. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster Publishing Company.

Chasteen, Amy L. 2001. "Constructing Rape: Feminism, Change, and Women's Everyday Understandings of Sexual Assault." *Sociological Spectrum* 21:101-139.

Check, James V. P., Neil M. Malamuth, Barbara Elias, and Susan A. Barton. 1985. "On Hostile Ground." *Psychology Today* 19:56-61.

Coker, Ann L., Patricia G Cook-Craig, Corrine M. Williams, Bonnie S. Fisher, Emily R. Clear, Lisandra S. Garcia, and Lea M. Hegge. 2011. "Evaluation of Green Dot: An Active Bystander Intervention to Reduce Sexual Violence on College Campuses." *Violence Against Women* 1-20.

Connell, Raewyn W. 1987. *Gender and Power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Connell, Raewyn W., and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Society* 19:829-859.

Crocker, Jennifer 2002. "The Costs of Seeking Self-Esteem." *Journal of Social Issues* 58:597-615.

Disch, William B., Lisa L. Harlow, James F. Campbell and Thomas R. Dougan 2000. "Student Functioning, Concerns, and Socio-Personal Well-Being." *Social Indicators Research* 54:41-74.

Deitz, Sheila R., Madeleine Littman, and Brenda J. Bentley. 1984. "Attribution of Responsibility for Rape: The Influence of Observer Empathy, Victim Resistance, and Victim Attractiveness." *Sex Roles* 10:261-280.

Deitz, Sheila R., Karen Tiemann Blackwell, Paul C. Daley, and Brenda J. Bentley. 1982. "Measurement of Empathy Toward Rape Victims and Rapists." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 43:372-384.

Deming, Michelle. E., Eleanor Krassen Covan, Suzanne C. Swan, and Deborah L. Billings. 2013. "Exploring Rape Myths, Gendered Norms, Group Processing and the Social Context of Rape Among College Women: A Qualitative Analysis." *Violence Against Women* 19:465-485.

Donovan, Roxanne A. 2007. "To Blame or Not To Blame: Influences of Target Race and Observer Sex on Rape Blame Attribution." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 22:722-736.

DuMont, Janice, Karen-Lee Miller and Terri L. Myhr. 2003. "The Role of 'Real Rape' and 'Real Victim' Stereotypes in the Police Reporting Practices of Sexually Assaulted Women." *Violence Against Women* 9:466-486.

Edwards, Katie M., Jessica A. Turchik, Christina M. Dardis, Nicole Reynolds, and Christine A. Gidycz. 2011. "Rape Myths: History, Individual and Institutional-Level Presence, and Implications for Change." *Sex Roles* 65:761-773.

Ellis, Lee 1989. *Theories of Rape: Inquiries into the Causes of Sexual Aggression*. New York, NY: Hemisphere Publishing Company.

Ellison, Louise, and Vanessa E. Munro. 2009. "Reacting to Rape: Exploring Mock Juror's Assessments of Complainant Credibility." *British Journal of Criminology* 49:202-219.

Estrich, Susan. 1987. *Real Rape*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Farmer, G. Lawrence, and Sarah McMahon. 2005. "Scale for the Identification of Acquaintance Rape Attitudes." *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* 11:213-235.

Feild, Hubert S. 1978. Attitudes Towards Rape: A Comparative Analysis of Police, Rapists, Crisis Counselors, and Citizens." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 36:156-179.

Finch, Emily and Vanessa E. Munro. 2007. "The Demon Drink and The Demonized Woman: Socio-Sexual Stereotypes and Responsibility Attribution in Rape Trials Involving Intoxicants." *Social Legal Studies* 16:591-614.

Finch, Janet. 1987. "The Vignette Technique in Survey Research." *Sociology* 21:105-114.

Fisher, Bonnie S., Francis T. Cullen and Michael G. Turner. 2000. "The Sexual Victimization of College Women." *U.S. Department of Justice: Office of Justice Programs, National Institute Of Justice.*

Fisher, Bonnie S., Leah E. Daigle, and Francis T. Cullen. 2010. *Unsafe in the Ivory Tower: The Sexual Victimization of College Women.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fonow, Mary Margaret, Laurel Richardson, and Virginia W. Wemmerus 1992. "Feminist Rape Education: Does It Work?" *Gender & Society* 6:108-121.

Forbes, Gordon B., Rebecca L. Jobe, Kay B. White, Emily Bloesch and Leah E. Adams-Curtis 2005. "Perceptions of Dating Violence Following a Sexual and Nonsexual Betrayal of Trust: Effects of Gender, Sexism, Acceptance of Rape Myths, and Vengeance Motivation." *Sex Roles* 52:165-173.

Flood, Michael. 2008. Measures for the Assessment of Dimensions of Violence Against Women: A Compendium. Unpublished. Melbourne: Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health & Society, La Trobe University.

Franklin, Cortney A. 2010. "Physically Forced, Alcohol-Induced, and Verbally Coerced Sexual Victimization: Assessing Risk Factors among University Women." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38:149-159.

Frese, Bettina, Miguel Moya, and Jesús L. Megías. 2004. "Social Perception of Rape: How Rape Myth Acceptance Modulates the Influence of Situational Factors." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 19:143-161.

Frith, Hannah. 2009. "Sexual Scripts, Sexual Refusals, and Rape." Pp. 99-122 in *Rape: Challenging Contemporary Thinking*, edited by M. Horvath and J. Brown. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.

Gerger, Heike, Hanna Kley, Gerd Bohner, and Frank Siebler. 2007. "The Acceptance of Modern Myths About Sexual Aggression Scale: Development and Validation in German and English." *Aggressive Behavior* 33:422-440.

Gidycz, Christine A., Kimberly Hanson and Melissa J. Layman. 1995. "A Prospective Analysis of the Relationships Among Sexual Assault Experiences." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 19:5-29.

Gross, Alan M., Andrea Winslett, Miguel Roberts and Carol L. Gohm. 2006. "An Examination of Sexual Violence Against College Women." *Violence Against Women* 12:288-300.

Grubb, Amy Rose and Julie Harrower. 2008. "Understanding Attribution of Blame in
Cases of Rape: An Analysis of Participant Gender, Type of Rape and Perceived
Similarity to the Victim." *Journal of Sexual Aggression* 15:63-81.

Grubb, Amy Rose and Emily Turner. 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* 17:443-
452.

Hamby, Sherry L. and Mary P. Koss. 2003. "Shades of Gray: A Qualitative Study of
Terms Used in the Measurement of Sexual Victimization." *Psychology of Women
Quarterly* 27:243-255.

Harned, Melanie S. 2005. "Understanding Women's Labeling of Unwanted Sexual
Experiences With Dating Partners." *Violence Against Women* 11:374-413.

Harris, Kate Lockwood. 2011. "The Next Problem With No Name: The Politics and
Pragmatics of the Word *Rape*." *Women's Studies in Communication* 34:42-63.

Harrison, Lisa A., Dawn M. Howerton, Ashley M. Secarea, and Chau Q. Nguyen. 2008.
"Effects of Ingroup Bias and Gender Role Violations on Acquaintance Rape
Attributions." *Sex Roles* 713-725.

Hayes, Rebecca M., Rebecca L. Abbot, and Savannah Cook. 2016. "It's Her Fault:
Student Acceptance of Rape Myths on Two College Campuses." *Violence Against
Women* 1-16.

