

AN UMBRELLA OF DOMINANCE? AN EXAMINATION OF OPPRESSIVE BELIEFS IN  
THE CONTEXT OF RAPE

by

JERICHO M. HOCKETT

B.A., Kansas State University, 2007

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department Of Psychology  
College of Arts And Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

2009

Approved by:

Major Professor  
Donald A. Saucier

## **Abstract**

Research has demonstrated that negative perceptions of rape victims may vary based on characteristics such as the victims' race (e.g., Estrich, 1987; Wyatt, 1992). This study examined rape from feminist (e.g., Collins, 1991; hooks, 2003) and Social Dominance Theory (SDT; e.g., Pratto, 1996; Sidanius, 1993) perspectives to assess the relationship between individuals' social dominance orientation (SDO) and differences in their attitudes toward rape victims of differing races. After reading newspaper-style vignettes describing the rape of either a White or Black victim, participants ( $N = 83$ ) completed measures assessing their levels of rape myth acceptance (RMA), gender role beliefs, SDO, racism, and social desirability. Results indicated that participants' SDO scores significantly predicted their perceptions of the triviality of the rape. Specifically, when participants' SDO scores were higher, they perceived the rape as less trivial for White victims. However, participants higher in SDO did not perceive the rape of Black victims as being either more or less trivial. Consistent with previous research, this study also found that negative attitudes toward women significantly predicted overall negative perceptions of both the Black and White rape victims (e.g., Hockett, Saucier, Hoffman, Smith, & Craig, in press) and that individuals perceived the Black rape victims as less credible than the White rape victims (Wyatt, 1992). These results contribute to our understanding of the relationships among individuals' attitudes about power, race, and rape by offering support for feminist theories about the relationship between rape and power, as well as for SDT and feminist theories regarding the structure of dominance.

## Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
CHAPTER 1 - Introduction .....	1
Rape Victim Perception .....	3
Rape Victim Characteristics and Perceptions of Rape Victims.....	3
Feminist and Social Psychological Theoretical Models of Dominance .....	5
An Umbrella of Dominance? .....	7
CHAPTER 2 - Method.....	8
Participants.....	8
Materials .....	8
Rape Vignettes .....	9
Measure of Rape Myth Acceptance .....	9
Measure of Gender Role Beliefs.....	9
Dominance Measure .....	10
Racism Measures .....	11
Social Desirability Measure .....	11
Procedure .....	12
CHAPTER 3 - Results .....	13
Sex Differences, Relationships Among Measures, and Social Desirability Effects.....	13
Condition Effects .....	14
Analytic Strategy .....	14
Regression Models to Predict Perceptions of Rape Victims .....	15
Analytic Strategy .....	15
Overall VPS Composite .....	15
Victim Denigration .....	15
Victim Credibility .....	16
Victim Trivialization.....	16
Victim Blame .....	17

Victim Deservingness and Responsibility .....	18
CHAPTER 4 - Discussion .....	18
Conclusion .....	22
References.....	23
Appendix A - Rape Vignettes.....	30
Race Condition: White Victim .....	30
Race Condition: Black Victim.....	30
Appendix B - Demographic Questionnaire.....	31
Appendix C - Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS).....	32
Appendix D - Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) .....	34
Appendix E - Attitudes toward Women Scale-Short Form (AWS-S) .....	35
Appendix F - Male Role Norms Scale (MRNS).....	37
Status Norms.....	37
Toughness Norms .....	37
Anti-Femininity Norms.....	38
Appendix G - Social Dominance Orientation Scale (SDO).....	39
Appendix H - Attitudes Toward Blacks Scale (ATB) .....	40
Appendix I - Racial Argument-Conclusion Scale (RAS).....	42
Appendix J - Social Desirability Scale (SD).....	48
Appendix K - Victim Perceptions Scale (VPS) .....	50
Appendix L - Contact Information for Local and National Sexual Assault Services.....	51

## List of Tables

Table 1 Means and Standard Deviations for Males and Females on the Measures.....	53
Table 2 Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations among Predictive Measures.....	55
Table 3 Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations among Dependent Measures and Social Desirability.....	56
Table 4 Means and Standard Deviations by Condition on all Measures .....	57
Table 5 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Overall VPS Composite.....	59
Table 6 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Victim Denigration .....	62
Table 7 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Victim Credibility .....	65
Table 8 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Victim Trivialization.....	68
Table 9 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Victim Blame.....	71
Table 10 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Victim Deservingness .....	74
Table 11 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Victim Responsibility .....	77

## **Acknowledgements**

Foremost, I would like to thank my Major Professor Dr. Donald Saucier for his expert and enthusiastic mentorship and instruction throughout my undergraduate and graduate school careers. I would also like to thank the rest of my Masters committee—Dr. Angela Hubler and Dr. Brenda McDaniel—for their service and direction on this project. I would like to thank the “Saucier Lab” graduate students—Mark Chu, Jessica McManus, Sara Smith, Megan Strain, and Russ Webster—for their feedback and encouragement during the initial stages of this project. Finally, I would like to thank two “Saucier Lab” undergraduate students—Cathleen Klausing and Danielle Zanotti—for their invaluable help in finding and gathering sources, reading drafts, and providing feedback for this project.

## CHAPTER 1 - Introduction

*“The experience of oppressed people is that the living of one’s life is confined and shaped by forces and barriers which are not accidental or occasional and hence avoidable, but are systematically related to each other in such a way as to catch one between and among them and restrict or penalize motion in any direction.”*

--p. 50, Marilyn Frye, 2004

Competitive struggles between men and women are often described lightheartedly. However, feminist theory and social psychological research attest that power relations between men and women are much more complex than this carefree term suggests. Consider, for example, the topic of sexual violence by men against women. Research shows that approximately 2.8 percent of women on a typical college campus are raped in a normal six-month period (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000), and one-eighth (National Victim Center, 1992) to one-fourth (Fisher, Cullen & Turner, 2000) of adult women in America has been or will be forcibly raped in their lifetimes. Perhaps unsurprisingly, research also indicates that men are the most common sexual aggressors. For example, victimized college women reported in a recent survey that their boyfriends were the most common sexual aggressors, followed by male friends and acquaintances (Gross, Winslett, Roberts, & Gohm, 2006).

In addition to having a high incidence in the United States, rape also has a particularly negative impact on victimized individuals. For example, studies show that individuals who were raped were more likely to experience depression, anxiety, and traumatic symptoms than non-victims (Thompson & West, 1992), as well as other physical and psychological health problems (Goodman, Koss, & Russo, 1993), including persistent fear, anger, and humiliation (e.g., Burgess & Holmstrom, 1974).

Evidence suggests, however, that the trauma suffered by rape victims is not limited solely to the experience of the crime itself. It may, in fact, be prolonged after the crime by others’ reactions to the victims. Medical service employees, law enforcement officers, and even legal professionals (see Edwards & Macleod, 1999) may offer differential treatment (Campbell, 1998; Campbell et al., 1999) to rape victims that they do not perceive as “real victims.” That is, victims who do not fit the profile of non-intoxicated women who sustained apparent physical injuries and

clearly displayed emotional distress due to the crime (Maier, 2008) may receive negatively biased treatment. This may be evidenced by dismissal of criminal suits despite victims' wishes to pursue prosecution in the criminal justice system (Campbell, 1998) and by inadequate provision of medical services to rape victims (e.g., information about pregnancy testing and STD risks; Campbell & Bybee, 1997). Similarly, it appears that negative perceptions of rape victims may also be related to a poorer quality of support provided to the victim by the community in general (e.g., Burgess & Holmstrom, 1974). The term *revictimization* refers to this notion that rape victims may experience additional anxiety, alienation, and self-blame (Madigan & Gamble, 1991) following others' attributions of blame to the victims (Mazelan, 1980; Neville & Pugh, 1997).

Such negative perceptions of rape victims by legal and medical professionals as well as by other individuals may be influenced by a multitude of factors that are extraneous to the rape itself. For example, more negative perceptions of rape victims have been related to perceptions of the victims' pre-rape behaviors as "incautious" (for a narrative review, see Pollard, 1992), and to the victims' clothing as more revealing (Whatley, 1996). Other victim characteristics may also influence individuals' perceptions of and reactions to rape victims, such as the victims' race (Estrich, 1987; Foley, Evancic, Karnik, King, & Parks, 1995; LaFree, 1980; LaFree, Reskin, & Visher, 1985; Ugwuegbu, 1979; Willis, 1992; Wyatt, 1992) and sex (King & Woollett, 1997; Scarce, 1997; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992; Whatley & Riggio, 1993).

Therefore, the purpose of the present research is to consider rape not only as a context in which individuals' attitudes about sex and gender may influence perceptions of rape victims, but also as a context in which attitudes about power and race may influence perceptions of rape victims of different races as well. To do so, we will examine rape from a feminist theoretical perspective as a context in which power hierarchies based on race may be visible as elements of a potentially broader social power structure. More specifically, the current study will examine the relationships among individuals' racial attitudes, their beliefs about rape, their gender roles beliefs, their attitudes about general intergroup dominance, and their attributions of blame and responsibility to Black and White rape victims. The following sections will demonstrate the utility of this course of study by examining research on perceptions of rape and rape victims, as well as research suggesting that rape may allow individuals to justify the expression of negative attitudes toward rape victims based on victim characteristics such as race. Further, feminist and



psychological theoretical models of dominance will be explored as they relate to individuals' attitudes about race in a context of sexual violence.

### **Rape Victim Perception**

Much of the research on individuals' perceptions of rape victims in general has focused on "rape myths," which appear to be self-evident truths about rape that justify male sexual violence against women and minimize the seriousness of rape crimes (p. 78, Bohner & Lampridis, 2004; also see Burt, 1980; Bohner et al., 1998). For example, measures of individuals' belief in rape myths (referred to as rape myth acceptance, or RMA) assess support for statements such as "Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve," "Many women have an unconscious wish to be raped, and may then unconsciously set up a situation in which they are likely to be attacked," and "If a girl engages in necking or petting and she lets things get out of hand, it is her own fault if her partner forces sex on her" (p. 223, Burt, 1980; see also Brownmiller, 1975, and Ward, 1995; for a review, see Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994).

RMA, which appears to be a temporally stable attitude (e.g., Heppner, Humphrey, Hildenbrand-Gunn, & DeBord, 1995), not only propagates such stereotypic beliefs about rape and rape victims among both men and women (e.g., Burt, 1980), but research also shows that RMA is positively related to several negative outcomes. For example, higher levels of RMA predicts a higher self-reported likelihood to rape by men (e.g., Ceniti & Malamuth, 1984; Malamuth, 1989a, 1989b; Osland, Fitch, & Willis, 1996; Quackenbush, 1989) and is also positively related to the belief that relationships between men and women are inherently adversarial and to conservative political beliefs for both men and women (for a meta-analytic review, see Anderson, Cooper, & Okamura, 1997; Abbey & Harnish, 1995; Bohner & Lampridis, 2004; Lopez, George, & Davis, 2007; Monto & Hotaling, 2001). RMA is also related to victim blaming (e.g., Anderson, Cooper, & Okamura, 1997).

### **Rape Victim Characteristics and Perceptions of Rape Victims**

As previously noted, many characteristics pertaining to the victim—but not to the crime of rape itself—may influence individuals' perceptions of rape victims. Regarding acquaintance rape victims, for example, several studies suggest that individuals' perceptions of the extent to which such victims stray from the mythic "real victim" image are related to the extent to which

they blame the victims. One study (Cassidy & Hurrell, 1995) demonstrating this effect showed that less conservatively dressed victims were blamed more than victims whose dress was more conservative. Similar negative attitudes are found not only toward acquaintance rape victims, but also in varying degrees toward rape victims in general (e.g., Anderson et al., 1997; Pollard, 1992; Whatley, 1996).

Another characteristic that may attenuate the perceived severity of rape victims' experiences is perceptions of the victim's gender. Specifically, research shows that individuals who perceive rape victims as violating traditional gender roles have more negative perceptions of the victims, including greater victim blame (e.g., Abrams, Viki, Masser, & Bohner, 2003; Viki & Abrams, 2002). Similarly, individuals' own attitudes about gender roles are also related to their perceptions of rape victims: those who adhere to traditional gender roles have more negative perceptions of rape victims and greater victim blame (e.g., Howard, 1984a, 1984b; Simonson & Subich, 1999; Yamawaki & Tschanz, 2005).