Hickman, Susan E. and Charlene L. Muehlenhard. 1997. "College Women's Fears and
Precautionary Behaviors Relating to Acquaintance Rape and Stranger Rape."
Psychology of Women Quarterly 21:527-547.

Hines, Denise A. 2007. "Predictors of Sexual Coercion Against Women and Men: A
Multilevel, Multinational Study of University Students." *Archives of Sexual
Behavior* 36:403-422.

Hockett, Jericho M., Donald A. Saucier, and Caitlyn Badke. 2016. "Rape Myths, Rape
Scripts, and Common Experiences of College Women: Differences in Perceptions
of Women Who Have Been Raped." *Violence Against Women* 22:307-323.

hooks, bell. 2000. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Cambridge, MA: South End
Press.

Hox, Joop J., Ita G. G. Kreft, and Piet L. J. Hermkens. 1991. "The Analysis of Factorial
Surveys." *Sociological Methods & Research* 19:493-510.

Humphrey, Carolyn Faye. 2001. *Acquaintance Rape: Exploring the Relationship Between Cognition and Behavioral-intentions Through the Development of Contemporary Measures of Attitudes*. Diss. University of Missouri-Columbia, 2001.

Jasso, Guillermina 2006. "Factorial Survey Methods for Studying Beliefs and Judgments." *Sociological Methods & Research* 34:334-421.

Johnson, Barbara E., Douglas L. Kuck and Patricia R. Schander. 1997. "Rape Myth Acceptance and Sociodemographic Characteristics: A Multidimensional Analysis." *Sex Roles* 36:693-707.

Johnson, Kim K. P. and MiYoung Lee. 2000. "Effects of Clothing and Behavior on Perceptions Concerning an Alleged Date Rape." *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal* 28:332-356.

Kahane, Leo H. 2008. *Regression Basics 2nd Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kahn, Arnold S., Jennifer Jackson, Christine Kully, Kelly Badger and Jessica Halvorsen. 2003. "Calling It Rape: Differences in Experiences of Women Who Do or Do Not Label Their Sexual Assault as Rape." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 27:233-242.

Kimmel, Michael S. (2008). *Guyland: The Perilous World Where Boys Become Men*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.

Klippenstine, Marc A., Regina A. Schuller, and Ann-Marie Wall. 2007. "Perceptions of Sexual Assault: The Expression of Gender Differences and the Impact of Target Alcohol Consumption." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 37:2620-2641.

Koss, Mary P., Antonia Abbey, Rebecca Campbell, Sarah Cook, Jeanette Norris, Maria Testa, Sarah Ullman, Carolyn West, and Jacquelyn White. 2007. "Revising the SES: A Collaborative Process to Improve Assessment of Sexual Aggression and Victimization." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 31:357-370.

Koss, Mary. P. and Christine J. Oros. 1982. "Sexual Experiences Survey: A Research Instrument Investigating Sexual Aggression and Victimization." *Journal of Consulting and ClinicalPsychology* 50:455-457.

Krahé, Barbara. 1988. "Victim and Observer Characteristics of Responsibility Attributions to Victims of Rape." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 18:50-58.

Krahé, Barbara. 1991. "Social Psychological Issues in the Study of Rape." *European Review of Social Psychology* 2:279-309.

Krahé, Barbara and Jennifer Temkin. 2009. "Addressing the Attitude Problem in Rape Trials: Some Proposals and Methodological Considerations." Pp. 301-321 in *Rape: Challenging Contemporary Thinking*, edited by M. Horvath and J. Brown. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.

Krahé, Barbara, Jennifer Temkin, and Steffen Bieneck. 2007. "Schema-Driven Information Processing in Judgments about Rape." *Applied Cognitive Psychology* 21:601-619.

Larsen, Knud S. and Ed Long. 1988. "Attitudes Towards Rape." *The Journal of Sex Research* 24:299-304.

Levine-MacCombie, Joyce and Mary P. Koss. 1986. "Acquaintance Rape: Effective Avoidance Strategies." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 10:311-320.

Littleton, Heather A. 2011. "Rape Myths and Beyond: A Commentary on Edwards and Colleagues (2011)." *Sex Roles* 65:792-797.

Littleton, Heather A. and Danny Axsom. 2003. "Rape and Seduction Scripts of University Students: Implications for Rape Attributions and Unacknowledged Rape". *Sex Roles* 49:465- 475.

Littleton, Heather A., Holly Tabernik, Erika J. Canales, and Tamika Backstrom. 2009. "Risky Situation or Harmless Fun? A Qualitative Examination of College Women's Bad Hook-Up and Rape Scripts." *Sex Roles* 60:793-804.

Loiselle, Marci and Wayne R. Fuqua. 2007. "Alcohol's Effects on Women's Risk Detection in a Date-Rape Vignette." *Journal of American College Health* 55:261-266.

Lonsway, Kimberly A. and Louise F. Fitzgerald. 1994. "Rape Myths." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 18:133-164.

Lonsway, Kimberly A. and Louse F. Fitzgerald. 1995. "Attitudinal Antecedents of Rape Myth Acceptance: A Theoretical and Empirical Reexamination." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 68:704-711.

Ludwick, Ruth, Marion E. Wright, Richard A. Zeller, Dawn W. Dowding, William Lauder, and Janice Winchell. 2004. "An Improved Methodology for Advancing Nursing Research: Factorial Surveys." *Advances in Nursing Science* 27:224-238.

Ludwick, Ruth and Richard A. Zeller. 2001. "The Factorial Survey: An Experimental Method to Replicate Real World Problems." *Nursing Research* 50:129-133.

Madriz, Esther. 1997. *Nothing Bad Happens To Good Girls*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Masters, N. Tatiana, Jeanette Norris, Susan A. Stoner and William H. George. 2006. "How Does It End? Women Project the Outcome of A Sexual Assault Scenario." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 30:291-302.

Maurer, Trent W. and David W. Robinson. 2008. "Effects of Attire, Alcohol, and Gender on Perceptions of Date Rape. *Sex Roles* 58:423-434.

May, Rollo. 1991. *The Cry for Myth*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

McPhail, Beverly A. 2015. "Feminist Framework Plus: Knitting Feminist Theories of Rape Etiology Into a Comprehensive Model." *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse* 1:1-16.

McMahon, Sarah. 2007. "Understanding Community-Specific Rape Myths." *Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work* 22:357-370.

McMahon, Sarah, and G. Lawrence Farmer. 2011. "An Updated Measure for Assessing Subtle Rape Myths." *Social Work Research* 35:71-81.

Mardorossian, Carine M. 2002. "Toward A New Feminist Theory of Rape." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 27:743-775.

Muehlenhard, Charlene L. and Leigh Ann Kimes. 1999. "The Social Construction of Violence: The Case of Sexual and Domestic Violence." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 3:234-245.

Nayak, Madhabika B., Christina A. Byrne, Mutsumi K. Martin and Anna George Abraham. 2003. "Attitudes Toward Violence Against Women: A Cross-Nation Study." *Sex Roles* 49:333-342.

O'Byrne, Rachel, Susan Hansen, and Mark Rapley. 2008. "'If a Girl Doesn't Say No…': Young Men, Rape and Claims of 'Insufficient Knowledge.'" *Journal of Community and Applied Social Phsychology* 18:168-193.