Moreover, modern theories of racial prejudice also appear to suggest that the race of a rape victim and individuals' racial attitudes may similarly provide justification for negative attitudes toward minority race rape victims. More specifically, such theories contend that individuals may express their negative racial attitudes in situations in which it may be viewed as appropriate to react negatively to a minority racial group member, or in which individuals can otherwise justify (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003) or rationalize their behavior as non-prejudiced to themselves and others (e.g., Crosby, Bromley, & Saxe, 1980; Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Saucier, Miller, & Doucet, 2005). Some research has supported these theories by showing that individuals' perceptions of crime, perpetrators, and victims may be related to the victims' and perpetrators' races and to individuals' racial attitudes. For example, one study of over 2,000 homicide cases in Georgia showed that capital punishment sentences varied according to victim race, with Black defendants who killed White victims being much more likely to have received the death sentence than White defendants who killed Black victims (Baldus & Woodworth, 1998; Baldus, Woodworth, & Pulaski, 1990; United States General Accounting Office, 1990). A later study also showed this pattern of less severe sentencing for crimes against Blacks and more severe sentencing for crimes against Whites (Saucier, Hockett, & Wallenberg, 2008). Moreover, however, these authors also found this pattern to be associated with mock jurors' higher levels of racism.

Similarly, racial attitudes appear to influence perceptions of rape victims, with studies that appear to demonstrate a situation (i.e., rape) in which expression of negative racial attitudes regarding the victim may be perceived as justifiable due to the social acceptance of negative attitudes about rape victims in general. Specifically, Black rape victims may be perceived as less credible than White victims (Wyatt, 1992), if they are perceived as “real” rape victims at all (Estrich, 1987). Further, rape crimes involving Black victims are more likely to be perceived as “alright” (Foley, Evancic, Karnik, King, & Parks, 1995) and are also viewed as less serious (Foley et al., 1995; LaFree, 1980; LaFree, Reskin, & Visher, 1985; Ugwuegbu, 1979; Willis, 1992) than rape crimes involving White victims. Thus, in accordance with modern racial prejudice theories, it appears that rape may be a situation that allows for the justification of negative attitudes toward the victim, especially when the victim is a racial minority.

### **Feminist and Social Psychological Theoretical Models of Dominance**

Social power, such as may be demonstrated by individuals’ expression of negative attitudes toward rape victims based on race, sex, and sexual orientation, has traditionally been conceptualized as a force that is possessed and controlled by the privileged few at the top of status hierarchies (i.e., Whites, males, and heterosexuals, as opposed to racial minorities, females, and gays, lesbians, or bisexuals). Conversely, some feminist (e.g., Collins, 1991; hooks, 2003) and sociological (e.g., Foucault, 1990) theories offer an alternative analysis of modern power that strays from the focus on its traditional components. These perspectives present a model of power as “a dynamic or network of non-centralized forces” (p. 26, Bordo & Heywood, 2004). That is, power is possessed neither by individuals nor by groups, but develops through micro level processes “in a capillary fashion throughout the social body” (Armstrong, 2006), resulting in the dominant statuses of certain groups and ideologies. From these perspectives, power may be conceptualized as a socially pervasive entity or mechanism that should not only be considered in terms of its unique oppressive forms, including racism, sexism, heterosexism, classism, and ageism. Rather, power should also be examined from an analysis of these forms of oppression as being inextricably connected within the context of a larger, more general “ideology of domination that permeates Western culture on various levels” (p. 51, hooks, 2003).

Social dominance theory (SDT; e.g., Pratto, 1996; Sidanius, 1993; Sidanius & Pratto, 1993, 1999) from the social psychological literature also focuses its analysis of power on social

hierarchies, suggesting that they result from both institutional and individual discrimination via the differential allocation of resources to various groups (Sidanius, Pratto, Martin, & Stallworth, 1991). SDT posits that the individual's role in the construction and maintenance of such caste-systems is driven in part by a desire for positive group identity, which may be increased by comparison of one's group or oneself to negative reference groups and group members (Sidanius et al., 1991). To examine this phenomenon, Pratto and colleagues (1994) postulated that individuals have differing levels of social dominance orientation (SDO), or the extent to which an individual believes that some groups should dominate others in a social hierarchy. In addition to finding support for this hypothesis, Pratto et al. (1994) also found that individuals with higher SDO were more nationalistic and patriotic, that they subscribed more to cultural elitism, and that they had higher levels of racism and sexism. Ideologies centered on group inequality such as these (for a review, see Sidanius et al., 1991) are referred to by SDT as *hierarchy-legitimizing myths*.

SDT posits that hierarchy-legitimizing myths must be presented as self-evident truths, disseminated, and normalized to ensure that the systematic and pervasive nature of status hierarchies and intergroup prejudices are effectively preserved. Because both higher- and lower-status groups must perceive those systems as the norm for hierarchies to be maintained, these myths may take the forms of universal moral, religious, or political principles (Sidanius et al., 1991; Pratto et al., 1994). By presenting the myths as such, inequality may be justified or unquestioned.

There appears to be a parallel between the SDT analysis of power and feminist analyses of rape. That is, some feminist theorists analyze rape as an expression of power that may be used to maintain the male-dominant sex hierarchy (Brownmiller, 1975; Chiroro, Bohner, Viki, & Jarvis, 2004; Hazelwood & Burgess, 1987; Hegeman & Meikle, 1980; Janssen, 1995; Lisak & Roth, 1988; McCabe & Wauchope, 2005; Russell, 1982; Sanday, 1981; Schwendinger & Schwendinger, 1974). Thus, in much the same way that principles promoting differential group status may underlie social inequalities, combining feminist theory and SDT leads to the suggestion that a principle of male dominance may underlie rape and perceptions of rape.

There are real-world examples supporting these theoretical models of rape, such as the historic use of rape as a standard war tactic (e.g., Brownmiller, 1975, 1994; Hensen, 1999; Salas, 1990; Stiglmayer, 1994) "to drive a wedge through a community, shatter a society, to destroy a

people” (MacKinnon, 1998, p. 50) by disgracing women to their families and humiliating men (e.g., Barry, 1995). There is also supportive empirical evidence of the relationship between dominance and rape. For example, research has found that greater conformity to masculine norms reflecting power over women and interpersonal power has also been associated with more reports of past sexually aggressive behavior toward women (Locke & Mahalik, 2005). This finding suggests that a desire for dominance may be related to the enactment of sexual violence against women. The relationship between power and rape was further examined by a study showing that men’s desire for sexual dominance mediated the relationship between their RMA and rape proclivity, or self-reported likelihood to rape (Chiroro et al., 2004). That is, this study’s results suggest that the desire for sexual dominance over women may be the motivation for men who hold false beliefs about rape, rapists, and rape victims (Burt, 1980) to report a higher rape proclivity (Chiroro et al., 2004; also see Aosved & Long, 2006; Zurbriggen & Yost, 2004; see also Lisak & Roth, 1990; Muehlenhard & Falcon, 1990; Muir, Lonsway, & Payne, 1996).

Research has also focused on the relationship between dominance and rape-specific hierarchy-legitimizing myths (i.e., rape myths). Recently, one study (Hockett, Saucier, Hoffman, Smith, & Craig, in press) found support for feminist theoretical predictions regarding the relationship between RMA and power. Specifically, it was shown that individuals’ scores on measures of general intergroup dominance (including SDO) and sex-based oppression measures (i.e., sexism and prejudice towards gays and lesbians) predicted RMA and other attitudes toward rape and rape victims above and beyond participant sex, empathy, political conservatism, belief that the world is a just place, and social desirability. Another recent study also demonstrated that RMA, which the authors described as a form of intolerance, is positively correlated with various other specific oppressive belief systems, including racism, sexism, prejudice against homosexuals, ageism, classism, and religious intolerance (Aosved & Long, 2006).

### **An Umbrella of Dominance?**

While the results of these two previous studies do suggest that unique forms of oppression (e.g., RMA, racism, sexism, prejudice against homosexuals) may be elements of a more general ideology of dominance, this generalization may be limited. Aosved and Long’s (2006) findings supported the prediction that oppressive beliefs may be related, but they did not include any theoretical predictions about or measures of more general dominance belief systems

(such as SDO). Conversely, while Hockett et al. (in press) *did* examine this prediction, they did not fully test the theoretical prediction that *multiple* oppressive beliefs (e.g., RMA, racism, sexism, heterosexism) are “systematically related to each other,” as is argued by feminist theorist Marilyn Frye in the epigraph.

Therefore, the current study will be a theoretical contribution from two perspectives—feminist theory and SDT—that examines what previous research can only reservedly suggest: that an umbrella of dominance couches various hierarchy-legitimizing ideologies. Likewise, because rape is theorized from the feminist standpoint to be an expression of dominance and because it is also a unique situation in which multiple oppressive belief systems may be expressed simultaneously, framing this research in the context of rape offers concrete and relevant extensions to two areas of research—rape and power. Thus, we utilized rape vignettes to test the hypothesis that SDO will predict differences in individuals’ attributions of blame and responsibility to rape victims of different races above and beyond individuals’ levels of racism, gender role beliefs, RMA, and demographic characteristics.

## **CHAPTER 2 - Method**

### **Participants**

In partial fulfillment of research requirements for their general psychology courses, undergraduate participants ( $N = 83$ ) voluntarily signed up for the study using the university’s electronic system. Thirty-five participants were male and 48 were female. Of the 81 participants who reported their sexual orientation, one reported being gay, one reported being bisexual, and 79 reported being heterosexual. All 83 participants reported being single. Seventy-four were White, four were Black, two were Latino/a, two were Asian/ Pacific Islander, and one did not report his or her ethnicity. Sixty-three were first year students, 12 were sophomores, 6 were juniors, and 2 were seniors. The participants’ mean age was 19.20 ( $SD = 1.06$ ) with the overall sample being between the ages of 18 and 23.

### **Materials**

### ***Rape Vignettes***

For this study, which employs a between-groups design, we wrote two rape vignettes in which we varied the victim's race (White versus Black). In each vignette, participants read a simulated news article reporting the rape of a woman. The newspaper-style vignette form has been used in other research on rape victims (e.g., Bohner et al., 1993; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). Victim race was varied in the report by providing a brief but explicit description of the victim as either a "22-year-old White woman" or a "22-year-old Black woman." No other features of the vignette were varied by condition. See Appendix A for the full vignettes.

### ***Measure of Rape Myth Acceptance***

RMA was assessed using the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS; Burt, 1980). Participants indicated their agreement with each of 13 items (e.g., *Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve*) on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) Likert-type scale. Higher scores indicated more acceptance of (i.e., belief in) rape myths. The RMAS for this sample was found to be internally consistent  $\alpha = .78$ .

### ***Measure of Gender Role Beliefs***

To measure participants' attitudes concerning the rights and roles of women, we used Spence, Helmreich and Stapp's (1973) short form of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS-S), a 25-item version developed from the original 55-item measure (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). Participants reported their levels of agreement to items such as "Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than of a man," and "A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage" using Likert-type scales from 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*). The appropriate items from this scale were reverse scored so that higher scores indicated higher agreement with traditional feminine norms. This measure was also found to be internally consistent for this sample,  $\alpha = .82$ .

The Male Role Norm Scale (MRNS) was developed by Thompson and Pleck (1986) as a short version of the Brannon Masculinity Scale (Brannon, 1976; Brannon & Juni, 1984). We used this measure to assess participants' attitudes concerning three dimensions of the traditional male role: status norms (e.g., *A man always deserves the respect of his wife and children*), toughness norms (e.g., *Nobody respects a man very much who frequently talks about his worries, fears, and problems*), and anti-femininity norms (e.g., *It bothers me when a man does something*

that I consider “feminine”). Participants reported their levels of agreement using Likert-type scales from 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*). Relevant items on each scale were reverse-scored so that higher scores indicated higher agreement with traditional masculine norms, and scale scores were obtained by averaging the raw scores of the items in each subscale (Thompson & Pleck, 1986). These scales were demonstrated to be internally consistent, with the Status scale’s  $\alpha = .90$ , the Toughness scale’s  $\alpha = .90$ , and the Anti-femininity scale’s  $\alpha = .84$ .

To measure individuals’ perceptions of the victims’ adherence to gender roles, we used a modified version of Bem’s (1974) Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) in which participants were directed to indicate how well each trait described the victim rather than themselves. A factor analysis of the Masculinity and Femininity subscales of this measure was conducted to produce a shorter version. This analysis resulted in a Masculinity factor containing 12 traits stereotypically associated with the male gender (e.g., *assertive, ambitious, independent*) and a Femininity factor containing 12 traits stereotypically associated with the female gender (e.g., *sympathetic, gentle, soft-spoken*). On a Likert-type scale from 1 (*never or almost never true of the victim*) to 9 (*always or almost always true of the victim*), participants indicated how descriptive of the victim 24 different traits are. Masculinity and Femininity scores were obtained by averaging the ratings on each of the two respective subscales, and higher scores indicated greater perceptions of the victims’ adherence to gender roles. These factors were found to be reliable,  $\alpha$ s = .91 and .83, respectively.

### ***Dominance Measure***

To measure individuals’ general attitudes about dominance, we assessed participants’ beliefs that group hierarchies should exist in a social hierarchy using Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, and Malle’s (1994) SDO scale. On a Likert-type scale from 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*), participants indicated their agreement with each of 16 statements about the positioning of groups in a social hierarchy (e.g., *To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups*). Relevant items were reverse-scored so that higher scores on each item indicated higher levels of social dominance orientation. The internal reliability of this scale was demonstrated to be high for this sample,  $\alpha = .94$ .



### ***Racism Measures***

To assess participants' attitudes toward Blacks, we administered the Racial Arguments Scale (RAS; Saucier & Miller, 2003). On the RAS, participants reported the extent to which they believed that each of 13 arguments regarding issues relevant to Blacks support conclusions that are either positive or negative toward Blacks. These reports were made using Likert-type scales from 1 (*not at all*) to 9 (*very much*). Responses on the positive items were reverse-scored so that higher scores represent more negativity toward Blacks on all items, and overall scores were obtained by averaging the responses over all 13 items. Because the RAS does not measure how much participants agree with the arguments and conclusions, their responses were less likely to be influenced by self-presentational concerns. Previous research supports this claim, as the RAS is not confounded with social desirability but that it predicts prejudiced behavior above and beyond other self-report racism measures. The RAS was found have acceptable internal consistency,  $\alpha = .69$ .

In addition, the Attitudes Toward Blacks scale (ATB; Brigham, 1993) was also included because items on this measure appear to reflect stereotypical, mythic beliefs similar to those included in the RMAS. On the ATB, participants reported their agreement with each of 20 statements regarding their attitudes toward Blacks using 9-point Likert-type scales from 1 (*not at all*) to 9 (*very much*). A sample item is "*Generally, Blacks are not as smart as Whites.*" Relevant items were reverse-scored so that higher responses represented more negativity toward Blacks. This measure was found to have very good internal consistency,  $\alpha = .90$ .

### ***Social Desirability Measure***

To assess participants' need for social approval in testing situations, we used the Marlowe-Crowne (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964) social desirability measure (SD). This scale consists of 33 true-false items consisting of statements that participants who are motivated to present themselves in socially desirable ways are likely to report as being true (e.g., *I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake*) or false (e.g., *I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way*) of themselves. Participants' scores on this measure consisted of the number of socially desirable responses they reported, with higher scores indicating greater need for approval. In their original analyses of the scale, Crowne and Marlowe report a Kuder-Richardson

formula 20 coefficient (a reliability index for measures with dichotomous choice) of .88, suggesting very good internal consistency.

All predictive measures for this study are included in Appendices B through J.

## **Procedure**

During the research sessions, conducted at a scheduled time and location in Kansas State University's Psychology Department, participants received randomly assigned questionnaire packets containing the rape vignettes and measures of SDO, RMA, racial attitudes, attitudes about gender roles, and social desirability in counterbalanced orders. Participants also completed demographic items regarding their age, race, sex, and sexual orientation. After reading the rape vignettes, participants responded to nine items, our dependent measures, regarding their perceptions of the rape victim in the vignette. Seven items were adapted from the Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale (Ward, 1988) and assessed participants' perceptions of the victim, including one item pertaining to victim denigration (e.g., *The individual who made the report is a less desirable person because he/she was raped*), one item pertaining to the victim's credibility (e.g., *The individual who made the report may have claimed rape to protect his/her reputation*), and two items pertaining to the victim's deservingness (e.g., *The individual who made the report is an innocent victim* and *The individual who made the report deserved to be raped*). There was also one item pertaining to trivialization of the victim (e.g., *The individual who made the report may have put him/herself into a situation in which he/she was likely to be sexually assaulted because he/she has an unconscious wish to be raped*), two items pertaining to the victim's blame (e.g., *The individual who made the report should not blame him/herself for the rape* and *The individual who made the report is to blame for the rape*), and two items pertaining to the victim's responsibility (e.g., *The perpetrator, not the victim, is responsible for the rape* and *The individual who made the report is responsible for the rape*). Participants responded on 9-point Likert-type scales from 1 (*disagree strongly*) to 9 (*agree strongly*). These items are included in Appendix K.

Participants completed the packets in groups of approximately 5 and their participation took approximately 35 minutes. Participants were thanked for their participation, debriefed regarding the purpose of the research, provided with contact information for local and national sexual assault services (see Appendix L), and dismissed. The research was conducted in full

compliance with APA ethical standards and was approved by the Kansas State University Institutional Review Board.

## **CHAPTER 3 - Results**

### **Sex Differences, Relationships Among Measures, and Social Desirability Effects**

To analyze sex differences on the measures, independent samples *t*-tests were used to compare mean scores for male and female participants on each measure. As expected from prior research, results showed that men scored significantly higher than women participants on the ATB, the AWS, the MRNS Status and Toughness subscales, the SDO, and the key VPS items for victim Denigration and Credibility. These findings indicate that men, more than women, have more negative attitudes toward Blacks and towards women, hold greater beliefs that men should have status and be tough, have greater support for the existence of group hierarchies, and hold greater perceptions of rape victims as being less desirable and less credible. Calculation of the effect sizes for these differences indicated medium to large effects, with *Cohen's ds* ranging from .48 to 1.30. Men and women did not differ significantly on the BSRI Femininity and Masculinity subscales, indicating that they did not perceive the rape victims' genders differently. No sex differences were found on the MRNS Anti-femininity subscale, the SD, the RAS or the RMAS. Finally, men and women did not differ on their scores for the overall VPS composite, the VPS Blame, Deservingness, and Responsibility subscales, or on the key VPS item for victim Trivialization. Means and standard deviations for men and women on each of the measures are shown in Table 1.

Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among the predictive measures are shown in Table 2, and means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among the dependent measures are shown in Table 3. Participants' scores on the measure of social desirability were unrelated to their scores on the predictors, indicating that there were no social desirability effects. The prejudice measures (e.g., the RAS and the ATB) were significantly and positively intercorrelated, with participants' ratings on the ATB also significantly and positively related to their ratings on the VPS. Participants' scores on the MRNS Anti-femininity, Status and

Toughness subscales were intercorrelated with their scores on the VPS composite. Participants' VPS composite scores were significantly and positively related to their ratings on all measures except the BSRI Femininity and Masculinity measures, with which they were significantly and negatively related, and the RAS and SD measures, with which participants' VPS ratings had no significant relationships.

Among the dependent measures, participants' overall VPS composite scores were significantly and positively intercorrelated with the VPS Blame, Deservingness, and Responsibility subscales. None of the scores on the dependent measures were correlated with participants' scores on the social desirability measure.

## **Condition Effects**

### ***Analytic Strategy***

To help control for Type I errors, we used a one-way (Condition: *White* vs. *Black victim*) between-groups multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with all of the predictive measures (e.g., RMAS, AWS-S, MRNS subscales, BSRI subscales, SDO, RAS, ATB, and SD) as our dependent measures. The results revealed no main effects of condition on the dependent measures, *Pillai's Trace* = .994,  $F(11, 47) = 0.81$ ,  $p = .63$ , indicating that there were no preexisting differences on the measures between participants in each of the conditions. A second one-way (Condition: *White* vs. *Black victim*) between-groups MANOVA was conducted with the VPS composites (e.g., overall, Blame, Deservingness, and Responsibility) and key individual VPS items (e.g., Denigration, Credibility, and Trivialization) as our dependent measures. Contrary to our hypothesis that Black victims would be assigned more blame and responsibility than White victims, the results revealed no main effects of condition on the dependent measures, *Pillai's Trace* = .851,  $F(6, 75) = 1.50$ ,  $p = .19$ . These results suggest that the races of the victims portrayed in the vignettes did not affect individuals' levels of RMA, their attitudes toward women, their beliefs about the appropriateness of men's traditional gender roles, their perceptions of the gender of the victims, their levels of SDO, their attitudes toward Blacks, or their levels of social desirability. These results also suggest that the races of the victims did not affect participants' perceptions of the specific rape victims. Means and standard deviations for the measures by condition are shown in Table 4.

## **Regression Models to Predict Perceptions of Rape Victims**

### ***Analytic Strategy***

To test the effects of participants' levels of racism, gender role beliefs, and RMA on individuals' perceptions of the Black and White rape victims portrayed in the vignettes, we used hierarchical regression to predict participants' attitudes toward the Black and White rape victims. In these analyses, we entered participants' sex as a dummy coded variable (0 = males, 1 = females) in the first step. We entered participants' scores on all of the predictive measures in the second step. We entered condition as a dummy coded variable (0 = White, 1 = Black) in the third step. We entered the product term carrying the two-way interaction between sex and condition in the fourth step, and the product terms carrying the two-way interactions between condition and participants' scores on the predictive measures in the fifth step. Continuous predictors were standardized prior to entry and prior to computation of product terms to reduce issues with multicollinearity. Seven separate hierarchical regressions were conducted with each using the overall VPS composite score, the VPS subscale scores (e.g., Blame, Deservingness, or Responsibility), or the key individual VPS items (e.g., Denigration, Credibility, or Trivialization) as the criterion variable.

### ***Overall VPS Composite***

The regression analysis conducted using the participants' overall VPS scores as the criterion variable showed that the only step to significantly improve the model was the second step,  $R^2$  change = .455,  $F(11, 45) = 3.46$ ,  $p = .002$ . As we would expect from prior research, examination of the standardized regression coefficients of that step revealed that participants with more negative attitudes toward women on the AWS-S held more overall negative attitudes toward the rape victims,  $\beta = .43$ ,  $p = .032$ . The complete regression results are shown in Table 5.

### ***Victim Denigration***

The regression analysis conducted using the participants' scores on the VPS denigration item as the criterion variable showed that only the entry of participants' sex in the first step significantly improved the model,  $R^2$  change = .072,  $F(1, 57) = 4.14$ ,  $p = .04$ . As expected based on previous research, examination of the standardized regression coefficients of that step

revealed that female participants denigrated the victims less than did male participants,  $\beta = -.27$ ,  $p = .040$ . The complete regression results are shown in Table 6.

### ***Victim Credibility***

The regression analysis conducted using the participants' scores on the VPS credibility item as the criterion variable showed that the entry of the participants' scores on the predictive measures in the second step significantly improved the model,  $R^2 \text{ change} = .421$ ,  $F(11, 46) = 3.22$ ,  $p = .003$ . This demonstrated that participants who had more negative attitudes toward women on the AWS-S had greater perceptions that the victims may have claimed rape to protect their reputations (that is, they perceived the victims as less credible),  $\beta = .46$ ,  $p = .020$ . Entry of condition in the third step also significantly improved the model,  $R^2 \text{ change} = .067$ ,  $F(1, 45) = 6.34$ ,  $p = .016$ , such that participants perceived Black rape victims as less credible than White rape victims,  $\beta = .29$ ,  $p = .016$ . The complete regression results are shown in Table 7.

### ***Victim Trivialization***

The regression analysis conducted using the participants' scores on the VPS trivialization item as the criterion variable showed that the fifth step, in which the product terms carrying the two-way interactions between condition and participants' scores on the predictive measures, significantly improved the model,  $R^2 \text{ change} = .282$ ,  $F(11, 33) = 2.16$ ,  $p = .043$ . Further examination of the data revealed that the interaction between condition and participants' SDO scores was the only unique predictor,  $\beta = .70$ ,  $p = .009$ , indicating that participants' scores on the measure of SDO uniquely predicted the extent to which they believed the victim may have put herself into a situation in which sexual assault was likely to occur because of an unconscious wish to be raped differently for White victims than for Black victims. The complete regression results are shown in Table 8.

Simple slopes analyses were used to probe the interaction. When the victim was White, higher levels of SDO were associated with participants' perceptions of the rape as being less trivial,  $\beta = -.79$ ,  $p = .015$ . This result suggests that participants higher in SDO perceived the rapes of White victims as being less likely to have occurred due to any unconscious desires of the victim to be raped. However, when the rape victim was Black, there was no significant relationship between higher levels of SDO and participants' perceptions of the triviality of the

rape,  $\beta = .29, p = .233$ . This result suggests that participants higher in SDO did not perceive the rape of Black victims as being either more or less likely to have occurred due to the victims' unconscious desires to be raped.

### *Victim Blame*

The regression analysis conducted using the participants' scores on the VPS blame composite items as the criterion variable showed that the entry of the participants' scores on the predictive measures in the second step significantly improved the model,  $R^2 \text{ change} = .357, F(11, 46) = 2.36, p = .021$ . Participants who had more negative attitudes toward women and participants with greater acceptance of rape myths perceived the victims as more to blame,  $\beta = .50, p = .020$  and  $\beta = .34, p = .038$ , respectively. The fifth step, in which the product terms carrying the two-way interactions between condition and participants' scores on the predictive measures, also significantly improved the model,  $R^2 \text{ change} = .271, F(11, 33) = 2.36, p = .028$ . Further examination of the data revealed that three interactions uniquely predicted the extent to which participants' blamed the rape victims. First, the interaction between condition and participants' scores on the MRNS Status subscale was a unique predictor,  $\beta = -.67, p = .023$ . Second, the interaction between condition and participants' scores on the MRNS Toughness subscale was a unique predictor,  $\beta = .79, p = .019$ . Finally, the interaction between condition and participants' scores on the RAS was a unique predictor,  $\beta = -.75, p = .004$ . These results indicated that participants' scores on the MRNS Status subscale, the MRNS Toughness subscale, and the RAS each uniquely predicted the extent to which they blamed the rape victim differently for White victims than for Black victims. The complete regression results are shown in Table 8.