O'Toole, Richard, Stephen W. Webster, Anita W. O'Toole, and Betsy Lucal. 1999. "Teachers' Recognition and Reporting of Child Abuse: A Factorial Survey." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 23:1083-1101.

Pain, Rachel L. 1997. "Social Geographies of Women's Fear of Crime." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 22:231-244.

Payne, Diana J, Kimberly L. Lonsway, and Louise F. Fitzgerald. 1999. "Rape Myth Acceptance: Exploration of Its Structure and Its Measurement Using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale." *Journal of Research in Personality* 33:27-68.

Peterson, Zoë D., and Charlene L. Muehlenhard. 2004. "Was It Rape? The Function of Women's Rape Myth Acceptance and Definitions of Sex in Labeling Their Own Experiences." *Sex Roles* 51:129-144.

Pineau, Lois 1989. "Date Rape: A Feminist Analysis." *Law and Philosophy* 8:217-243.

Potts, Lydia and Silke Wenk. 2002. "Gender Constructions and Violence: Ambivalences of Modernity in the Process of Globalization: Toward an Interdisciplinary and International Research Network." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28:459-461.

Rader, Nicole E., David C. May and Sarah Goodrum 2007. "An Empirical Assessment of the "Threat of Victimization:" Considering Fear of Crime, Perceived Risk, Avoidance, and Defensive Behaviors." *Sociological Spectrum* 27:475-505.

Robinson, Dianne T., Gina Gibson-Beverly and Jonathan P. Schwartz. 2004. "Sorority and Fraternity Membership and Religious Behaviors: Relation to Gender Attitudes." *Sex Roles* 50:871-877.

Rossi, Peter H. and Andy B. Anderson. 1982. *Measuring Social Judgments*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Ryan, Kathryn M. 2011. "The Relationship Between Rape Myths and Sexual Scripts: The Social Construction of Rape." *Sex Roles* 65:774-782.

Sainani, Kristen. 2010. "The Importance of Accounting for Correlated Observations." *The American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 2:858-861.

Schoenberg, Nancy E. and Hege Ravdal. 2000. "Using Vignettes in Awareness and Attitudinal Research." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 3:63-74.

Schwartz, Martin D. and Walter S. DeKeseredy. 1997. *Sexual Assault on the College Campus: The Role of Male Peer Support*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Shrout, Patrick E. and Joseph L. Fleiss. 1979. "Intra-class Correlations: Uses in Assessing Rater Reliability." *Psychological Bulletin* 86:420-428.

Sleed, Michelle, Kevin Durrheim, Anita Kriel, Vernon Solomon, and Veronica Baxter. 2002. "The Effectiveness of Vignette Methodology: A Comparison of Written and Video Vignettes in Eliciting Responses about Date Rape." *South African Journal of Psychology* 32:21-28.

Sims, Calvin M., Nora E. Noel, and Stephen A. Maisto. 2007. "Rape Blame as a Function of Alcohol Presence and Resistance Type." *Addictive Behaviors* 32:2766-2775.

Smith, Rachel M., Dominic J. Parrott, Kevin M. Swartout, and Andra Teten Tharp. 2015. "Deconstructing Hegemonic Masculinity: The Roles of Antifeminity, Subordination to Women, and Sexual Dominance in Men's Perpetration of Sexual Aggression." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 16:160-169.

Stormo, Karla J., Alan R. Lang, and Werner G. K. Stritzke. 1997. "Attributions About Acquaintance Rape: The Role of Alcohol and Individual Differences." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 27:279-305.

Suarez, Eliana and Tahany M. Gadalla. 2010. "Stop Blaming the Victim: A Meta-Analysis on Rape Myths." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 25:2010-2035.

Tamborra, Tracy L., Leila B. Dutton, and Karen J. Terry. 2014. "Verbally Coerced Sex: Does She Have to Say 'No'." *International Review of Victimology* 20:227-241.

Taylor, Brian. 2006. "Factorial Surveys: Using Vignettes to Study Professional Judgment." *British Journal of Social Work* 36:1187-1207.

Tjaden, Patricia and Nancy Thoennes. 2006. "Extent, Nature, and Consequences of Rape Victimization: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey." *U.S. Department of Justice: Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.*

Vandiver, Donna M. and Jessica Rager Dupalo. 2012. "Factors that Affect College Students' Perceptions of Rape: What is the Role of Gender and Other Situational Factors?" *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 57:592-612.

Vélez-Blasini, Carlos J. and Heather J. Brandt. 2000. "Expectancies, Setting, Age, and Beverage Choice as Predictors of Sexual Behaviors in Hypothetical Dating Situations." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 30:1954-1976.

Velicer, Wayne F., Lorraine H. Huckel, and Catherine E. Hansen.1989. "A Measurement Model for Measuring Attitudes Toward Violence." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 15:349-364.

Wallander, Lisa. 2009. Twenty-five Years of Factorial Surveys in Sociology: A Review. *Social Science Research* 38: 505-520.

Walsh, Joan. F., Brenda M. DeVellis, and Robert F. DeVellis. 1997. "Date and Acquaintance Rape: Development and Validation of a Set of Scales." *Violence Against Women* 3:46-58.

Walters, Mikel L., Jieru Chen, and Matthew J. Breiding. 2013. "The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Findings on Victimization by Sexual Orientation." *Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.*

Ward, Colleen. 1988. "The Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale: Construction, Validation, and Cross-Cultural Applicability." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 12:127-146.

Ward, Rose Marie, Molly R. Matthews, Judith Weiner, Kathryn M. Hogan, and Halle C. Popson. 2012. "Alcohol and Sexual Consent Scale." *American Journal of Health Behavior* 36:746-756.

APPENDIX A: RAPE MYTH INSTRUMENTS

Scale	Sample	Scale Characteristics	Sample Statements	Reliability
ATR (1978)	police officers (n=254), rapists (n=20), community citizens (n=1056), rape crisis counselors (n=118)	32 statements that reflect societal attitudes towards rape. 6-point response scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree) Eight factors emerged in the scale: Woman's Responsibility for Rape Prevention; Sex as a Motivation; Severe Punishment; Victim Precipitation; Normality of Rapists; Power as Motivation; Favorable Perception of Woman after Rape; and Resistance as Woman's Role during Rape.	1. If a woman is going to be raped, she might as well relax and enjoy it. 2. A raped woman is a responsible victim, not an innocent one. 3. In most cases when a woman is raped, she was asking for it.	.62
RMA (1980)	598 adults	7-point response set ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree* with additional items rated from *always, frequently, sometimes, rarely, never* 19-item rape myth acceptance scale	1. When women go around braless or wearing short skirts and tight tops, they are just asking for trouble. 2. If a woman gets drunk at a party and has intercourse with a man she's just met there, she should be considered 'fair game' to other males at the party who want to have sex with her too, whether she wants to or not.	.88

Scale	Sample	Scale Characteristics	Sample Statements	Reliability
RES (1982)	Study 2: Both students and jurors (jurors n=186 and students n=190)	7-point scale ranging from 1 (strong empathy for the rapist) to 7 (strong empathy for the rape victim) The response scale also includes a neutral point expressing empathy for both The scale consists of 19 paired statements Designed to assess empathy for the rape victim or defendant in mock jurors' decision in sentencing in rape trials. The follow-up scale was designed to assess rape empathy on victim's physical attractiveness and resistance.	1. When a woman dresses in a sexually attractive way, she must be willing to accept the consequences of her behavior, whatever they are, since she is signaling her interest in having sexual relations. 2. A woman has the right to dress in a sexually attractive way whether she is really interested in having sexual relations or not. 3. If a man rapes a sexually active woman, his actions would not be justified by the fact that she chooses to have sexual relations with other men.	.84-.89
GATR (1988)	356 college students	The scale contains 22 (10 positive and 12 negative) statements. 5 Point Likert Scale	1. Some women at least secretly want to be raped. 2. Women who say no to sexual advances often mean yes.	.92