Simple slopes analyses were used to probe these interactions. When the victim was White, no significant relationships emerged between the extent to which participants blamed the victim and their beliefs that men should have status,  $\beta = .53, p = .124$  or that men should be tough,  $\beta = -.68, p = .07$ . When the victim was Black, a similar pattern resulted in that no significant relationships emerged between the extent to which participants blamed the victim and their beliefs that men should have status,  $\beta = -.53, p = .08$ , or that men should be tough,  $\beta = .52, p = .118$ . Overall, these results demonstrate that the relationships between victim blame and participants' beliefs about men's status and toughness roles were not significantly different from zero for either White or Black victims, indicating that victim blame was unrelated to

participants' attitudes about men's traditional roles of having status and being tough regardless of victim race. However, these relationships were significantly different for White victims than for Black victims. Specifically, the relationship between victim blame and the belief that men should have status was more negative for the White victim, but more positive for the Black victim. Similarly, the relationship between victim blame and the belief that men should be tough was more positive for the White victim, but more negative for the Black victim.

Finally, results also showed that no significant relationship emerged between the extent to which participants blamed the victim and their negative attitudes toward Blacks when the victim was White,  $\beta = .30, p = .310$ . However, the extent to which participants blamed the victim and their levels of RAS were significantly and negatively associated when the victim was Black,  $\beta = -.90, p = .001$ . In contrast to expectations based on previous research, this result indicates that the more negative attitudes participants' held toward Blacks, the less they blamed the Black victim.

### ***Victim Deservingness and Responsibility***

The regression models predicting the extent to which participants felt the victims deserved to be raped and the extent to which participants felt the victims were responsible for their own rapes failed to reach significance at entry of any of the five steps, indicating that these outcomes were not predictable from any main effects or interactive combinations of the participants' sex, the predictive measures, or the condition to which participants were assigned. The complete regression results for victim deservingness and responsibility are shown in Table 10 and 11, respectively.

## **CHAPTER 4 - Discussion**

The purpose of the current study was to examine the relationships between individuals' levels of SDO and differences in their attitudes toward rape victims of differing races. Altogether, our findings suggest that SDO may be related to some differences in individuals' perceptions of White and Black rape victims. Consistent with our hypotheses based on SDT and feminist theories, our analyses revealed that the introduction of participants' SDO scores significantly improved the predictive model for participants' perceptions of the triviality of rape



for specific victims. In particular, this research demonstrated that when participants' SDO scores were higher, they perceived the rapes as less likely due to an unconscious desire to be raped by the White victims. However, participants higher in SDO did not perceive the rape of Black victims as being either more or less likely to have occurred due to the victims' unconscious desires to be raped. As previously discussed, SDT postulates that individuals may be higher in SDO due in part to greater desires for positive group identity. Thus, because the majority of our participants were White, it is possible that a desire to maintain positive identity for the group "White people" may have had greater valence for higher-SDO participants' perceptions of the White rape victim than did negative attitudes about rape and rape victims or racist attitudes. Thus, while this finding was unexpected, it does appear to be consistent with SDT.

Further, while our results did not show SDO to be predictive of other differences in individuals' negative attitudes toward rape victims of different races above and beyond other individual difference predictors, we did find support for the suggestion based on feminist and SDT theory that "a principle of male dominance may underlie rape and perceptions of rape" (p. 11). Specifically, our results revealed that negative attitudes toward women significantly predicted overall negative perceptions of both Black and White rape victims, including specific perceptions of these rape victims as being less credible and more to blame. This finding is consistent previous research, which has shown that individuals' levels of sex-based oppression significantly and positively predict RMA and their negative attitudes toward rape and rape victims while controlling for demographic factors and social desirability (Hockett et al., in press).

Also consistent with previous research was our finding that individuals perceived Black rape victims as less credible than White rape victims (Wyatt, 1992). In contrast, however, we also found that Black rape victims were blamed less as individuals' negative attitudes toward Blacks increased. This may be evidence of a "bend over backwards" effect (Saucier & Miller, 2003; von Hippel, Sekaquaptewa, & Vargas, 1997) or positivity bias (Harber, 1998). That is, these higher-prejudiced individuals' may have recognized the disparity between their negative attitudes toward Blacks and their own egalitarian beliefs, values, and social norms, thus resulting in a need to overcompensate for their prejudice by blaming Black rape victims less. While this compensatory effect has typically been found for individuals' lower in prejudice (Harber, 1998; Saucier & Miller, 2003; von Hippel, Sekaquaptewa, & Vargas, 1997) the current study's finding

is consistent with some research that has demonstrated this effect with individuals higher in prejudice (e.g., Hockett, Zanotti, Klausing, & Saucier, under review).

Finally, we also found sex differences that were consistent with previous literature. In the current study, men reported more negative attitudes toward Blacks (e.g., on the ATB) and toward women (e.g., Aosved & Long, 2006; Burt, 1980; Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999), greater adherence to the belief that men should be tough (e.g., Davies, 2004) and should have status, and higher levels of SDO (e.g., Hockett et al., in press), than did women. Men also perceived the rape victims in the vignettes as less credible and less desirable than did women. No differences were found between men and women on the other victim perception items or composites, in their levels of social desirability, their perceptions of the victims' adherence to masculine or feminine gender roles, or their beliefs that men should be anti-feminine. In contrast to previous research, there were also no differences found between men and women in their levels of RMA (e.g., Aosved & Long, 2006; Burt, 1980; Hockett et al., in press; Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999).

Some findings from this study may be limited in the extent to which they can be generalized due to the study's correlational design (although this study also utilized an experimentally manipulated condition variable), as well as due to factors associated with convenience sampling (e.g., from a homogenous White, primarily female college demographic). However, our finding regarding the relationship between SDO and the trivialization of White rape victims' experiences may suggest that the attitudes under investigation (e.g., RMA, racism, sex-based oppression) may represent—at least in part—a more general umbrella of dominance. In other words, individuals' beliefs in the legitimacy of general group dominance may be a foundational attitude underlying other specific oppressive beliefs that individuals may endorse, including some negative attitudes toward rape victims, such as perceptions of the triviality of their experiences. However, because SDO was predictive of only one element of individuals' attitudes toward the rape victims in the vignettes (i.e., their perceptions of triviality of the rapes), more research is necessary before this conclusion may be made with complete confidence.

In addition to the tentative support for SDT offered by this finding, another unique contribution to SDT may be our use of a rape victim paradigm. More specifically, as previously noted, SDT argues that social hierarchies develop through discriminatory allocation of resources (Sidanius et al., 1991). Because rape victims are a group for whom resource allocation is already

limited (e.g., by negative responses to victims from individuals in legal, health, and social domains), the rape victim paradigm may offer interesting avenues of research in SDT when factoring in other victim characteristics that may also result in discriminatory allocation of resources (e.g., the victim's race, sex, and sexual orientation). Further, beyond its technical utility as a unique paradigm, our examination of power within the context of rape also offers some substantiation for feminist theories. By demonstrating that SDO significantly and uniquely predicts some perceptions of rape victims of different races (i.e., triviality of the rape), the outcome of the current study may give some evidence of a “cultural basis of group oppression” (hooks, 2003, p. 52) from which other linked forms of oppression (e.g., racism, sexism, and heterosexism) may extend. This intersectional framework may not only influence the way we conceive of oppression at the societal level, but it may also hold implications for the treatment of rape victims at the individual level. That is, it may be beneficial for members of legal and health fields and the victims' general communities to consider not only victim characteristics like race in their responses to rape victims, but also to more wholly address the extent of individuals' victimization by considering how those characteristics interact with each other in a more general hierarchical system. Utilization of intersectional frameworks in empirical research is also beneficial in that it may allow theories stemming from less quantitative fields (e.g., feminist theory) to be tested and verified, which may in turn generate additional theories and hypotheses for future research.

As suggested by the common conception of topics such as rape and race being sensitive in nature, the possibility that participants' levels of desirable responding may have imposed limitations to such implications. However, as previously argued, the prevalence of negative attitudes toward rape victims may suggest that assigning blame to the victims of rape is perceived by some to be socially acceptable. Thus, in contrast to being a sensitive topic, utilization of a rape paradigm may actually provide potential justification for participants to be more honest in reporting any negative attitudes. Further, as the results demonstrated, we were able to statistically control for the effects of social desirability on participants' perceptions of rape victims. However, extensions of the current work could examine victim blame for other types of rape victims (e.g., male, gay, and lesbian rape victims) or in other paradigms (e.g., utilizing vignettes that depict other types of crimes). Future research could also examine other

oppressive belief systems, such as sexism and heterosexism, including those that may not be as socially taboo to address, such as ageism.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, while some studies have examined the relationships among oppressive attitudes such as racism, sexism, and RMA (e.g., Aosved & Long, 2006), feminist and social dominance theories of power suggest that these various forms of oppression may not be just related, but may be aspects of more general oppressive structures, such as SDO. Thus, the purpose and contribution of the current study is exploration of the relationships between individuals' levels of SDO and their attitudes toward rape victims of differing races. The results of this study appear to offer some support for feminist theories about the relationship between rape and power, as well as for social psychological (i.e., SDT) and feminist theories regarding the structure of dominance. This was done by showing that consideration of more general forms of dominance may contextualize specific forms of oppression. That is, findings from the current study may suggest that individuals' negative attitudes (e.g., racism) that may influence their perceptions of rape victims may be part of a more general belief that social hierarchies should exist. These results provide support for theoretical foundations with applications in future research examining how intersections between specific dominance belief systems may be used to maintain social hierarchies. The theoretical frameworks and findings of the current study may improve our understanding of individuals' attitudes toward rape victims and may also begin to address the general social inequality that appears to encompass these false beliefs.

## References

- Abbey, A., & Harnish, R. J. (1995). Perception of sexual intent: The role of gender, alcohol consumption, and rape supportive attitudes. *Sex Roles, 32*, 297-313.
- Abrams, D., Viki, G. T., Masser, B., & Bohner, G. (2003). Perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape proclivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 111-125.
- Anderson, K. B., Cooper, H., & Okamura, L. (1997). Individual differences and attitudes toward rape: a meta-analytic review. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*(3), 295-316.
- Aosved, A. C., & Long, P. J. (2006). Co-occurrence of rape myth acceptance, sexism, racism, homophobia, ageism, classism, and religious intolerance. *Sex Roles, 55*, 481-492.
- Armstrong, A. (2006). *Foucault and Feminism*. Retrieved January 23, 2009, from <http://www.iep.utm.edu/f/foucufem.htm#H3>.
- Baldus, D. C., & Woodworth, G. G. (1998). Race discrimination and the death penalty: An empirical overview. In J. R. Acker, R. M. Bohm, & C. S. Lanier (Eds.), *America's experiment with capital punishment: Reflections on the past, present and future of the ultimate penal sanction* (385-415). Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Baldus, D., Woodworth, G., & Pulaski, C. (1990). *Equal justice and the death penalty: A legal and empirical analysis*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(6), 1173-1182.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*(2), 155-162.
- Bohner, G., & Lampridis, E. (2004). Expecting to meet a rape victim affects women's self-esteem: The moderating role of rape myth acceptance. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 7*, 77-87.
- Bohner, G., Reinhard, M. A., Rutz, S., Sturm, S., Kershbaum, B., & Effler, D. (1998). Rape myths as neutralizing cognitions: Evidence for causal impact of anti-victim attitudes on men's self-reported likelihood of raping. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 28*, 257-268.
- Bohner, G., Weisbrod, C., Raymond, P., Barzvi, A., & Schwarz, N. (1993). Salience of rape affects self-esteem: The moderating role of gender and rape myth acceptance. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 23*, 561-579.
- Bordo, S. and Heywood, L. (2004). *Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body*. Berkley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role: Our culture's blueprint for manhood, what's it done for us lately? In D. David and R. Brannon (Eds.), *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role* (pp. 1-45). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Brannon, R., & Juni, S. (1984). A scale for measuring attitudes about masculinity. *Psychological Documents, 14*, 6-7.
- Brigham, J. C. (1993). College students' racial attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 23*, 111-125.

- 23(23), 1933-1967.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975) *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Burgess, A. W., & Holmstrom, L. L. (1974). Rape trauma syndrome. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 131, 981-986.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 217-230.
- Campbell, R. (1998). The community response to rape: Victims' experiences with the legal, medical, and mental health systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 26, 355-379.
- Campbell, R., & Bybee, D. (1997). Emergency medical services for rape victims: Detecting the cracks in service delivery. *Women's Health: Research on Gender, Behavior and Policy*, 3, 75-101.
- Campbell, R., Sefl, T., Barnes, H. E., Ahrens, C. E., Wasco, S. M., & Zaragoza-Diesfeld, Y. (1999). Community services for rape vsurvivors: Enhancing psychological well-being or increasing trauma? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67(6), 847-858.
- Cassidy, L., & Hurrell, R. M. (1995). The influence of victim's attire on adolescents' judgments of date rape. *Adolescence*, 30(118), 319-323.
- Ceniti, J., & Malamuth, N. M. (1984). Effects of repeated exposure to sexually violent or nonviolent stimuli on sexual arousal to rape and nonrape depictions. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 22, 535-548.
- Chapleau, K. M., Oswald, D. L., & Russell, B. L. (2007). How ambivalent sexism toward women and men support rape myth acceptance. *Sex Roles*, 57, 131-136.
- Chapleau, K. M., Oswald, D. L., & Russell, B. L. (2008). Male rape myths: The role of gender, violence, & sexism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(5), 600-615.
- Chiroro, P., Bohner, G., Viki, T., & Jarvis, C. I. (2004). Rape myth acceptance and rape proclivity: Expected dominance versus expected arousal as mediators in acquaintance-rape situations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19, 427-442.
- Collins, P. H. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Crandall, C. S., & Eshleman, A. (2003). A justification-suppression of the expression and experience of prejudice. *Psychological Bulletin*. 129, 414-446.
- Crosby, F., Bromley, S., & Saxe, L. (1980). Recent unobtrusive studies of Black and White discrimination and prejudice: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87, 546-563.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The approval motive: Studies in evaluative dependence*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Davies, M. Correlates of negative attitudes toward gay men: Sexism, male role norms, and male sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research*, 41(3), 259-266.
- D'Augelli, A. R., & Rose, M. L. (1990). Homophobia in a university community: Attitudes and experiences of heterosexual freshman. *Journal of College Student Development*, 31, 484-491.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1991). Changes in the expression and assessment of racial prejudice. In H. J. Knopke, R. J. Norrell, & R. W. Rogers (Eds.). *Opening doors: Perspectives on race relations in contemporary America*. (119-148). University, AL, US: The University of Alabama Press.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2000). Aversive racism and selection decisions: 1989 and

1999. *Psychological Science*, 11, 315-319.
- Duncan, D. F. (1990). Prevalence of sexual assault victimization among heterosexual and gay/lesbian university students, *Psychological Reports*, 66, 65-66.
- Duncan, G. J., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (Eds.). (1997). *Consequences of growing up poor*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Dunton, B. C., & Fazio, R. H. (1997). An individual difference measure of motivation to control prejudiced reactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 316-326.
- Edwards, K. E., & Macleod, M. D. (1999). *The reality and myth of rape: Implications for the criminal justice system*.
- Estrich, S. (1987). *Real rape*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fazio, R. H., Jackson, J. R., Dunton, B. C., & Williams, C. J. (1995). Variability in automatic activation as an unobtrusive measure of racial attitudes: A bona fide pipeline? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 1013-1027.
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen F. T., & Turner M. G. (2000). The sexual victimization of college women. Retrieved March 17, 2008, from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/182369.pdf>.
- Finkelhor, D., Hotaling, G., Lewis, I. A., & Smith, C. (1990). Sexual abuse in a national survey of adult men and women: Prevalence, characteristics, and risk factors. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 14(1), 19-28.
- Foley, L. A., & Chamblin H. H. (1982). The effect of race and personality on mock jurors' decisions. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 112(1), 47-51.
- Foley, L. A., Evancic, C., Karnik, K., King, J., & Parks, A. (1995). Date rape: Effects of race of assailant and victim and gender of participants on perceptions. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 21(1), 6-18.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Frye, M. (2004). Oppression. In M. L. Anderson & P. H. Collins (Eds.), *Race Class and Gender*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. (48-51). Belmont: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism* (61-89). San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press.
- George, W. H., & Martinez, L. J. (2002). Victim blaming in rape: Effects of victim and perpetrator race, type of rape, and participant racism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26(2), 110-119.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 119-136.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). The ambivalence toward men inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent beliefs about men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 519-536.
- Goodman, L. A., Koss, M. P., & Russo, N. F. (1993). Violence against women: Physical and mental health effects: II. Research findings. *Applied and Preventative Psychology*, 2(2), 79-89.
- Gough, (1987). *California Psychological Inventory: Administrator's guide*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Gross, A. M., Winslett, A., Roberts, M., & Gohm, C. L. (2006). An examination of sexual violence against college women. *Violence Against Women*, 12(3), 288-300.
- Hazelwood, R., & Burgess, A. (1987). *Practical aspects of rape investigation: A multidisciplinary approach*. New York: Elsevier.
- Hegeman, N., & Meikle, S. (1980). Motives and attitudes of rapists. *Canadian Journal of*

- Behavioural Science*, 12,359-372.
- Hensen, M. R. (1999). *Comfort Woman: A Filipina's Story of Prostitution and Slavery under the Japanese Military*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Heppner, M. J., Humphrey, C. F., Hildenbrand-Gunn, T. L., & DeBord, K. A. (1995). The differential effects of rape prevention programming on attitudes, behavior, and knowledge. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 42(4), 508-518.
- Herek, G. M. (1989). Hate crimes against lesbians and gay men: Issues for research and policy. *American Psychologist*, 44, 948-955.
- Hockett, J. M., Saucier, D. A., Hoffman, B. H, Smith, S. J, & Craig, A. W. (in press). Oppression through acceptance? Predicting rape myth acceptance and attitudes toward rape victims. *Violence against Women*.
- Hockett, J. M., Zanotti, D. C., Klausning, C., & Saucier, D. A. (under review). The impact of citizenship status and racism on homicide perceptions. *Homicide Studies*.
- Hodge, S., & Canter, D. (1998). Victims and perpetrators of male sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 13(2), 222-239.
- Holzman, C. G. (1994). Multicultural perspectives on counseling survivors of rape. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless. Special Issue: Multicultural views on domestic violence*, 3(1), 81-97.
- Holzman, C. G. (1996). Counseling adult women rape survivors: Issues of race, ethnicity, and class. *Women and Therapy*, 19(2), 47-62.
- hooks, b. (2003). "Feminism: A movement to end sexist oppression" in C. R. McCann & S. K. Kim (Eds.), *Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Howard, J. A. (1984a). The "normal" victim: The effects of gender stereotypes on reactions to victims. *Social Psychological Quarterly*, 47, 270-281.
- Howard, J. A. (1984b). Social influences on attribution: Blaming some victims more than others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 494-505.
- Jackson, D. N. (1965). *Personality Research Form*. Goshen, NY: Research Psychologists Press.
- Janssen, E. (1995). Understanding the rapist's mind. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 31, 9-13.
- Kawakami, K., & Dovidio, J. F. (2001). The reliability of implicit stereotyping. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 212-225.
- King, M., & Woollett, E. (1997). Sexually assaulted males: 115 men consulting a counselling service. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 26, 579-583.
- Kite, M. E., & Whitley, B. E. (1996). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual persons, behaviours, and civil rights: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 336-352.
- Kuder, G. F., & Richardson, M. W. (1937). The theory of the estimation of test reliability. *Psychometrika*, 2, 151-160.
- LaFree, G. (1980). Variables affecting guilty pleas and convictions in rape cases. *Social Forces*, 58, 833-850.
- LaFree, G., Reskin, B., & Visher, C. (1985). Juror responses to victim behavior and legal issues in sexual assault trials. *Social Problems*, 32, 398-407.
- Levitt, E. E., & Klausen, A. D. (1974). Public attitudes toward homosexuality: Part of the 1970 National Survey by the Institute for Sex Research. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 1, 29-43.
- Lisak, D., & Roth, S. (1990). Motives and psychodynamics of self-reported, unincarcerated rapists. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 60, 268-280.



- Locke, B. D., & Mahalik, J. R. (2005). Examining masculinity norms, problem drinking, and athletic involvement as predictors of sexual aggression in college men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 279-283.
- Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1994). Rape myths: In review. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18*, 133-164.
- Lopez, P. A., George, W. H., & Davis, K. C. (2007). Do hostile sexual beliefs affect men's perceptions of sexual-interest messages? *Violence and Victims, 22*, 226-242.
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 302-318.
- MacKinnon, C. A. (1998). Rape, genocide, and women's human rights. In S. G. French, W. Teays, & Purdy, L. M. (Eds.), *Violence Against Women: Philosophical Perspectives* (43-56). Ithica, NY: Cornell University.
- Maier, S. L. (2008). "I have heard horrible stories..." Rape victim advocates' perceptions of the revictimization of rape victims by the police and medical system. *Violence Against Women, 14*(7). 786-808.
- Madigan, L., & Gamble, N. (1991). *The second rape: Society's continued betrayal of the victim*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1989a). The Attraction to Sexual Aggression scale: I. *Journal of Sex Research, 26*, 26-49.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1989b). The Attraction to Sexual Aggression scale: II. *Journal of Sex Research, 26*, 324-354.
- Mazelan, P. M. (1980). Stereotypes and perceptions of the victims of rape. *Victimology, 5*(2-4), 121-132.
- Mazzella, R., & Feingold, A. (1994). The effects of physical attractiveness, race, socioeconomic status, and gender of defendants and victims on judgments of mock jurors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24*, 315-344.
- McCabe, M. P., & Wauchope, M. (2005). Behavioral characteristics of men accused of rape: Evidence for different types of rapists. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 34*, 241-253.
- McCann, C. R., & Kim, S. (Eds.), (2003). *Feminist theory reader: Local and global perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Melanson, P. K. (1999). Belief in male rape myths: A test of two competing theories (Doctoral dissertation, Queen's University, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59*, 5620.
- McConaghy, N., & Zamir, R. (1995). Heterosexual and homosexual coercion, sexual orientation, and sexual roles in medical students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 24*, 489-502.
- McConahay, J. B., Hardee, B. B., & Batts, V. (1981). Has racism declined in America? It depends on who is asking and what is asked. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 25*, 563-579.
- Mezey, G., & King, M. (1989). The effects of sexual assault on men: A survey of 22 victims. *Psychological Medicine, 19*, 205-209.
- Monto, M. A., & Hotaling, N. (2001). Predictors of rape myth acceptance among male clients of female street prostitutes. *Violence Against Women, 7*, 275-293.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Falcon, P. L. (1990). Men's heterosocial skill and attitudes toward women as predictors of verbal sexual coercion and forceful rape. *Sex Roles, 23*, 241-259.
- Muir, G., Lonsway, K. A., & Payne, D. L. Rape myth acceptance among Scottish and American students. *Journal of Social Psychology, 136*, 261-262.
- National Victim Center and Crime Victims Research and Treatment Center. (1992). *Rape in America: A Report to the Nation*. Arlington, VA: National Victim Center.