Scale	Sample	Scale Characteristics	Sample Statements	Reliability
ARVS (1988)	(US Study) 572 college students	The scale contains 25 items 5-point scale ranging from 0 to 4 (disagree strongly, disagree mildly, neutral, agree mildly, agree strongly)	1. Sexually experienced women are not really damaged by rape. 2. A woman who goes out alone at night puts herself in a position to be raped. 3. Intoxicated women are usually willing to have sex.	.86
RMS (1995)	Core sample: 176 college students (84 men and 92 women)	The scale examines rape myth measures, acceptance of interpersonal violence and adversarial sexual beliefs (women are manipulative) as well as various aspects of the rape myth construct. The scale includes 19 rape myth items, 10 Hostility Towards Women (Check, Malamuth, Elias, and Barton 1985) items; 20 items from the Attitudes Toward Violence Scale (Velicer, Huckel, and Hansen 1989); and 15 items from the Adversarial Heterosexual Beliefs Scale (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1995).	19 Rape Myth Items (only) 1. When women talk and act sexy, they are inviting rape. 2. When a woman is raped, she usually did something careless to put herself in that situation.	N/A

Scale	Sample	Scale Characteristics	Sample Statements	Reliability
DAR (1997)	374 college women	The instrument contains five constructs that were theoretically derived: *Perceived Vulnerability* (the degree to which women believe they are personally at risk for date and acquaintance rape) *Self-Efficacy* (the level of confidence a woman has in herself to prevent rape); *Relational Priority* (degree to which a woman will neglect her own personal needs to maintain a relationship) *Rape Myth Acceptance* (Burt) (degree to which a woman subscribes to false cultural ideologies about rape and rape victims) * The rape myth acceptance scale has five items under the construct *Victim Blame.* *Commitment to Self-Defense* (degree to which a woman is committed to protecting herself) 6-point response scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree	Victim-Blaming (Rape Myth Acceptance) 1. Women who get drunk at a party or on a date deserves whatever happens to them. 2. (R) It is never a woman's fault if she is raped. 3. It's up to a woman to make sure she doesn't get a man aroused if she doesn't want him to force her to have intercourse. 4. Women often accuse men of rape because they are angry with the men for some other reason. 5. Most of what is labeled rape is just the woman changing her mind afterwards.	Rape Myth Acceptance .63

Scale	Sample	Scale Characteristics	Sample Statements	Reliability
IRMA (1999)	604 college students	The instrument contains 45 items including filler items The IRMA is intended to measure rape myth acceptance under a general rape myth construct with seven subscales: She asked for it; It wasn't really rape; He didn't mean to; She wanted it; She lied; Rape is a trivial event; and Rape is a deviant event. A short form (IRMA-SF) was designed to address only the general rape myth construct and not any of the seven rape myth components. The short form consists of 20 items including four items from the subscales, She asked for it; three items from Rape is a deviant event; two items each from the subscales: It wasn't really rape; He didn't mean to; She wanted it; She lied; and Rape is a trivial event and three negatively worded filler items.	1. If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control. 2. If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say it was rape. 3. If the rapist doesn't have a weapon, you can't really call it rape.	.93

Scale	Sample	Scale Characteristics	Sample Statements	Reliability
Updated IRMA (2011)	951 First year undergrad u-ate students	Utilizes four subscales from the original IRMA: She asked for it; It wasn't really rape; He didn't mean to and She lied. Phrases adjusted to include relevant terms and alcohol contexts "He didn't mean to do it" actually includes two factors: one on excusing the male perpetrator and the second focusing on the role of intoxication.	Changed language in several items to capture more subtle rape myths: 1. "A woman who dresses in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tries to force her to have sex" Changed to…. "If a girl initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a guy assumes she wants to have sex" 2. "A lot of women lead a guy on and then cry rape" Changed to… "A lot of girls lead a guy on and then have regrets" Added 4 items that capture more subtle rape myths by including specific alcohol statements.	
SIARA (2005)	1,782 first year college students	33 items to capture the dimensions of Sexual Expectations and Rape Myth endorsement. **The instrument includes some of the problems of previous rape myth scales by focusing on acquaintance rape and contexts involving alcohol.	1. When rape happens on a date, it is usually because the woman sends mixed messages to the man about what she wants sexually. 2. When an unattractive woman is raped, it can be assumed that she did more to provoke it than an attractive woman would.	.87

APPENDIX A: RAPE MYTH INSTRUMENTS CONTINUED

Scale	Sample	Scale Characteristics	Sample Statements	Reliability
AMMSA (2007)	848 university students (285 German version and 563 English version). Specific to study 4: internet sample (specific to victim blame)	The instrument was developed to include more modern (and subtle) myths about rape and contexts involving alcohol. Thirty of the original items were translated into English. The measure contains five constructs: *Denial of the scope of the problem*; *Antagonism toward victims' demands*; *Lack of support for the policies designed to help alleviate the effects of sexual violence*; *Beliefs that male coercion forms a natural part of sexual relationships*; and *Beliefs that exonerate male perpetrators by blaming the victim or the circumstances* (e.g. alcohol). **Responses are measured on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 7 (totally agree).	1. Alcohol is often the culprit when a man rapes a woman. 2. When a man urges his female partner to have sex, this cannot be called rape. 3. Any woman who is careless enough to walk through "dark alleys" at night is partly to blame if she is raped. 4. When a woman starts a relationship with a man, she must be aware that the man will assert his right to have sex.	.92

Scale	Sample	Scale Characteristics	Sample Statements	Reliability
RABS (2007)	368 undergraduate men (less reliable for n= 359 women)	50 items final version of RABS 8 domains: 1. Denial that acquaintance rape is real and causes trauma to the rape victim (*Not Rape*) 2. Women's behavior or appearance is the cause of rape (*Women Cause*) 3. Problematic attitudes and beliefs about mixing alcohol use and sexual activity (*Alcohol*) 4. Problematic attitudes and beliefs about the male sex role (*Sex Role*) 5. Dislike of the feminine and the intermingling of sex and violence (*Misogyny*) 6. Acceptance of traditional male and female gender roles (*Gender Role*) 7. Acceptance of sexual coercion as a legitimate means to acquire sex (*Coercion*) 8. Misinterpretation of women's sexual intent (*Misinterpretation*)	1. If a man and woman are engaged in consensual sexual activity, but the woman says she does not want to have intercourse, it is okay for the man to ignore this and go ahead, especially if he uses a condom. 2. In many cases, if a woman is raped by an acquaintance, she has to take some responsibility for what happened to her. 3. If a woman willingly gets drunk, then she is raped—she is more responsible for what happened to her than if she decided not to drink. 4. Certain women are more likely to be raped because of their flirting, teasing, or promiscuous behavior. 5. It is an unspoken rule that if a woman willingly goes with a man to some private or secluded place (such as the man's room), that she intends to have sex with him.	.93

APPENDIX B: CONCEPTUAL MODEL FRAMEWORK: CREATING SITUATIONAL AMBIGUITY

SAMPLE AMBIGUOUS RAPE MYTH VIGNETTE

Before the beginning of the school year, a young woman goes to a party with a few acquaintances to start off the new semester. When she arrives, there are a lot of people there. A little while later, she sees [**an acquaintance[21]**]. They talk for a bit, but then, she leaves to go to the bathroom. When she opens the bathroom door, [**he walks in[22]**], [**she initiates by kissing him him[23]**]. [**He is tipsy[24]**]. [**She is drunk**]. [**They have had a previous sexual relationship[25]**]. [**She is dressed provocatively[26]**]. They continue kissing and it starts to go further. He starts touching her breasts and they keep kissing. Afterwards, he starts lifting up her skirt and moves her underwear. [**She verbally protests[27]**]. He says, "it's okay." [**He puts his finger in her vagina[28]**]. [**She doesn't physically resist[29]**]. He does it for a little while longer until they are interrupted; she quickly fixes her clothing and goes back downstairs to the party,

---

[21] Relationship between victim and perpetrator is represented by variations in with a "known" perpetrator.

[22] Whether or they are alone is based on the Updated IRMA—also referring to women's responsibility to constantly navigate "safe" social situations.

[23] Whether or not she initiates sexual activity is relevant to her culpability in the situation (derived from the Updated IRMA as well as "Sex Scripts"—women are the gatekeepers of their sexuality) and "consent" (is she signaling sexual interest). *The vignette continues to describe the progression of a sexual encounter in which she is okay with sexual touching, but not penetration*

[24] Drunkenness is manipulated on several gradations of being "drunk"—this variable captures the "realism" as most sexual encounters do occur in the presence of alcohol (also in the Updated IRMA).

[25] Whether or not a previous sexual relationship is present reflects issues with "Consent" and whether a woman can refuse sex if they have had a previous sexual relationship (also in Updated IRMA). This also addresses the "Cultural Rape Script" in which the perpetrator should be a stranger.

[26] Whether or not the woman is dressed provocatively (revealing clothing) is often equated with her culpability in a rape setting. Also in the Updated IRMA.

[27] If women do not verbally resist (such as saying no)—the situation is often perceived as less traumatizing. Also in the Updated IRMA. This also ties into issues regarding consent.

[28] Sexual Scripts are often conceptualized around heterosexual (penile-vaginal) intercourse. Digital-vaginal penetration is often viewed as less traumatizing. The term "rape" is not present and the specific behavior is described.

[29] If women do not physically resist—the situation is often perceived as less traumatizing. Also in the Updated IRMA.

APPENDIX C: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Sexual Relationships and Dating among College Students

Thank you for participating in this study. Please fill out this brief survey that will tell us something about you. You will not be identified in any way, and please do not write your name on this sheet.

Sex: Which of the following best describes your sex?
○ Male
○ Female
○ Other (please specify):_____

Age: Which of the following best describes your age?
○ 18-19
○ 20-21
○ 22-23
○ 24-25
○ Other (please specify):_____

Education: Which of the following best describes your current level of education?
○ First year
○ Second year
○ Third year
○ Fourth year
○ Other (please specify): _____

Race/ Ethnicity: Are you:
○ White, non-Latino
○ Latino or Hispanic
○ African American
○ Native American
○ Asian or Pacific Islander
○ Other (please specify): _____

Relationships:
Have you ever been in an intimate relationship?
○ Yes
○ No

Are you currently in an intimate relationship?
○ Yes
○ No

Sexual Orientation: How would you categorize your sexual preference?
○ Heterosexual
○ Homosexual
○ Bisexual
○ Queer or Questioning

Sexual History:
Have you ever had sexual intercourse?
○ Yes
○ No
Are you currently sexually active?
○ Yes
○ No

Major: What is your current major?
○ ——————————————
○ ——————————————
○ Undecided

Residence: Do you currently live on or off-campus?
○ On-campus
○ Off-campus

Athletics:
Are you currently involved in college sports?
○ Yes
○ No
If yes, What sport(s) do you play? Please check all that apply.
○ Football
○ Tennis
○ Baseball
○ Basketball
○ Track
○ Swimming
○ Other (please specify): _____

Greek Life: Are you currently associated with a fraternity or sorority?
○ Yes
○ No

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>PLEASE CONTINUE TO THE NEXT SECTION>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

Instructions:
Please read the following vignette and indicate your level of agreement by circling how much you agree or disagree with the statement based on the following scenario.

Before the beginning of the school year, a young woman goes to a party with a few acquaintances to start off the new semester. When she arrives, there are a lot of people there. A little while later, she sees her boyfriend. They talk for a bit, but then, she leaves to go to the bathroom. When she opens the bathroom door, he walks in, she initiates by kissing him. He is tipsy. She is drunk. They have not had a previous sexual relationship. She is dressed provocatively. They continue kissing and it starts to go further. He starts touching her breasts and they keep kissing. Afterwards, he starts lifting up her skirt and moves her underwear. She verbally protests. He says, "it's okay." He puts his penis in her vagina. She doesn't physically resist. He does it for a little while longer until they are interrupted; she quickly fixes her clothing and goes back downstairs to the party.

Strongly Disagree/Somewhat Disagree/Neutral/Somewhat Agree/Strongly Agree

1.   In this scenario she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.

2.   In this case she should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.

3.   If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.

4.   In this scenario she is asking for trouble.

5.   In this scenario, he got too sexually carried away.

6.   In this situation he unintentionally pushed himself on her.

7.   In this situation he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.

8.   In this case she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.

9.   In this situation, she can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.

10.   She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.

11.   In this situation she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>PLEASE CONTINUE TO THE NEXT SECTION>>>>>>>>>

Instructions:
Please read the following vignette and indicate your level of agreement by circling how much you agree or disagree with the statement based on the following scenario.

Before the beginning of the school year, a young woman goes to a party with a few acquaintances to start off the new semester. When she arrives, there are a lot of people there. A little while later, she sees an acquaintance. They talk for a bit, but then, she leaves to go to the bathroom. When she opens the bathroom door, he walks in, she initiates by kissing him. He is drunk. She is tipsy. They have had a previous sexual relationship. She is not dressed provocatively. They continue kissing and it starts to go further. He starts touching her breasts and they keep kissing. Afterwards, he starts lifting up her skirt and moves her underwear. She verbally protests. He says, "it's okay." He puts his finger in her vagina. She physically resists. He does it for a little while longer until they are interrupted; she quickly fixes her clothing and goes back downstairs to the party.

Strongly Disagree/Somewhat Disagree/Neutral/Somewhat Agree/Strongly Agree

1.   In this scenario she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.

2.   In this case she should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.

3.   If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.

4.   In this scenario she is asking for trouble.

5.   In this scenario, he got too sexually carried away.

6.   In this situation he unintentionally pushed himself on her.

7.   In this situation he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.

8.   In this case she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.

9.   In this situation, she can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.

10.   She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.

11.   In this situation she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>PLEASE CONTINUE TO THE NEXT SECTION>>>>>>>>>

Instructions:

Please read the following vignette and indicate your level of agreement by circling how much you agree or disagree with the statement based on the following scenario.