- Neville, H. A., & Pugh, A. O. (1997). General and culture-specific factors influencing African American women's reporting following sexual assault: An exploratory investigation. *Violence against Women, 3*(4), 361-381.
- Osland, J. A., Fitch, M., & Willis, E. E. (1996). Likelihood to rape in college males. *Sex Roles, 35*, 171-183.
- Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 33*, 27-68.
- Pollard, P. (1992). Judgments about victims and attackers in depicted rapes: A review. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 31*, 307-326.
- Pratto, F. (1996). Sexual politics: The gender gap in the bedroom and the cabinet. In D. M. Buss & N. Malamuth (Eds.), *Sex, power, and conflict: Evolutionary and feminist perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(4), 741-763.
- Quackenbush, R. L. (1989). A comparison of androgynous, masculine sex-types, and undifferentiated males on dimensions of attitudes towards rape. *Journal of Research in Personality, 23*, 318-342.
- Rector, N. A., & Bagby, R. M. (1995). Criminal sentence recommendations in a simulated rape trial: Examining juror prejudice in Canada. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 13*(1), 113-121.
- Russell, D. E. The prevalence and incidence of forcible rape and attempted rape of females. *Victimology, 7*, 81-93.
- Salas, E. (1999). *Soldaderas in the Mexican military: Myth and history*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 39-40.
- Sanday, P. R. (1981). The socio-cultural context of rape: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Social Issues, 37*, 5-27.
- Saucier, D. A., & Miller, C. T. (2003). The persuasiveness of racial arguments as a subtle measure of racism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(10), 1303-1315.
- Saucier, D. A., Miller, C. T., & Doucet, N. (2005). Differences in helping whites and blacks: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9*, 2-16.
- Saucier, D. A., Hockett, J. M., & Wallenberg, A. S. (2008). The impact of racial slurs and racism on the perceptions and punishment of violent crime. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23*(5), 685-701.
- Scarce, M. (1997). Same-sex rape of male college students. *Journal of American College Health, 45*, Issue 4.
- Schwendinger, J. R., & Schwendinger, H. (1974). Rape myths: In legal, theoretical, and everyday practice. *Crime and Social Justice, 1*, 18-26.
- Sidanius, J. (1993). The psychology of group conflicts and the dynamics of oppression: A social dominance perspective. In W. McGuire & S. Iyengar (Eds.), *Current approaches to political psychology* (183-219). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1993). The dynamics of social dominance and the inevitability of oppression. In P. Sniderman & P. E. Tetlock (Eds.), *Prejudice, politics, and race in America today* (173-211). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and*

- oppression*. New York, NY, US: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Martin, M., & Stallworth, L. M. (1991). Consensual racism and career track: Some implications of social dominance theory. *Political Psychology, 12*(4), 691-721.
- Simonson, K., & Subich, L. M. (1999). Rape perceptions as a function of gender-role traditionality and victim-perpetrator association. *Sex Roles, 40*(7-8), 617-634.
- Smith, L. T. (2008). In A. M. Jaggar (Ed.). *Just methods: An interdisciplinary feminist reader*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 58-67.
- Smith, M. R., & Gordon, R. A. (1998). Personal need for structure and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Journal of Social Psychology, 138*(1), 83-87.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. (1972). Who likes competent women? Competence, sex-role congruence of interests, and subjects' attitudes toward women as determinants of interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 2*/3, 197-213.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 2*, 219-220.
- Stiglmayer, A. "The Rapes in Bosnia-Herzegovina," (1994). In A. Stiglmayer (Ed.). *Mass Rape: The War against Women in Bosnia-Herzegovina*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 82-169.
- Struckman-Johnson, C., & Struckman-Johnson, D. (1992). Acceptance of male rape myths among college men and women. *Sex Roles, 27*, 85-100.
- Thompson, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1986). The structure of male role norms. *American Behavioral Scientist, 29*, 531-543.
- Thompson, V. S., & West, S. D. (1992). Attitudes of African American adults toward treatment in cases of rape. *Community Mental Health Journal, 28*(6), 531-536.
- Ugwuegbu, D. C. (1979). Racial and evidential factors in juror attribution of legal responsibility. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 16*, 133-146.
- United States General Accounting Office (1990). *Death penalty sentencing: Research indicates pattern of racial disparities* (Report to Senate and House Committee on the Judiciary, 101st Congress, 2nd Session). Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office.
- Viki, G. T., & Abrams, D. (2002). But she was unfaithful: Benevolent sexism and reactions to rape victims who violate traditional gender role expectations. *Sex Roles, 47*, 289-293.
- Ward, C. A. (1995) *Attitudes toward Rape: Feminist and Social Psychological Perspectives*. London: Sage Publications.
- Whatley, M. A. (1996). Victim characteristics influencing attributions of responsibility to rape victims: A meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior: A Review Journal, 1*, 81-95.
- Whatley, M. A., & Riggio, R. E. (1993). Gender differences in attributions of blame for male rape victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 8*, 502-511.
- Willis, C. E. (1992). The effect of sex role stereotype, victim and defendant race, and prior relationship on race culpability attributions. *Sex Roles, 26*, 213-226.
- Wyatt, G. E. (1992). The sociocultural context of African American and White American women's rape. *Journal of Social Issues, 48*(1), 77-91.
- Yamawaki, N., & Tschanz, B. T. (2005). Rape perception differences between Japanese and American college students: On the mediating influence of traditionality. *Sex Roles, 52*(5-6), 379-392.
- Zurbriggen, E. L., & Yost, M. R. (2004). Power, desire, and pleasure in sexual fantasies. *Journal of Sex Research, 41*, 288-300.

## **Appendix A - Rape Vignettes**

### **Race Condition: White Victim**

K-State Collegian: Rape reported in Manhattan

A Manhattan woman reported she was raped Thursday evening, according to a Riley County Police report. According to the report, the 22-year-old White woman was on her way to meet some friends for dinner when she was sexually assaulted in a parking lot adjacent to a downtown business between 5 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. The suspect is a White male between 5 feet, 7 inches and 5 feet, 10 inches tall, weighing between 175 and 200 pounds. He was wearing a dark hooded sweatshirt and sweat pants at the time of the incident and was seen fleeing the area East-bound in a green Ford Explorer. Police are investigating the report. If you have any information, please contact the Riley County Police Department at (785)537-2112.

### **Race Condition: Black Victim**

K-State Collegian: Rape reported in Manhattan

A Manhattan woman reported she was raped Thursday evening, according to a Riley County Police report. According to the report, the 22-year-old Black woman was on her way to meet some friends for dinner when she was sexually assaulted in a parking lot adjacent to a downtown business between 5 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. The suspect is a White male between 5 feet, 7 inches and 5 feet, 10 inches tall, weighing between 175 and 200 pounds. He was wearing a dark hooded sweatshirt and sweat pants at the time of the incident and was seen fleeing the area East-bound in a green Ford Explorer. Police are investigating the report. If you have any information, please contact the Riley County Police Department at (785)537-2112.

## Appendix B - Demographic Questionnaire

Age: \_\_\_\_\_ Ethnicity: \_\_\_\_\_

Hometown and state: \_\_\_\_\_

Your sex (please circle one):

Male      Female

Your sexual orientation (please circle one):

Gay      Lesbian      Bisexual      Heterosexual

Describe Your Hometown (please circle one):

Rural      Suburban      Urban

Class Year (please circle one):

First year      Sophomore      Junior      Senior

Marital Status (please circle one):

Married      Single      Divorced

## **Appendix C - Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS)**

Please state your agreement with the following statements as honestly as you can.

Please use the 5 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>			<i>Strongly Agree</i>	

1. \_\_\_\_\_ A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ Any female can get raped.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ One reason that women falsely report a rape is that they frequently have a need to call attention to themselves.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wants to.
5. \_\_\_\_\_ When women go around braless or wearing short skirts and tight tops, they are just asking for trouble.
6. \_\_\_\_\_ In the majority of rapes, the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.
7. \_\_\_\_\_ If a girl engages in necking or petting and she lets things get out of hand, it is her own fault if her partner forces sex on her.
8. \_\_\_\_\_ Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve.
9. \_\_\_\_\_ A woman who is stuck-up and thinks she is too good to talk to guys on the street deserves to be taught a lesson.
10. \_\_\_\_\_ Many women have an unconscious wish to be raped, and may then unconsciously set up a situation in which they are likely to get attacked.
11. \_\_\_\_\_ 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.
12. What percentage of women who report a rape would you say are lying because they are angry and want to get back at the man they accuse? (circle one)

*Almost none    About a quarter    About half    About three quarters    Almost all*

13. What percentage of rapes of reported rapes would you guess were merely invented by women who discovered they were pregnant and wanted to protect their own reputations?  
(circle one)

*Almost none    About a quarter    About half    About three quarters    Almost all*

## Appendix D - Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI)

Listed below are a number of traits people commonly use in describing themselves. For each trait listed below, please indicate on a scale from 1 to 9 how well each trait **describes the victim or the victim's personality**.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
<i>Never or Almost Never True of the Victim</i>									<i>Always or Almost Always True of the Victim</i>										
_____									1. Ambitious	_____									13. Assertive
_____									2. Yielding	_____									14. Tender
_____									3. Has leadership abilities	_____									15. Willing to take risks
_____									4. Eager to soothe	_____									16. Gentle
_____									5. Defends own beliefs	_____									17. Individualistic
_____									6. Understanding	_____									18. Affectionate
_____									7. Strong personality	_____									19. Self-sufficient
_____									8. Compassionate	_____									20. Warm
_____									9. Willing to take a stand	_____									21. Independent
_____									10. Sensitive to the needs of others	_____									22. Soft-spoken
_____									11. Acts as a leader	_____									23. Self-reliant
_____									12. Sympathetic	_____									24. Shy



## Appendix E - Attitudes toward Women Scale-Short Form (AWS-S)

The statements listed below describe attitudes toward the role of women in society that different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions.

Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>					<i>Strongly Agree</i>			

1. \_\_\_\_\_ Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than of a man.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ Telling dirty jokes should be mostly a masculine prerogative.
5. \_\_\_\_\_ Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men.
6. \_\_\_\_\_ Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.
7. \_\_\_\_\_ It is insulting to women to have to the “obey” clause remain in the marriage service.
8. \_\_\_\_\_ There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.
9. \_\_\_\_\_ A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.
10. \_\_\_\_\_ Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.
11. \_\_\_\_\_ Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.
12. \_\_\_\_\_ Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.

13. \_\_\_\_\_ A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or have quite the same freedom of action as a man.
14. \_\_\_\_\_ Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.
15. \_\_\_\_\_ It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.
16. \_\_\_\_\_ In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.
17. \_\_\_\_\_ Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage, even their fiancés.
18. \_\_\_\_\_ The husband should not be favored by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.
19. \_\_\_\_\_ Women should be concerned with their duties of childbearing and house tending, rather than with desires for professional and business careers.
20. \_\_\_\_\_ The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.
21. \_\_\_\_\_ Economic and social freedom are worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity.
22. \_\_\_\_\_ On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than are men.
23. \_\_\_\_\_ There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.
24. \_\_\_\_\_ Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.
25. \_\_\_\_\_ The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.

## **Appendix F - Male Role Norms Scale (MRNS)**

The statements listed below describe attitudes toward the role of women in society that different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions.

Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>
<i><b>Strongly Disagree</b></i>					<i><b>Strongly Agree</b></i>			

### **Status Norms**

1. \_\_\_\_\_ Success in his work has to be a man's central goal in this life
2. \_\_\_\_\_ The best way for young men to get the respect of other people is to get a job, take it seriously, and do it well.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ A man owes it to his family to work at the best-paying job he can get.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ A man should generally work overtime to make more money whenever he has the chance.
5. \_\_\_\_\_ A man always deserves the respect of his wife and children.
6. \_\_\_\_\_ It is essential for a man to always have the respect and admiration of everyone who knows him.
7. \_\_\_\_\_ A man should never back down in the face of trouble.
8. \_\_\_\_\_ I always like a man who's totally sure of himself.
9. \_\_\_\_\_ A man should always think everything out coolly and logically, and have rational reasons for everything he does.
10. \_\_\_\_\_ A man should always try to project an air of confidence even if he really doesn't feel confident inside.
11. \_\_\_\_\_ A man must stand on his own two feet and never depend on other people to help him do things.

### **Toughness Norms**

12. \_\_\_\_\_ When a man is feeling a little pain he should try not to let it show very much.

13. \_\_\_\_\_ Nobody respects a man very much who frequently talks about his worries, fears, and problems.
14. \_\_\_\_\_ A good motto for a man would be “When the going gets tough, the tough get going.”
15. \_\_\_\_\_ I think a young man should try to become physically tough, even if he’s not big.
16. \_\_\_\_\_ Fists are sometimes the only way to get out of a bad situation.
17. \_\_\_\_\_ A real man enjoys a bit of danger now and then.
18. \_\_\_\_\_ In some kinds of situations a man should be ready to use his fists, even if his wife or girlfriend would object.
19. \_\_\_\_\_ A man should always refuse to get into a fight, even if there seems to be no way to avoid it.

### **Anti-Femininity Norms**

20. \_\_\_\_\_ It bothers me when a man does something that I consider “feminine.”
21. \_\_\_\_\_ A man whose hobbies are cooking, sewing, and going to the ballet probably wouldn’t appeal to me.
22. \_\_\_\_\_ It is a bit embarrassing for a man to have a job that is usually filled by a woman.
23. \_\_\_\_\_ Unless he was really desperate, I would probably advise a man to keep looking rather than accept a job as a secretary.
24. \_\_\_\_\_ If I heard about a man who was a hairdresser and a gourmet cook, I might wonder how masculine he was.
25. \_\_\_\_\_ I think it’s extremely good for a boy to be taught to cook, sew, clean the house, and take care of younger children.
26. \_\_\_\_\_ I might find it a little silly or embarrassing if a male friend of mine cried over a sad love scene in a movie.

## Appendix G - Social Dominance Orientation Scale (SDO)

Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9

*Disagree Very Strongly*

*Agree Very Strongly*

1. \_\_\_\_\_ Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.
5. \_\_\_\_\_ If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.
6. \_\_\_\_\_ It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.
7. \_\_\_\_\_ Inferior groups should stay in their place.
8. \_\_\_\_\_ Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.
9. \_\_\_\_\_ It would be good if groups could be equal
10. \_\_\_\_\_ Group equality should be our ideal.
11. \_\_\_\_\_ All groups should be given an equal chance in life.
12. \_\_\_\_\_ We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.
13. \_\_\_\_\_ Increased social equality.
14. \_\_\_\_\_ We would have fewer problems if we treated people more equally.
15. \_\_\_\_\_ We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible.
16. \_\_\_\_\_ No one group should dominate in society.