Before the beginning of the school year, a young woman goes to a party with a few acquaintances to start off the new semester. When she arrives, there are a lot of people there. A little while later, she sees an acquaintance. They talk for a bit, but then, she leaves to go to the bathroom. When she opens the bathroom door, she walks out, he initiates by kissing her. He is tipsy. She is sober drunk. They have had a previous sexual relationship. She is dressed provocatively. They continue kissing and it starts to go further. He starts touching her breasts and they keep kissing. Afterwards, he starts lifting up her skirt and moves her underwear. She verbally protests. He says, "it's okay." He puts his finger in her vagina. She doesn't physically resist. He does it for a little while longer until they are interrupted; she quickly fixes her clothing and goes back downstairs to the party.

Strongly Disagree/Somewhat Disagree/Neutral/Somewhat Agree/Strongly Agree

1.   In this scenario she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.

2.   In this case she should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.

3.   If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.

4.   In this scenario she is asking for trouble.

5.   In this scenario, he got too sexually carried away.

6.   In this situation he unintentionally pushed himself on her.

7.   In this situation he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.

8.   In this case she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.

9.   In this situation, she can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.

10.   She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.

11.   In this situation she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.

>>>>>>>>>>>>PLEASE CONTINUE TO THE NEXT SECTION>>>>>>>>>

Thank you for your participation!

APPENDIX D: ITEM-TO-ITEM COMPARISON OF UPDATED IRMA AND AARMS

Updated IRMA	Ambiguous Acquaintance Rape Myth Scale	Contextual Variables in the Vignettes
Subscale: She Asked for It		
If a girl is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.	In this scenario she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.	**INITIATE** (vic/perp initiate kissing)- 2 levels 　1 He initiates by kissing her 　2 She initiates by kissing him
If a girl goes to a room alone with a guy at a party, it is her own fault if she is raped.		**ALONE** (victim and perpetrator alone)-2 levels 　1 They are not alone 　2 They are alone
If a girl acts like a slut, eventually she is going to get into trouble.		**ALC VIC** (victim intoxication level)-3 levels 　1 She is sober
If a girl initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a guy assumes she wants to have sex.	In this case she should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.	2 She is tipsy 　3 She is drunk
When girls are raped, it's often because the way they said "no" was unclear.	If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.	**VIC DRESS** (victim clothing)-2 levels 　1 She is not dressed provocatively 　2 She is dressed provocatively
When girls go to parties wearing slutty clothes, they are asking for trouble.	In this scenario she is asking for trouble.	

Updated IRMA	Ambiguous Acquaintance Rape Myth Scale	Contextual Variables in the Vignettes
Subscale: He Didn't Mean To		

Guys don't usually intend to force sex on a girl, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.	In this scenario, he got too sexually carried away.	**ALC PERP** (perpetrator intoxication level)-3 levels
		  1 He is sober
		  2 He is tipsy
		  3 He is drunk

Rape happens when a guy's sex drive gets out of control.		
When guys rape, it is usually because of their strong desire for sex.		
If a guy is drunk, he might rape someone unintentionally.	In this situation he unintentionally pushed himself on her.	
It shouldn't be considered rape if they guy was drunk and didn't realize what he was doing.	In this situation, he didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.	
If both people are drunk, it can't be rape.	N/A	

Updated IRMA	Ambiguous Acquaintance Rape Myth Scale	Contextual Variables in the Vignettes
Subscale: It Wasn't Really Rape		

If a girl doesn't say "no" she can't claim rape.	In this case she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.	**REL PERP** (relationship to perpetrator)-3 levels
		  1 Acquaintance
		  2 Friend
		  3 Boyfriend

If a girl doesn't physically resist sex—even protesting verbally—it can't be considered rape.		
If a girl doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say it was rape.		**PRSEX PERP** (victim previous sexual relationship with perpetrator)-2 levels
A rape probably did not happen if the girl has no bruises or marks.	N/A	1 They have not had a previous sexual relationship

If the accused "rapist" doesn't have a weapon, you really can't call it rape.	N/A	2 They have had a previous sexual relationship
		PEN TYPE (penetration type)-2 levels
		  1 He puts his penis in her vagina
		  2 He puts his finger in her vagina
		VNONC BEH (victim non-consent behavioral)-2 levels
		  1 she physically resists
		  2 she doesn't physically resist
		VNONC VERB (victim non-consent verbal) -2 levels
		  1 She verbally protests
		  2 She doesn't verbally protest

APPENDIX D: ITEM-TO-ITEM COMPARISON OF UPDATED IRMA AND AARMS CONT.

Updated IRMA	**Ambiguous Acquaintance Rape Myth Scale**	**Contextual Variables in the Vignettes**
Subscale: She Lied		
A lot of times, girls who say they were raped agreed to have sex and then regret it.	In this situation she can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.	
A lot of times, girls who say they were raped often led the guy on and then had regrets.	She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.	
Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at guys.	In this situation she might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.	
A lot of times, girls who claim they were raped have emotional problems.	N/A	
Girls who are caught cheating on their boyfriends sometimes claim it was rape.	N/A	

APPENDIX E: SEQUENTIAL MODEL FITTING

In this section, I will discuss the method used for data reduction of the contextual and socio-demographic variables. Mixed regression models were used to determine the factors most relevant to the decision under analysis. The dependent variables were tested using mixed regression models (Allison 1999; Hox et al. 1991; Kahane 2008; Ludwick et al. 2004; O'Toole et al. 1999; Rossi and Anderson 1982; Taylor 2006; Wallander 2009) to account for correlated observations (Sainani 2010). Sequential model fitting was conducted on all contextual variables to determine which factors would be included in the final models for statistical analysis. Sequential model fitting began with the initial model including all contextual variables. In order to perform sequential modeling on all of the contextual variables, each significant variable was included in the model (phase 1). After each significant variable was included in the model, subsequent variables were added based on the size of the coefficients to determine if they became significant and would be used for the final model. The same method was used to determine which socio-demographic variables would be included in the final model. Initially, only the significant variables were included and subsequent variables were added to determine if they became significant to simplify the final models used for analysis and interpretation. The first and final models are listed below and organized by subscale.

SHE ASKED FOR IT: CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES: PHASE ONE

Rape Myth Items Regressed on the Contextual Variables Manipulated in the Vignettes				
Rape Myth Subscale: She Asked for It				
Contextual Variables (Reference Group)	If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.	She should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.	She is asking for trouble.	She is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.
She is Drunk (She is Sober)	-.0270	-.2275*	.0804	-.2185**
She is Tipsy (She is Sober)	-.0280	-.1181	.1299	-.2082*
He is Drunk (He is Sober)	-.0442	-.0448	.0896	-.0184
He is tipsy (He is Sober)	-.0018	.0260	.1229	.0483
Boyfriend (Acquaintance)	.0485	.0571	.1201	-.0817
Friend (Acquaintance)	-.0430	-.0682	.0411	-.0892
She Initiates (He Initiates)	.0601	.1903**	.2122**	.2049**
She Does Not Physically Resist (She Does Physically Resist)	.4800**	.5696**	.2207**	.5346**
She is Dressed Provocatively (She is not Dressed Provocatively)	.0318	.1075	.2122**	.1769**
Digital Penetration (Penile Penetration)	.0051	.0315	.0487	.0686
Alone (Not Alone)	.0900	.0314	-.0346	.0580
She Does Not Verbally Protest (She Does Verbally Protest)	.6425**	.6101**	.3260**	.6003**
Previous Sexual Relationship (No Previous Sexual Relationship)	-.0519	.1380	-.0368	-.0214
*p<.05, **p<.01				

Sequential Model Fitting: Mixed Effect Modeling of Rape Myth Items Regressed on Contextual Variables: Final Models for Analyses				
Rape Myth Subscale: She Asked for It				
Contextual Variables (Reference Group)	If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.	She should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.	She is asking for trouble.	She is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.
She is Drunk (She is Sober)		-.1517*		-.2091**
She is Tipsy (She is Sober)				-.2087*
He is Drunk (He is Sober)				
He is tipsy (He is Sober)				
Boyfriend (Acquaintance)				
Friend (Acquaintance)				
She Initiates (He Initiates)		.1760*	.2069**	.1988**
She Does Not Physically Resist (She Does Physically Resist)	.4669**	.5660**	.2234**	.5409**
She is Dressed Provocatively (She is not Dressed provocatively)			.2055**	.1755**
Digital Penetration (Penile Penetration)				
Alone (Not Alone)				
She Does Not Verbally Protest (She Does Verbally Protest)	.6490**	.6259**	.3245**	.5884**
Previous Sexual Relationship (No Previous Sexual Relationship)				
*p<.05, **p<.01				

Mixed Effect Model: Rape Myth Items Regressed on the Contextual Variables Manipulated in the Vignettes			
Rape Myth Subscale: He Didn't Mean To			
Contextual Variables (Reference Group)	He didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.	He got too sexually carried away.	He unintentionally pushed himself on her.
She is Drunk (She is Sober)	-.0443	.2349**	.0516
She is Tipsy (She is Sober)	-.0333	.0752	.0372
He is Drunk (He is Sober)	.3204**	-.1031	.2685**
He is tipsy (He is Sober)	.2920**	-.1486	.2136**
Boyfriend (Acquaintance)	.0711	-.0520	.0022
Friend (Acquaintance)	.0442	-.0523	-.0305
She Initiates (He Initiates)	.1148	-.1131	-.0092
She Does Not Physically Resist (She Does Physically Resist)	.2104**	-.3430**	-.0299
She is Dressed Provocatively (She is not Dressed Provocatively)	.0179	.0276	.0749
Digital Penetration (Penile Penetration)	.0285	-.0538	-.0742
Alone (Not Alone)	-.0126	-.0570	.0008
She Does Not Verbally Protest (She Does Verbally Protest)	.2981**	-.4435**	.1517*
Previous Sexual Relationship (No Previous Sexual Relationship)	-.0118	-.0117	.0197
*p<.05, **p<.01			

Sequential Model Fitting: Mixed Effect Modeling of Rape Myth Items Regressed on Contextual Variables: Final Models for Analyses			
Rape Myth Subscale: He Didn't Mean To			
Contextual Variables (Reference Group)	He didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.	He got too sexually carried away.	He unintentionally pushed himself on her.
She is Drunk (She is Sober)		.2349*	
She is Tipsy (She is Sober)			
He is Drunk (He is Sober)	.3267**		.2607**
He is tipsy (He is Sober)	.2972**		.2066**
Boyfriend (Acquaintance)			
Friend (Acquaintance)			
She Initiates (He Initiates)	.1163*		
She Does Not Physically Resist (She Does Physically Resist)	.2031**	-.3430**	
She is Dressed Provocatively (She is not Dressed Provocatively)			
Digital Penetration (Penile Penetration)			
Alone (Not Alone)			
She Does Not Verbally Protest (She Does Verbally Protest)	.3067**	-.4435**	.1452*
Previous Sexual Relationship (No Previous Sexual Relationship)			
*p<.05, **p<.01			

Mixed Effect Model: Rape Myth Items Regressed on the Contextual Variables Manipulated in the Vignettes	
It Wasn't Really Rape	
Contextual Variables (Reference Group)	In this case, she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.
She is Drunk (She is Sober)	-.1486
She is Tipsy (She is Sober)	-.2142**
He is Drunk (He is Sober)	-.0643
He is tipsy (He is Sober)	-.0386
Boyfriend (Acquaintance)	.1471
Friend (Acquaintance)	.1196
She Initiates (He Initiates)	.1683**
She Does Not Physically Resist (She Does Physically Resist)	.6052**
She is Dressed Provocatively (She is not Dressed Provocatively)	.0533
Digital Penetration (Penile Penetration)	.1039
Alone (Not Alone)	.0206
She Does Not Verbally Protest (She Does Verbally Protest)	.6148**
Previous Sexual Relationship (No Previous Sexual Relationship)	-.0834
*p<.05, **p<.01	

Sequential Model Fitting: Mixed Effect Modeling of Rape Myth Items Regressed on Contextual Variables:	
Rape Myth Subscale: It Wasn't Really Rape	
Contextual Variables (Reference Group)	In this case, she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.
She is Drunk (She is Sober)	-.1616*
She is Tipsy (She is Sober)	-.2019*
He is Drunk (He is Sober)	
He is tipsy (He is Sober)	
Boyfriend (Acquaintance)	
Friend (Acquaintance)	
She Initiates (He Initiates)	.1703**
She Does Not Physically Resist (She Does Physically Resist)	.5844**
She is Dressed Provocatively (She is not Dressed Provocatively)	
Digital Penetration (Penile Penetration)	
Alone (Not Alone)	
She Does Not Verbally Protest (She Does Verbally Protest)	.6398**
Previous Sexual Relationship (No Previous Sexual Relationship)	
*p<.05, **p<.01	

Mixed Effect Model: Rape Myth Items Regressed on the Contextual Variables Manipulated in the Vignettes			
Rape Myth Subscale: She Lied			
Contextual Variables (Reference Group)	She might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.	She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.	She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.
She is Drunk (She is Sober)	.0223	-.1950**	-.0705
She is Tipsy (She is Sober)	-.1242	-.0750	.0114
He is Drunk (He is Sober)	.0229	-.0087	.0976
He is tipsy (He is Sober)	-.0438	-.0044	.0792
Boyfriend (Acquaintance)	.0302	.1194	.0654
Friend (Acquaintance)	.0332	.0755	-.0055
She Initiates (He Initiates)	-.0184	.1603**	.1922**
She Does Not Physically Resist (She Does Physically Resist)	-.0455	.4648**	.4255**
She is Dressed Provocatively (She is not Dressed Provocatively)	.0258	.0125	-.0817
Digital Penetration (Penile Penetration)	-.0274	.0476	.0609
Alone (Not Alone)	-.0841	.0545	.0531
She Does Not Verbally Protest (She Does Verbally Protest)	.0000	.5905**	.5155**
Previous Sexual Relationship (No Previous Sexual Relationship)	.0155	.0603	.0384
*p<.05, **p<.01			

Sequential Model Fitting: Mixed Effect Modeling of Rape Myth Items Regressed on Contextual Variables			
Rape Myth Subscale: She Lied			
Contextual Variables (Reference Group)	She might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.	She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.	She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.
She is Drunk (She is Sober)		-.1641**	
She is Tipsy (She is Sober)			
He is Drunk (He is Sober)			
He is tipsy (He is Sober)	-.1363*		
Boyfriend (Acquaintance)			
Friend (Acquaintance)			
She Initiates (He Initiates)		.1520**	.1823**
She Does Not Physically Resist (She Does Physically Resist)		.4621**	.4455**
She is Dressed Provocatively (She is not Dressed Provocatively)			
Digital Penetration (Penile Penetration)			
Alone (Not Alone)			
She Does Not Verbally Protest (She Does Verbally Protest)		.6172**	.5209**
Previous Sexual Relationship (No Previous Sexual Relationship)			
*p<.05, **p<.01			

Mixed Effect Model: Rape Myth Items Regressed on Demographic Variables				
Rape Myth Subscale: She Asked for It				
Demographic Variables (Reference Group)	If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.	She should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.	She is asking for trouble.	She is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.
Male (Female)	.0149	.2718*	.3280**	.2326
Black (White)	.1692	.0211	.4434*	.2212
Other Race Group (White)	.3043	.3546	.2631	.2340
Second Year (First Year)	-.2783*	-.1560	-.0407	-.1454
Third Year (First Year)	-.1323	-.2315	-.3099	-.2493
Fourth Year (First Year)	-.3217	-.2846	-.0994	-.2944
Heterosexual (Not Heterosexual)	-.3174	.1609	.3680	.3607
Affiliated with Greek Life (Not Affiliated)	-.0067	.1884	.1685	.0521
Respondent has Dated (Respondent has not Dated)	-.0348	-.1076	.0384	-.2045
Respondent has had Sexual Intercourse (Respondent has not had Sexual Intercourse)	.3409*	.5862**	.3899**	.3261*
*p<.05, **p<.01				

Sequential Model Fitting: Mixed Effect Modeling of Rape Myth Items Regressed on Demographic Variables: Final Models for Analyses				
Rape Myth Subscale: She Asked for It				
Demographic Variables (Reference Group)	If she claims non-consensual sex happened in this situation it was because she was unclear.	She should not be surprised if he assumes she wants to have sex.	She is asking for trouble.	She is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.

NS |
Male (Female)			.2733*	
Black (White)				
Other Race Group (White)				
Second Year (First Year)				
Third Year (First Year)				
Fourth Year (First Year)				
Heterosexual (Not Heterosexual)				
Affiliated with Greek Life (Not Affiliated)				
Respondent has Dated (Respondent has not Dated)				
Respondent has had Sexual Intercourse (Respondent has not had Sexual Intercourse)	.3045*	.5298**	.3754**	
*p<.05, **p<.01				

Mixed Effect Model: Rape Myth Items Regressed on Demographic Variables			
Rape Myth Subscale: He Didn't Mean To			
Demographic Variables (Reference Group)	He didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.	He got too sexually carried away.	He unintentionally pushed himself on her.
Male (Female)	.2781**	.1860	.1352
Black (White)	.2556	.0761	.1075
Other Race Group (White)	.2199	.1768	.0466
Second Year (First Year)	-.1676	.1135	-.3428**
Third Year (First Year)	-.1569	.2086	-.1019
Fourth Year (First Year)	-.2031	.4067	-.1803
Heterosexual (Not Heterosexual)	.1090	-.0274	.1186
Affiliated with Greek Life (Not Affiliated)	.1434	-.0474	-.0590
Respondent has Dated (Respondent has not Dated)	-.1992	.0099	-.0377
Respondent has had Sexual Intercourse (Respondent has not had Sexual Intercourse)	.3552**	-.0907	.2747*
*p<.05, **p<.01			

Sequential Model Fitting: Mixed Effect Modeling of Rape Myth Items Regressed on Demographic Variables: Final Models for Analyses			
Rape Myth Subscale: He Didn't Mean To			
Demographic Variables (Reference Group)	He didn't realize what he was doing so it shouldn't be considered non-consensual.	He got too sexually carried away.	He unintentionally pushed himself on her.
Male (Female)	.2152*	.2083*	
Black (White)			
Other Race Group (White)			
Second Year (First Year)			.2938**
Third Year (First Year)			
Fourth Year (First Year)			
Heterosexual (Not Heterosexual)			
Affiliated with Greek Life (Not Affiliated)			
Respondent has Dated (Respondent has not Dated)			
Respondent has had Sexual Intercourse (Respondent has not had Sexual Intercourse)	.2599**		.2598*
*p<.05, **p<.01			

Mixed Effect Model: Rape Myth Items Regressed on Demographic Variables	
Rape Myth Subscale: It Wasn't Really Rape	
Demographic Variables (Reference Group)	In this case, she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.
Male (Female)	.0576
Black (White)	.2775
Other Race Group (White)	.2721
Second Year (First Year)	-.0896
Third Year (First Year)	-.1930
Fourth Year (First Year)	-.3097
Heterosexual (Not Heterosexual)	-.1920
Affiliated with Greek Life (Not Affiliated)	.1184
Respondent has Dated (Respondent has not Dated)	-.1094
Respondent has had Sexual Intercourse (Respondent has not had Sexual Intercourse)	.5658**
*p<.05, **p<.01	

IT WASN'T REALLY RAPE: SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES: FINAL
MODEL

Sequential Model Fitting: Mixed Effect Modeling of Rape Myth Items Regressed on Demographic Variables: Final Models for Analyses	
Rape Myth Subscale: It Wasn't Really Rape	
Demographic Variables (Reference Group)	In this case, she wasn't clear so she can't claim non-consensual sex happened.
Male (Female)	
Black (White)	
Other Race Group (White)	
Second Year (First Year)	
Third Year (First Year)	
Fourth Year (First Year)	
Heterosexual (Not Heterosexual)	
Affiliated with Greek Life (Not Affiliated)	
Respondent has Dated (Respondent has not Dated)	
Respondent has had Sexual Intercourse (Respondent has not had Sexual Intercourse)	.4913**
*p<.05, **p<.01	

Mixed Effect Model: Rape Myth Items Regressed on Demographic Variables			
Rape Myth Subscale: She Lied			
Demographic Variables (Reference Group)	She might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.	She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.	She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.
Male (Female)	.3541**	.0562	.1125
Black (White)	.2061	.2409	.2572
Other Race Group (White)	.4348*	.2083	.5241*
Second Year (First Year)	.0343	-.2096	-.0880
Third Year (First Year)	-.2357	-.2340	-.2087
Fourth Year (First Year)	.1485	-.2496	-.1838
Heterosexual (Not Heterosexual)	-.0966	-.0099	-.0418
Affiliated with Greek Life (Not Affiliated)	.0291	.0787	.0769
Respondent has Dated (Respondent has not Dated)	-.0490	-.1854	-.1606
Respondent has had Sexual Intercourse (Respondent has not had Sexual Intercourse)	.1170	.5208**	.5318**
*p<.05, **p<.01			

Sequential Model Fitting: Mixed Effect Modeling of Rape Myth Items Regressed on Demographic Variables: Final Models for Analyses			
Rape Myth Subscale: She Lied			
Demographic Variables (Reference Group)	She might accuse him of non-consensual sex to get back at him.	She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she agreed to it.	She can't claim she experienced non-consensual sex because she led him on and then regretted it.
Male (Female)	.3476**		
Black (White)			
Other Race Group (White)	.4329*		.5142*
Second Year (First Year)			
Third Year (First Year)			
Fourth Year (First Year)			
Heterosexual (Not Heterosexual)			
Affiliated with Greek Life (Not Affiliated)			
Respondent has Dated (Respondent has not Dated)			
Respondent has had Sexual Intercourse (Respondent has not had Sexual Intercourse)		.4189**	.4702**
*p<.05, **p<.01			