## Appendix H - Attitudes Toward Blacks Scale (ATB)

Please use the following scale to rate your level of agreement with the following statements by putting the appropriate number from 1 to 9 on each line.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<i>Not at all</i>				<i>Moderately</i>				<i>Very much</i>

1. \_\_\_\_ If a black were put in charge of me, I would not mind taking advice and direction from him or her.
2. \_\_\_\_ If I had a chance to introduce black visitors to my friends and neighbors, I would be pleased to do so.
3. \_\_\_\_ I would rather not have blacks live in the same apartment building I live in.
4. \_\_\_\_ I would probably feel somewhat self-conscious dancing with a black in a public place.
5. \_\_\_\_ I would not mind it at all if a black family with about the same income and education as me moved in next door.
6. \_\_\_\_ I think that black people look more similar to each other than white people do.
7. \_\_\_\_ Interracial marriage should be discouraged to avoid the “who-am-I?” confusion which the children feel.
8. \_\_\_\_ I get very upset when I hear a white make a prejudicial remark about blacks.
9. \_\_\_\_ I favor open housing laws that allow more racial integration of neighborhoods.
10. \_\_\_\_ It would not bother me if my new roommate was black.
11. \_\_\_\_ It is likely that blacks will bring violence to neighborhoods when they move in.
12. \_\_\_\_ I enjoy a funny racial joke, even if some people might find it offensive.
13. \_\_\_\_ The federal government should take decisive steps to override the injustices blacks suffer at the hands of local authorities.
14. \_\_\_\_ Black and white people are inherently equal.
15. \_\_\_\_ Black people are demanding too much too fast in their push for equal rights.
16. \_\_\_\_ Whites should support blacks in their struggle against discrimination and segregation.
17. \_\_\_\_ Generally, blacks are not as smart as whites.

18. \_\_\_\_\_ I worry that in the next few years I may be denied my application for a job or a promotion because of preferential treatment given to minority group members.
19. \_\_\_\_\_ Racial integration (of schools, businesses, residences, etc.) has benefited both whites and blacks.
20. \_\_\_\_\_ Some blacks are so touchy about race that it is difficult to get along with them.

## Appendix I - Racial Argument-Conclusion Scale (RAS)

Please read each of the following arguments and rate how well the argument supports the conclusion offered. Please answer honestly, and circle an answer for each argument. Remember that by indicating that an argument supports a conclusion, it does not necessarily indicate that you personally endorse the argument or its conclusion.

Please use the following scale to rate your level of agreement with the following statements by putting the appropriate number from 1 to 9 on each line.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<i>Not at all</i>				<i>Moderately</i>				<i>Very much</i>

1. Because the world is a diverse place with many different cultures and people, requiring college students to take courses such as African-American studies is a benefit to them. These courses provide students with better understandings of other ethnic groups, cultures, and value systems. This educational experience can enrich students' lives through cultural awareness.

Conclusion: Courses like African-American studies should be required in the education of all college students.

How much does the argument support the conclusion? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Experts have argued that SAT scores for African-Americans may be lower than for Whites due to the poorer opportunities available to African-Americans for education. However, the SAT is a valid predictor of college performance and no concessions should be made for African-Americans. Lower scores mean poorer performance, and a sliding scale would only promote future failure for African-Americans with low SAT scores regardless of why they get low SAT scores.



Conclusion: African-Americans should not be given leniency for low SAT scores in the college admissions process.

How much does the argument support the conclusion? \_\_\_\_\_

3. Articles written about athletes consistently describe White athletes as “intelligent”, “hard-working”, and “crafty”, and describe African-American athletes as “talented”, “flashy”, and “athletic”. These biased descriptions serve to promote the stereotype that African-American athletes are not as intelligent as White athletes, and fail to credit African-American athletes for their intelligence, discipline, and work ethics.

Conclusion: Biased descriptions of athletes should be avoided to stop perpetuating the stereotype that African-American athletes are less intelligent than White athletes.

How much does the argument support the conclusion? \_\_\_\_\_

4. Rodney King was the African-American motorist who was beaten by police officers in Los Angeles in an incident captured on video. The incident was broadcast as an unmotivated racial assault on King by the police, but this may not be entirely accurate. King was beaten following a long car chase and resisted arrest upon his capture, and the physical response by the police may have been somewhat warranted.

Conclusion: Rodney King may have at least partially provoked the beating he received from the Los Angeles police officers.

How much does the argument support the conclusion? \_\_\_\_\_

5. The United States government is built on a representative democracy which means that politicians are elected to represent their constituents in making the country’s decisions.

However, the political construction of power in the U.S. does not allow adequate representation of African-Americans as shown by the few African-American politicians who have attained political positions in the highest levels of our government.

Conclusion: The political parties should allow and support the rise of African-American politicians within the parties to guarantee fair representation of African-Americans in the government of this country.

How much does the argument support the conclusion? \_\_\_\_\_

6. It has been argued that welfare programs are too often exploited by African-Americans in this country. Welfare offices in every state appear packed with African-Americans applying for and collecting welfare benefits. These high numbers of African-American welfare recipients are disproportionate for their numbers in the general population, and other racial groups are suffering because they can not receive benefits.

Conclusion: The numbers of African-Americans receiving welfare should be limited to provide benefits for others.

How much does the argument support the conclusion? \_\_\_\_\_

7. Sickle cell anemia is a disease that is inherited by many African-American children. The disease is fatal, but research to combat the disease has not been as well-funded as research concerning ailments that influence Whites as well. The differences in funding are inexcusable, especially since sickle cell anemia is a deadly disease, killing many African-Americans every year.

Conclusion: Research to combat sickle cell anemia needs to be as well-funded as research for other diseases.

How much does the argument support the conclusion? \_\_\_\_\_

8. President Bill Clinton issued an apology to African-Americans for the institution of slavery that existed in this country over 130 years ago. Clinton’s apology was inappropriate because he and the present government have no connection with the long-abolished practice of slavery, and the apology may instead incite current tension in race relations.

Conclusion: President Clinton should not have apologized to African-Americans for slavery.

How much does the argument support the conclusion? \_\_\_\_\_

9. Christians celebrate Christmas, the Jewish celebrate Chanukah, and some African-Americans celebrate Kwanzaa, a holiday originating from African culture, during the winter “holiday season”. Many people had never heard about Kwanzaa until recently and suggest that, since it appears to be a “new” holiday, it must be a second-tier holiday seeking to emulate Christmas without much inherent significance.

Conclusion: Kwanzaa is not a holiday on the same level of importance as Christmas.

How much does the argument support the conclusion? \_\_\_\_\_

10. It has been shown that White Americans score 15 points higher on IQ tests than African-Americans. This difference in IQ scores has even been shown when other variables such as education levels and socioeconomic status are taken into account.

Conclusion: Whites are more intelligent than African-Americans.

How much does the argument support the conclusion? \_\_\_\_\_

11. “Waiting to Exhale” and other major motion pictures starring primarily African-American casts have been too infrequent in U.S. theaters. Too often African-American actors and actresses have been relegated to minor roles in Hollywood productions, or to roles as villains, and it is about time that African-Americans like Angela Bassett and Denzel Washington can achieve starring roles.

Conclusion: African-Americans should be represented in motion pictures in starring roles more frequently than they were in the past.

How much does the argument support the conclusion? \_\_\_\_\_

12. The United Negro College Fund helps to pay the tuition and expenses that allow African-Americans to go to college. While no doubt benefiting African-American students, this organization is unconstitutionally biased in that it does not offer financial assistance to White students as well. Meanwhile, thousands of White students continue to miss out on furthering their education due to financial limitations.

Conclusion: The United Negro College Fund should be forced, by law, to provide financial resources to both White and African-American students.

How much does the argument support the conclusion? \_\_\_\_\_

13. Recent educational studies have shown that African-Americans who do poorly in school may do so because of language difficulties and cultural differences. It has been argued that the use of familiar language and relevant cultural examples in the education of African-American children can help to improve the performances that African-American children show in school.

Conclusion: School systems should incorporate material into their curricula that is sensitive to African-American culture in order to better educate African-Americans.

How much does the argument support the conclusion?

\_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix J - Social Desirability Scale (SD)

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally.

Write “T” (for true) or “F” (for false) beside each item number to indicate your answers.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ I have never intensely disliked someone.
5. \_\_\_\_\_ On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.
6. \_\_\_\_\_ I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
7. \_\_\_\_\_ I am always careful about my manner of dress.
8. \_\_\_\_\_ My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.
9. \_\_\_\_\_ If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.
10. \_\_\_\_\_ On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability
11. \_\_\_\_\_ I like to gossip at times.
12. \_\_\_\_\_ There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
13. \_\_\_\_\_ No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
14. \_\_\_\_\_ I can remember “playing sick” to get out of something.
15. \_\_\_\_\_ There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
16. \_\_\_\_\_ I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
17. \_\_\_\_\_ I always try to practice what I preach.
18. \_\_\_\_\_ I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.
19. \_\_\_\_\_ I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.

20. \_\_\_\_\_ When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.
21. \_\_\_\_\_ I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
22. \_\_\_\_\_ At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.
23. \_\_\_\_\_ There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
24. \_\_\_\_\_ I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.
25. \_\_\_\_\_ I never resent being asked to return a favor.
26. \_\_\_\_\_ I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
27. \_\_\_\_\_ I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.
28. \_\_\_\_\_ There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
29. \_\_\_\_\_ I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
30. \_\_\_\_\_ I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
31. \_\_\_\_\_ I have never felt that I was punished without cause.
32. \_\_\_\_\_ I sometimes think when people have a misfortune that they only got what they deserve.
33. \_\_\_\_\_ I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

## Appendix K - Victim Perceptions Scale (VPS)

Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9

*Disagree Very Strongly*

*Agree Very Strongly*

1. \_\_\_\_\_ The individual who made the report is a less desirable person because he/she was raped.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ The individual who made the report may have claimed rape to protect his/her reputation.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ The individual who made the report is an innocent victim.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ The individual who made the report deserved to be raped.
5. \_\_\_\_\_ The individual who made the report may have put him/herself into a situation in which he/she was likely to be sexually assaulted because he/she has an unconscious wish to be raped.
6. \_\_\_\_\_ The individual who made the report should not blame him/herself for the rape.
7. \_\_\_\_\_ The perpetrator, not the victim, is responsible for the rape.
8. \_\_\_\_\_ The individual who made the report is to blame for the rape.
9. \_\_\_\_\_ The individual who made the report is responsible for the rape.



## **Appendix L - Contact Information for Local and National Sexual Assault Services**

If you, a friend, or family member has been a victim of sexual assault and/or rape, you can contact the following services for immediate help. These facilities are also capable of answering any questions you may have regarding sexual assault and/or rape.

Women's Center	532-6444
After Hours Emergency Phone: (785) 313-6344	
<a href="http://www.k-state.edu/womenscenter/">www.k-state.edu/womenscenter/</a>	
Lafene Women's Clinic	532-6544
Crisis Center	539-2785
	1-800-727-2785
Mercy Health Center	776-3322
National Sexual Assault Hotline	800-656-HOPE (800-656-4673)
	<a href="http://www.rainn.org">www.rainn.org</a> , <a href="mailto:info@rainn.org">info@rainn.org</a>
Kansas Coalition Against Sexual & Domestic Violence	785-232-9784
Statewide Crisis Hotline	800-400-8864
	888-END-ABUSE

Other resources include:

All Emergencies	911
K-State Police Department	532-6412
Riley County Police Department	537-2112
Office of Student Life	532-6220
Counseling Center	532-6927
KSU Student Attorney	532-6541

\*\* If you are a victim of sexual assault and/or rape DO NOT SHOWER OR CHANGE CLOTHES. Seek medical attention immediately to prevent pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases. If you suspect you have been drugged ask for a urine test to be taken. Date rape drugs leave the body quickly and need be tested for immediately following the assault.

NOTE: You do not have to file a police report to have a rape kit conducted in the state of Kansas. Ask for a specially trained SANE/SART nurse to perform the exam.

**Table 1 Means and Standard Deviations for Males and Females on the Measures**

Measure	Gender		Possible Range	Actual Range	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>
	Males	Females				
1. RMAS	2.07 (0.37)	1.90 (0.57)	1-5	1.00-3.08	1.59	79
2. AWS-S	4.30 (1.10)	3.30 (0.82)	1-9	1.36-7.48	4.68*	78
3. MRNS (Status)	6.31 (1.08)	4.90 (1.65)	1-9	1.82-8.91	4.26***	77
4. MRNS (Toughness)	6.25 (1.70)	4.02 (1.74)	1-9	1.00-9.00	5.74***	79
5. MRNS (Anti-femininity)	5.26 (1.54)	4.66 (1.60)	1-9	1.00-8.75	1.65	77
6. BSRI (Femininity)	5.37 (0.93)	5.39 (0.92)	1-9	3.08-7.75	-0.08	77
7. BSRI (Masculinity)	5.73 (1.03)	5.76 (1.41)	1-9	1.67-8.50	-0.08	78
8. SDO	4.36 (1.74)	3.30 (1.56)	1-9	1.00-8.50	2.81**	76
9. RAS	5.00 (1.10)	4.57 (0.83)	1-9	1.62-8.69	1.87	70
10. ATB	4.17 (1.29)	3.36 (1.35)	1-9	1.00-8.20	2.54*	67
11. SD	14.66 (5.19)	13.95 (5.31)	1-33	3.00-26.00	0.55	68
12. VPS	2.33 (0.78)	1.96 (0.95)	1-9	1.00-4.33	1.83	80
13. VPS (Blame)	2.03 (1.27)	1.79 (1.30)	1-9	1.00-7.00	0.83	81

14. VPS (Credibility)	3.83 (2.19)	2.81 (2.04)	1-9	1.00-9.00	2.17*	81
15. VPS (Denigration)	3.06 (2.18)	1.77 (1.36)	1-9	1.00-9.00	3.31***	81
16. VPS (Deservingness)	2.40 (1.11)	2.00 (1.25)	1-9	1.00-5.00	1.51	81
17. VPS (Responsibility)	1.57 (0.98)	1.51 (0.91)	1-9	1.00-5.00	0.30	80
18. VPS (Trivialization)	2.20 (1.91)	2.48 (2.24)	1-9	1.00-9.00	-0.60	81

---

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ . Standard deviations appear in parentheses after the means.

**Table 2 Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations among Predictive Measures**

Measure	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.	1.97	.050	---										
2.	3.73	1.07	.51***	---									
3.	5.47	1.60	.45***	.53***	---								
4.	4.96	2.04	.36**	.64***	.74***	---							
5.	4.91	1.59	.25*	.53***	.40***	.55***	---						
6.	5.38	0.92	-.07	-.18	-.00	-.17	-.18	---					
7.	5.75	1.26	-.24*	-.28*	-.01	-.08	-.37**	.38**	---				
8.	3.74	1.71	.44***	.59***	.44***	.58***	.61***	-.06	-.29*	---			
9.	4.75	0.97	.07	.31**	.10	.22	.38**	-.06	-.27*	.42***	---		
10	3.71	1.38	.54***	.64***	.40**	.47***	.69***	-.07	-.44***	.69***	.56***	---	
11.	14.24	5.23	.04	.02	.17	-.04	-.18	.01	-.02	-.07	-.10	-.13	---

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ . 1 = RMAS; 2 = AWS-S; 3 = MRNS (Status); 4 = MRNS (Toughness); 5 = MRNS (Anti-femininity); 6 = BSRI (Femininity); 7 = BSRI (Masculinity); 8 = SDO; 9 = RAS; 10 = ATB; 11 = SD

**Table 3 Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations among Dependent Measures and Social Desirability**

Measure	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	2.11	0.90	---							
2.	1.89	1.29	.68***	---						
3.	3.24	2.15	.63***	.25*	---					
4.	2.31	1.85	.52***	.11	.35**	---				
5.	2.17	1.20	.67***	.35**	.34**	.15	---			
6.	1.54	0.94	.73***	.45***	.36**	.32**	.44***	---		
7.	2.36	2.10	.48***	.26*	.10	.17	.13	.19	---	
8.	14.24	5.23	.05	-.13	.02	-.08	.10	.06	.14	---

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ . 1 = VPS; 2 = VPS (Blame); 3 = VPS (Credibility); 4 = VPS (Denigration); 5 = VPS (Deservingness); 6 = VPS (Responsibility); 7 = VPS (Trivialization); 8 = SD

**Table 4 Means and Standard Deviations by Condition on all Measures**

Measure	Condition		Possible Range	Actual Range
	White Victim	Black Victim		
1. RMAS	2.06 (0.55)	1.89 (0.44)	1-5	1.00-3.08
2. AWS-S	4.02 (1.21)	3.47 (0.79)	1-9	1.36-7.48
3. MRNS (Status)	5.75 (1.62)	5.50 (1.40)	1-9	1.82-8.91
4. MRNS (Toughness)	5.29 (2.17)	4.51 (2.00)	1-9	1.00-9.00
5. MRNS (Anti-femininity)	4.93 (1.74)	4.92 (1.67)	1-9	1.00-8.75
6. BSRI (Femininity)	5.48 (1.01)	5.61 (0.89)	1-9	3.08-7.75
7. BSRI (Masculinity)	5.67 (1.08)	6.08 (1.36)	1-9	1.67-8.50
8. SDO	3.94 (1.85)	3.50 (1.69)	1-9	1.00-8.50
9. RAS	4.91 (0.96)	4.53 (0.81)	1-9	1.62-8.69
10. ATB	3.85 (1.51)	3.48 (1.26)	1-9	1.00-8.20
11. SD	15.03 (4.76)	14.14 (6.09)	1-33	3.00-26.00
12. VPS	2.07 (0.93)	2.16 (0.87)	1-9	1.00-4.33
13. VPS (Blame)	1.95 (1.33)	1.79 (1.24)	1-9	1.00-7.00

14. VPS (Credibility)	2.90 (2.07)	3.58 (2.23)	1-9	1.00-9.00
15. VPS (Denigration)	2.24 (1.62)	2.38 (2.11)	1-9	1.00-9.00
16. VPS (Deservingness)	2.30 (1.28)	2.04 (1.13)	1-9	1.00-5.00
17. VPS (Responsibility)	1.55 (0.91)	1.53 (0.97)	1-9	1.00-5.00
18. VPS (Trivialization)	1.93 (1.57)	2.75 (2.48)	1-9	1.00-9.00

---

*Note.* Standard deviations appear in parentheses after the means.



**Table 5 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Overall VPS Composite**

Step and predictor variables	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
Step 1	.007	.007	
Sex			-.085
Step 2	.462***	.455***	
RMAS			.283
AWS-S			.428*
MRNS (Status)			-.066
MRNS (Toughness)			.124
MRNS (Anti-femininity)			-.068
BSRI (Femininity)			-.216

	BSRI (Masculinity)			-0.131
	SDO			-0.132
	RAS			-0.159
	ATB			0.148
	SD			0.091
Step 3		.681	.001	
	Condition			0.038
Step 4		.682	.001	
	Condition x Sex			-0.082
Step 5		.743	.088	
	Condition x RMAS			0.204

Condition x AWS-S	.145
Condition x MRNS (Status)	-.225
Condition x MRNS (Toughness)	.128
Condition x MRNS (Anti-femininity)	.361
Condition x BSRI (Femininity)	.092
Condition x BSRI (Masculinity)	.070
Condition x SDO	.191
Condition x RAS	-.222
Condition x ATB	-.515
Condition x SD	.080

---

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table 6 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Victim Denigration**

Step and predictor variables	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
Step 1	.072*	.072*	
Sex			-.268*
Step 2	.186	.114	
RMAS			.113
AWS-S			-.065
MRNS (Status)			-.239
MRNS (Toughness)			.091
MRNS (Anti-femininity)			.188
BSRI (Femininity)			-.119

BSRI (Masculinity)				-0.017
SDO				.026
RAS				-.148
ATB				.209
SD				-.003
Step 3		.195	.009	
Condition				-.106
Step 4		.203	.008	
Condition x Sex				.197
Step 5		.431	.228	
Condition x RMAS				.097

Condition x AWS-S	.204
Condition x MRNS (Status)	.731
Condition x MRNS (Toughness)	-1.025*
Condition x MRNS (Anti-femininity)	.225
Condition x BSRI (Femininity)	-.321
Condition x BSRI (Masculinity)	.253
Condition x SDO	.169
Condition x RAS	.508
Condition x ATB	-.781
Condition x SD	-.223

---

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table 7 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Victim Credibility**

Step and predictor variables	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
Step 1	.032	.032	
Sex			-.179
Step 2	.453**	.421**	
RMAS			.162
AWS-S			.461*
MRNS (Status)			.069
MRNS (Toughness)			-.112
MRNS (Anti-femininity)			-.166
BSRI (Femininity)			-.191

	BSRI (Masculinity)									-0.032
	SDO									-0.268
	RAS									.321
	ATB									.146
	SD									.018
Step 3										
	Condition									.286*
Step 4										
	Condition x Sex									-0.038
Step 5										
	Condition x RMAS									.053



Condition x AWS-S	.235
Condition x MRNS (Status)	-.275
Condition x MRNS (Toughness)	.456
Condition x MRNS (Anti-femininity)	-.134
Condition x BSRI (Femininity)	.176
Condition x BSRI (Masculinity)	-.031
Condition x SDO	.070
Condition x RAS	-.143
Condition x ATB	-.216
Condition x SD	.198

---

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table 8 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Victim Trivialization**

---

Step and predictor variables	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
Step 1	.032	.032	
Sex			.179
Step 2	.305	.273	
RMAS			-.006
AWS-S			.053
MRNS (Status)			.446
MRNS (Toughness)			.063
MRNS (Anti-femininity)			-.117
BSRI (Femininity)			-.047

---

BSRI (Masculinity)			-0.128
SDO			-0.012
RAS			-0.240
ATB			.140*
SD			.106
Step 3	.308	.003	
Condition			.059
Step 4	.327	.019	
Condition x Sex			.292
Step 5	.609*	.282*	
Condition x RMAS			-0.171

Condition x AWS-S	-139
Condition x MRNS (Status)	-462
Condition x MRNS (Toughness)	.380
Condition x MRNS (Anti-femininity)	.319
Condition x BSRI (Femininity)	.051
Condition x BSRI (Masculinity)	-.054
Condition x SDO	.704**
Condition x RAS	-.469
Condition x ATB	.334
Condition x SD	.297

---

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table 9 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Victim Blame**

Step and predictor variables	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
Step 1	.011	.011	
Sex			-.106
Step 2	.368*	.357*	
RMAS			.339*
AWS-S			.498*
MRNS (Status)			-.086
MRNS (Toughness)			.194
MRNS (Anti-femininity)			-.268
BSRI (Femininity)			-.047

	BSRI (Masculinity)									-042
	SDO									-102
	RAS									-282
	ATB									.027
	SD									-173
Step 3										
	Condition									
Step 4										
	Condition x Sex									
Step 5										
	Condition x RMAS									

Condition x AWS-S	-0.328
Condition x MRNS (Status)	-0.671*
Condition x MRNS (Toughness)	.788*
Condition x MRNS (Anti-femininity)	.441
Condition x BSRI (Femininity)	-0.074
Condition x BSRI (Masculinity)	.134
Condition x SDO	.077
Condition x RAS	-0.747**
Condition x ATB	-0.116
Condition x SD	-0.011

---

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table 10 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Victim Deservingness**

Step and predictor variables	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
Step 1	.022	.022	
Sex			-.150
Step 2	.245	.222	
RMAS			.177
AWS-S			.165
MRNS (Status)			-.086
MRNS (Toughness)			-.068
MRNS (Anti-femininity)			.101
BSRI (Femininity)			-.200



	BSRI (Masculinity)			-0.162
	SDO			-0.064
	RAS			-0.057
	ATB			.021
	SD			.160
Step 3		.249	.004	
	Condition			-0.069
Step 4		.267	.018	
	Condition x Sex			-0.286
Step 5		.382	.116	
	Condition x RMAS			.390

Condition x AWS-S	.267
Condition x MRNS (Status)	-.023
Condition x MRNS (Toughness)	-.452
Condition x MRNS (Anti-femininity)	.439
Condition x BSRI (Femininity)	.195
Condition x BSRI (Masculinity)	-.005
Condition x SDO	-.143
Condition x RAS	.188
Condition x ATB	-.739
Condition x SD	.157

---

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table 11 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Victim Responsibility**

---

Step and predictor variables	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
Step 1	.019	.019	
Sex			.139
Step 2	.299	.279	
RMAS			.368*
AWS-S			.284
MRNS (Status)			-.315
MRNS (Toughness)			.177
MRNS (Anti-femininity)			.030
BSRI (Femininity)			-.140

---

	BSRI (Masculinity)			-0.114
	SDO			.111
	RAS			-0.185
	ATB			-0.254
	SD			.072
Step 3		.301	.003	
	Condition			-0.056
Step 4		.301	.000	
	Condition x Sex			-0.028
Step 5		.359	.058	
	Condition x RMAS			-0.050

Condition x AWS-S	.405
Condition x MRNS (Status)	.099
Condition x MRNS (Toughness)	.078
Condition x MRNS (Anti-femininity)	.087
Condition x BSRI (Femininity)	.151
Condition x BSRI (Masculinity)	.062
Condition x SDO	-.245
Condition x RAS	-.060
Condition x ATB	-.289
Condition x SD	-.044

---

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .