

379  
N81  
NO. 6377

ATTRIBUTION OF BLAME TOWARD THE RAPE VICTIM

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the  
North Texas State University in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Deborah Gail Schult, B.A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1987

Deborah G. Schult, Attribution of Blame Toward the Rape Victim. Master of Arts (Counseling Psychology), August 1987, 94 pp., 25 tables, references, 20 titles.

This study investigated the impact of victim provocative-ness and rape history upon male and female subjects' perceptions of attribution of blame toward the rape victim. One hundred and forty-four subjects (a) read one of 12 fictional case reports of a rape incident from a sexual abuse center which systematically varied level of victim provocativeness and rape history and (b) completed a nine-item Rape Questionnaire (RQ). Data were analyzed by a 2 (subject's sex) x 3 (level of provocativeness) x 2 (rape history) analysis of variance on the Rape Questionnaire total score. An ancillary multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) was also performed on the nine Rape Questionnaire items to check for potential masking of individual item differences from the Rape Questionnaire score. In addition, the data were reanalyzed in the 2 x 3 x 2 design by substituting high versus low scorers on the Attitudes Towards Women Scale (AWS) based upon median splits of the AWS for subject sex.

The 2 (subject sex) x 3 (provocativeness) x 2 (rape history) MANOVA resulted in a sex by provocativeness interaction with males, relative to females, attributing

more blame as the victim's level of provocativeness increased. In addition, significant differences emerged for provocativeness, rape history, and sex of subject. In general, subjects attributed more blame as the victim's provocativeness increased. Similarly, victims with rape histories were assigned more blame than victims without rape histories.

The 2 (AWS) x 3 (provocativeness) x 2 (rape history) MANOVA resulted in a main effect for all three independent variables. In general subjects attributed more blame as the victim's provocativeness increased. Also victims with rape histories were assigned more blame than victims without rape histories. Finally, profeminist individuals attributed less blame to the victim than did traditional individuals.

Implications for training of professional counselors and other service-providers are discussed. Future research directions are also noted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
ATTRIBUTION OF BLAME TOWARD RAPE VICTIMS	
CHAPTER	
I. Introduction. . . . .	1
Rape Victims	
Role of Provocativeness	
Victim's Sexual History	
Sex of Subject	
Rationale	
Purpose of the Study	
II. Method. . . . .	34
Subjects	
Measures	
Procedures	
III. Results . . . . .	41
Check Items	
Principal Analyses	
Ancillary Analyses	
IV. Discussion. . . . .	66
Appendices . . . . .	75
References . . . . .	92

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Means and Standard Deviations of Scenarios Listed in Ascending Order from Low to High Provocativeness . . . . .	83
2. Results of ANOVA for Scenario by Sex. . . . .	85
3. Results of the Duncan Range Test. . . . .	86
4. Numbers and Percentages of Subjects Selecting the Correct Responses to Check Items 1 Through 5 Based Upon the Case Reports Read. . . . .	90
5. Numbers and Percentages of Subjects Selecting the Correct Response to Check Item 4 Listed by Sex and Total Number of Subjects. . . . .	42
6. Numbers and Percentages of Subjects Selecting the Correct Response to Check Item 5 Listed by Sex and Total Number of Subjects. . . . .	43
7. Means and Standard Deviations for Subject Responses on Rape Questionnaire Total Scores by the Victim's Level of Provocativeness and Rape History. . . . .	44
8. ANOVA for Attribution of Blame Toward the Victim for Sex, Provocativeness, and Rape History. . . . .	45
9. Means and Standard Deviations of Rape Questionnaire Total Scores for Provocativeness Main Effects . . . . .	45
10. Means and Standard Deviations of Rape Questionnaire Total Scores for Rape History . . . . .	46
11. MANOVA for Attribution of Blame Toward the Victim for Level of Provocativeness, Rape History and Sex of Subject. . . . .	47
12. Means and Standard Deviations for Sex by Provocativeness Interaction for Rape Questionnaire Item 1. . . . .	49

## LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Page

13.	Means and Standard Deviations for Sex by Provocativeness Interaction for Rape Questionnaire Item 7. . . . .	50
14.	Univariate F Tests for Sex. . . . .	51
15.	Univariate F Tests for Provocativeness. . . . .	52
16.	Univariate F Tests for Rape History . . . . .	54
17.	Means and Standard Deviations for Subject Responses on Rape Questionnaire Total Scores by the Victim's Level of Provocativeness and Rape History . . . . .	56
18.	ANOVA for Attribution of Blame Toward the Victim for AWS, Provocativeness and Rape History . . . . .	57
19.	Means and Standard Deviations of Rape Questionnaire Total Scores for Provocativeness Main Effect. . . . .	57
20.	Means and Standard Deviations of Rape Questionnaire Total Scores for Rape History Main Effect . . . . .	58
21.	Means and Standard Deviations of Rape Questionnaire Total Scores for AWS Main Effect. . . . .	59
22.	MANOVA for Attribution of Blame Toward the Victim for Level of Provocativeness, Rape History and AWS . . . . .	60
23.	Univariate F Tests for AWS. . . . .	61
24.	Univariate F Tests for Provocativeness. . . . .	62
25.	Univariate F Tests for Rape History . . . . .	64

## ATTRIBUTION OF BLAME TOWARD THE RAPE VICTIM

The FBI's most recent Uniform Crime Report ("Crime Rate," 1985) indicates that the number of crimes reported to police during the first half of 1985 rose three percent. During this six month period, reported murders fell by two percent while violent crime overall went up four percent and property crime increased by three percent. Reported rapes rose by seven percent. A broader and more reliable gauge of crime than the Uniform Crime Reports is the Bureau of Justice Statistics' National Crime Survey ("Crime Rate," 1985). The Crime Survey is generally thought to be a more thorough index of crime because it includes crimes that are not reported to the police. It has been estimated that only approximately 35 percent of crimes are reported to the police. Bureau director, Steven R. Schlesinger ("Crime Rate," 1985) comments

It is particularly encouraging that the victimization rate for every major crime we measure with the exception of rape (italics added) has declined significantly during the past three years. (p. 1B)

According to the National Crime Survey, ("Crime Rate," 1985) the rape victimization rate for females 12 years of age and older increased to one and six tenths incidents

per one thousand females in 1984, compared to one and three tenths incidents per one thousand females in the preceding year. Rape is a crime of violence (Amir, 1971) that occurs in this country every six minutes. One out of every one thousand females will be raped this year. Any woman regardless of place of residence, social or economic class, age, or appearance can be a victim of rape. Amir (1971) found that in 87 percent of all rapes, the rapist either carries a weapon or threatens the victim with death. Roughness occurs in 29 percent of the crimes, non-brutal beatings in 25 percent, brutal beatings in 20 percent, and choking in 12 percent of all rapes.

Undoubtedly rape is a nonnormative event in a woman's life. The actual act of rape is often intended to degrade or humiliate the victim: objects such as bottles, gun barrels, or sticks may be thrust into her vagina or anus; she may be forced to swallow urine or sperm; her breasts may be bitten or burned. Often the victim's primary concern is saving her life, not her chastity. In some cases the victim escapes without external signs of injury, but she may suffer vaginal tears, infections, contract venereal disease or become impregnated. Very often, the victim suffers for months or years afterwards (Holmstrom & Burgess, 1975).

For most women, the post-rape experience can be as devastating and threatening as the actual rape. Often times by implication she risks further trauma if she chooses to



report her offense to authorities. She must relate her account to police officers, medical personnel, counselors, and prosecutors. If a suspect is arrested, she might be subjected to direct and cross-examination at a preliminary hearing and trial.

Holmstrom and Burgess (1975) have documented a syndrome which often results from rape. This syndrome includes an acute phase of disorganization of the victim's life style and long-term process of reorganization of her life style.

The acute phase includes many physical symptoms such as muscular tension, sleep disturbances, and a wide range of emotional reactions. The long-term process includes change in lifestyle such as changing residences, dealing with repetitive nightmares and phobias, and learning how to trust people again.

Public attitudes toward rape and the rape victim have appeared to affect the victim in a variety of ways. These attitudes often impact upon the rape victim from the initial stages of deciding whether to report the crime or remain silent, through the victim's feelings of self-esteem, general psychological adjustment following the rape, and immediate and long term effects on the victim's behavior patterns (Resick, Calhoun, Atkeson & Ellis, 1981; Holmstrom & Burgess, 1978).

Public interest in the crime of rape has been generated by activists in the women's movement. As the issues

concerning forcible sexual assault and the subsequent treatment of the victim by the criminal justice system have been exposed to public scrutiny, these issues have become the subject of media dramatizations as well as discussions in public schools, churches, and civic organizations. This attention has created an atmosphere conducive to the reform of rape legislation, the development of more rigorous procedures for rape enforcement, and an insistence on more sensitive treatment of victims by agents of the criminal justice system and the medical profession. In addition to changes in the fabric of social institutions, rape crisis lines, victim advocacy services, and mental health services have been established to assist victims in communities throughout the United States.

Due to public interest in the crime of rape, research in this area has proliferated during recent years. National studies contributed to the identification and understanding of the dynamics of rape, the circumstances under which such offenses usually occur, the social and psychological implications of victimization, needed legislative change and improvement in the treatment of victims and the enforcement of rape statutes.

#### Rape Victims

Recent studies on rape reflect the growing concern regarding the rape victim. One controversial issue surrounding the role of a rape victim is whether or not the

victim was "asking" for or provoked the rape in some way. An example of the devaluation of the victim promoted by this opinion is documented in the Report of the Task Force on Sex Bias and Sex-Role Stereotyping in Psychotherapeutic Practice (American Psychological Association, 1975). One individual comments,

A psychoanalytically oriented male therapist, with some agreement from some of the other male (therapists), insisted that there was no such thing as rape--that the women always "asked" for it in some way. (p. 1172)

The rape victim then seems to be blamed for the offense committed against her. Many attribute blame to the victim and view her as somehow contributing to the rape. One way that individuals can justify this view is to perceive the victim as behaving in a sexually provocative manner.

#### Role of Provocativeness

One of the earlier studies examining the role of victim's provocativeness was conducted by Scroggs (1976), who looked at penalties assigned for rape as a function of the victim's provocativeness and amount of damage suffered by the victim. In his study, Scroggs varied victim provocativeness as a function of the woman's attire and victim damage as a function of whether or not a pregnancy resulted from the rape. The specific hypotheses examined were (a) the rapist of a provocatively dressed woman will receive a lighter sentence, especially from male subjects and in

particular from older male subjects; and (b) the rapist who damages the victim (i.e., impregnates the victim) will receive a more severe sentence, especially from the female subjects.

Using a between-subjects design, participants evaluated one of four hypothetical cases of rape which crossed degrees of provocativeness overtypes of resulting victim damage: (a) provocatively dressed victim/damage; (b) provocatively dressed victim/no damage; (c) non-provocatively dressed victim/damage and (d) non-provocatively dressed victim/no damage. Participants were asked to "sentence" the rapist according to a 9-point Likert-type scale, with lower scores indicating a more lenient sentence and higher scores indicating a harsher sentence. Subjects were also asked to administer one of two randomly selected cases to a parent and a grandparent.

Main effects for the provocation effect approached significance in the expected direction--that is, rapists of provocative victims tended to be given more lenient sentences than did rapists of nonprovocative victims. No significant differences between the sexes were noted. However, there was a significant main effect for age, with older subjects assigning more severe penalties ( $p < .05$ ), as well as a significant main effect for damage ( $p < .01$ ) and a significant interaction of age with damage ( $p < .01$ ). Older subjects assigned higher penalties for the rapist if he impregnated the victim, whereas younger subjects assigned virtually the same penalty regardless of whether the victim was impregnated or not. No other interactions were significant.

In a later study conducted in India, Kanekar and Kolsawalla (1981) investigated perceptions of the victim's role in a rape by focusing on the degree of blame attributed to the victim. They hypothesized that the attribution of blame to the victim is a function of her respectability and sexual provocativeness, as well as the respectability of the rapist. Variations in the descriptions of a rapist and victim were used to manipulate the experimental variables in a 2 (subject sex) x 2 (married vs. divorced victim) x 2 (provocative vs. unprovocative victim) x 2 (married vs. divorced rapist) design. Marital status was used as the index of respectability since it has been established that a married person in India--either male or female--is considered more respectable than one who is divorced. The victim's level of provocativeness was varied by describing her as either dressed or not dressed in a sexually provocative manner.

The dependent measures were the blame attributed to the rape victim and the length of imprisonment recommended for the rapist. Subjects rated the degree of blame attributed to the rape victim on a twenty-one-point scale from -10 ("Not at all her fault") to +10 ("Totally her fault") and assigned length of imprisonment for the rapist on a scale of zero to 45 years.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for attributed blame showed a main effect for victim's provocativeness ( $p < .001$ ), with

the provocative victim blamed more than the unprovocative victim. A significant triple interaction effect was found involving subject's sex, victim's respectability and victim's provocativeness ( $p < .05$ ). The only significant difference between male and female subjects was in the married unprovocative victim condition, where male subjects attributed greater blame than female subjects ( $p < .01$ ).

ANOVA of the years of imprisonment recommended for the rapist showed main effects of subject's sex ( $p < .005$ ) and victim's provocativeness ( $p < .005$ ). Longer imprisonment was recommended by female subjects than by male subjects, and longer imprisonment was recommended when the victim was unprovocative rather than provocative. No effects were found on either the victim's responsibility or rapist's punishment when the respectability of the rapist was considered.

Kanekar, Kolsawalla, and D'Souza (1981) presented two further experiments, the first of which looked at the social status of both the rapist and the rape victim and also the victim's sexual provocativeness. They investigated the effects these two variables had on the attribution of blame to the victim for her own rape and the punishment recommended for the rapist. A higher social status was expected to favor the person concerned and to be detrimental to the other person involved. For example, it was hypothesized that a situation in which a high-status victim who was violated by a low-status rapist would be more socially repugnant than a

situation in which a low-status victim was violated by a high-status rapist. Thus the major focus of this study was the possible interaction between victim's status and victim's provocativeness. Social status was defined according to social class: namely upper or lower.

Male and female Indian graduate students read a description of a rape incident and indicated the length of imprisonment they would recommend for the rapist on a scale ranging from zero to 45 years. They also indicated the extent to which they felt the victim was at fault, using a 21-point Likert-type scale ranging from -10 (Not at all her fault") to +10 ("Totally her fault").

The rapist and victim were described as coming either from an upper middle class family or from a lower working class family. The provocative victim was described as dressed in a sexually provocative manner, while this description was omitted in the case of the unprovocative victim. Thus, the study employed a 2 (subject's sex) x 2 (upper middle class vs. lower working class status rapist) x 2 (upper middle class vs. lower working class status victim) x 2 (provocative vs. unprovocative victim) factorial design.

ANOVA for years of recommended imprisonment for the rapist revealed no significant effects. A nearly significant interaction between victim's status and victim's provocativeness was found; that is subjects tended to recommend longer imprisonment for the rapist with the low-status

unprovocative victim than with the low-status provocative victim. A significant main effect of victim's provocative-ness emerged in the blame attributed to the victim for her own rape ( $p < .001$ ). There was a significant triple interaction among subject's sex, victim's status, and victim's provocativeness ( $p < .05$ ). In all conditions relevant to this interaction, the provocative victim was seen as more at fault than was the unprovocative victim. However, this difference was significant only for the low-status victim in the case of male subjects ( $p < .025$ ) and for the high status victim in the case of female subjects ( $p < .001$ ).

In their second experiment, Kanekar et al. (1981) investigated the distinction between causal and moral responsibility as attributed to a rape victim. An analogy was employed to explain the distinction. The example given was of a blind man falling into a ditch as being an instance of causal responsibility, whereas an inebriated man falling into a ditch would be an instance of moral responsibility.

Male and female Indian undergraduates were given written case accounts of a rape which varied only in the description of the victim. The study utilized a 2 (subject's sex) x 2 (married vs. divorced victim) x 2 (attractive x unattractive victim) x 2 (provocative vs. unprovocative victim) factorial design.

After reading the report of the rape, subjects indicated the length of recommended imprisonment for the rapist on a



scale ranging from zero to 45 years. The second item instructed the subjects to assume they had the same information as provided above except for the occurrence of the rape itself and asked them to indicate the likelihood that a rape would occur given the above circumstances. The responses to this item were recorded on a 21-point scale ranging from -10 ("Not at all likely") to +10 ("Extremely likely").

A significant main effect was found for subject's sex for years of imprisonment recommended for the rapist ( $p < .005$ ), with female subjects recommending longer imprisonment than male subjects. A significant main effect of subject's sex ( $p < .025$ ), as well as significant main effect of victim's provocativeness ( $p < .001$ ) and a significant interaction between subject's sex and victim's attractiveness ( $p < .05$ ) were found for likelihood of rape for the provocative victim. Female subjects indicated a greater likelihood of rape than did male subjects, but this difference was significant only in the case of the unattractive victim ( $p < .005$ ).

Best and Demin (1982) looked at victim's provocativeness and victim's attractiveness as determinants of blame in rape. They proposed two purposes for their research: (a) to examine the extent that judgments of blame attributed to the victim are dependent upon the victim's attractiveness, independent of victim's behavior, and (b) to examine the effects of victim's attractiveness and provocation upon the blame assigned to the rapist.

First, an independent sample of undergraduate men and women evaluated the victim's provocativeness on a five-point Likert-type scale as described in two hypothetical stories depicting events prior to a rape. One story described the victim's pre-rape behavior as drinking alone in a bar, while the other story described the victim's pre-rape behavior as studying alone in a library. The difference in the degree of provocativeness was statistically significant ( $p < .01$ ), with the behavior of the victim drinking alone in the bar being rated more provocative than the victim studying alone in the library.

The experimental subjects read an expanded version of the two stories previously rated for degree of provocativeness. This version described the victim as quite attractive or unattractive, resulting in four stories in which attractiveness and provocativeness were completely crossed. Each of these stories were presented to the subjects along with two five-point rating scales in which the subject was asked to evaluate the degree of blame the victim and rapist should be assigned for precipitating the rape.

A multivariate analysis of variance was performed on the ratings of the victim's and rapist's blameworthiness. The analysis indicated a main effect for provocativeness ( $p < .01$ ). There was no significant interaction between attractiveness and provocativeness. Analysis of covariance on the ratings of the victim's blameworthiness, using the ratings of

rapist blameworthiness as the covariate, showed the provocative victims being blamed significantly more than nonprovocative victims ( $p < .01$ ). A second analysis of covariance on the rating of the rapist's blameworthiness, using the ratings of the victim's blameworthiness as a covariate, indicated that rapists were blamed significantly less when their victims were provocative than when they were not provocative ( $p < .01$ ).

The studies discussed suggest that provocative victims are attributed more blame for the rape than are nonprovocative victims. Consistent with this finding is that the rapist of a provocative victim is blamed less and sentenced more leniently than a rapist of a nonprovocative victim. Females tend to recommend stiffer penalties for a rapist than do males. However, caution in generalizing on the basis of the work of Kanaker and associates (1981) is necessary since cultural differences may account for some of their findings.

#### Victim's Sexual History

Legally, rape is defined solely by the victim's nonconsent to intercourse. However, recent studies reveal the tendency of the general public to incorporate a variety of extra-legal factors in their perceptions of rape victims, such as prior chastity (Berger, 1977) and victim-rapist relationship (Krulewitz, 1982). One such factor concerns the sexual history of the victim. The rape victim's

position is somewhat unique in that she is not the active agent in the offense but rather the target against which the assault is directed. Yet she may be attributed blame for the rape if she is perceived to possess qualities which make her a more likely target for the assault (Cann, Calhoun, & Selby, 1979). That sexual history is an important factor is evident in Amir's (1971) work, in which one theorist proposed that a victim's "bad reputation" be considered as a precipitating factor in inducing her rape. One result of this type of logic is that a victim with a sexual history might be perceived as possessing qualities sufficient for inducing a rape, and therefore will be held accountable for a greater degree of blame. The negative implications of this viewpoint include potential emotional harm to the victim due to self and other condemnation, as well as a reduced likelihood of conviction of the rapist.

Cann et al. (1979) examined the impact of the victim's sexual history. College males and females read one of five versions of a newspaper article describing the first day of a rape trial. The first three paragraphs of the article were identical in all accounts. The final paragraph was varied to create five information conditions describing the victim's past sexual experience. In two conditions, the sexual experience information was explicit, indicating an active or inactive past. In three other conditions, no explicit information was presented, but the reason was varied as follows:

(a) the victim refused to testify, (b) the judge refused to allow testimony, or (c) no mention was made of sexual experience.

A questionnaire consisting of 16 items assessed participants' reactions to the account. Six nine-point scales were combined to form an index of liking for the victim. A single 10-point scale required the subjects to divide the blame for the incident so that both victim and rapist were assigned a percentage of the total blame. Two six-point items assessed the reactions to the accused rapist (to what extent was he at fault and how severely should he be punished). Six six-point items probed the perceptions of the victim. Finally, a six-point item asked the subjects to indicate how much sexual experience the victim had had prior to the rape, from "very little" to "a lot." This served as a manipulation check for the sexually active conditions, and also allowed for assessment of the assumptions subjects made when no explicit information was provided.

The main effect for the five information conditions was the only significant effect on the perceived sexual experience item ( $p < .0001$ ). Utilizing a Newman-Keuls comparison of all pairs of means, several patterns concerning the perceived sexual experience were observed. The victim in the "sexually inactive" information condition received a significantly lower rating on the sexual experience variable than victims in other information conditions. The remaining two

information conditions in which the "judge refused" to allow testimony and in which "no mention" was made of sexual experience, received moderate ratings, differing significantly from the extreme information conditions but not from one another. This indicates that the active-inactive manipulation was highly successful.

The two items dealing with perceptions of the accused rapist yielded only borderline main effects for sex of subject. Females viewed the rapist as more at fault for what happened and as deserving of more severe punishment than did males ( $p < .06$ ).

The item dealing with the believability of the victim's testimony produced no significant effects. Neither sexual experience information nor sex of subject influenced the perceived credibility of the victim's account of the incident.

Main effects for subject sex revealed that males, in comparison to females, saw the victim's behavior as contributing more to her rape, perceived the victim as more at fault, and viewed the victim as having a greater "unconscious desire" to be raped ( $p < .03$ ).

Consistent with other findings, significant main effects suggest that males viewed the victim as "the type of person" who gets herself into these situations and as more likely to have caused the rape through her behaviors than did females ( $p < .02$ ).

On the "type of person" question, a significant effect was found for the victim in the "refuses to testify" information condition in that she was seen as the "type of person" who gets into these situations, and as being most likely to have caused the rape through her suggestive behavior ( $p < .05$ ). In addition, the victim in the "sexually active" information condition was perceived as the "type of person" more so than the victims in the "no mention," "sexually inactive" or "judge refuses" information conditions ( $p < .05$ ). A significant main effect on the measure of "liking" showed that the victims in the "sexually active" and "victim refuses" information conditions were liked least, while the victims in the "no mention" and "judge refuses" information conditions were liked most ( $p < .02$ ).

An analysis of the assignment of relative blame yielded significant main effects for sex of subject and sexual experience information. The main effect for sex indicated that females assigned significantly less blame to the victim than did males ( $p < .009$ ).

Evaluation of the sexual experience information main effect revealed that in the "victim refuses" information condition, the victim was assigned relatively more blame than the average of the other information conditions ( $p < .01$ ). In the "sexually active" information condition, the victim was not assigned significantly greater blame than the average of the other three information conditions. The

victim in the "judge refuses" information condition was assigned less relative blame than the victims in the "sexually inactive" or "no mention" information conditions ( $p < .01$ ). When the victim refused to testify, she was assigned the greatest degree of blame, but if the judge disallowed the information the victim was assigned the least amount of blame for her own victimization.

In a later study, L'Armand and Pepitone (1982) hypothesized that (a) judgments as to the seriousness of the rape would be inversely related to the extent of the victim's sexual history (i.e., the rape will be judged less seriously for the more sexually experienced victim, and more seriously for the less sexually experienced victim); and (b) the rape would be deemed a less serious offense when the rapist and victim were involved in a dating or intimate relationship.

These investigators had university men and women make judgements concerning the crime presented in a simulated newspaper article entitled, "Jury Convicts in Rape Trial." Each article had four paragraphs containing the following information: (a) a guilty verdict and the ages of the victim and rapist as 20 and 27 respectively; (b) the man's defense testimony that the woman had consented; (c) the victim's denial of the consent; and (d) the circumstances of the arrest.



The independent variables were (a) sexual history of the victim; (b) victim-rapist relationship and (c) validity of victim testimony. The factorial design resulting from manipulation of these variables was a 3 (no mention of sexual history vs. one previous sexual relationship vs. many casual sexual relationships and a "reputation for promiscuity") x 3 (strangers vs. dating relationship vs. dating relationship with prior consensual intercourse) x 2 (corroborated vs. uncorroborated victim testimony).

Dependent measures included rating of the recommended length of sentence for the convicted rapist (ranging from zero to 50 years) and ratings of the seriousness of the crime, damage to the victim, victim blame, and rapist blame (each of these latter four ratings used scales ranging from zero to 100). In addition, major themes arising from the subject's response to the question, "Why did you recommend the sentence you did?" were scored. The themes were grouped into two classes: those mitigating the rape (she led him on, was dating him, etc.) and those emphasizing its seriousness (a serious crime, victim suffering, etc.).

Descriptions of the victim's sexual history significantly affected judgments of rape. Victims with a limited sexual history were blamed less ( $p < .01$ ) and were considered to have suffered more damage ( $p < .001$ ) than victims with an extensive sexual history. Women scored significantly higher than men on all measures except victim blame ( $p < .01$ ). The

content analysis of comments, however, showed that there was no greater tendency to mitigate the rape where a limited or extensive victim sexual history was described than when no description was offered. The authors attributed this finding to the reluctance of subjects to reveal that their judgments were based on the victim's sexual history.

Descriptions of a dating or intimate victim-rapist relationship significantly affected all judgments of seriousness, victim damage, and rapist blame ( $p < .05$ ) but not in victim blame or recommended sentence. Finally, there were significant sex-by-relationship interactions for victim damage and rapist blame ( $p < .05$ ). Women discounted less in the presence of a dating or intimate victim-rapist relationship ( $p < .05$ ). Consistent with these findings, content analysis showed that fewer respondents noted mitigating circumstances for stranger-rape than for date-rape or date-rape with prior consensual intercourse ( $p < .001$ ).

These studies suggest that information regarding the victim's sexual history can influence attribution of blame. As concluded by Cann et al. (1979) and L'Armand and Pepitone (1982), rapes committed against sexually experienced victims are seen as less serious than similar offenses against sexually inexperienced victims. Similarly, sexually experienced victims are attributed relatively more blame than are sexually inexperienced victims. This phenomenon has been discussed in terms of causal attribution theories (Krulowitz

& Payne, 1978) and "just world" hypotheses (Jones & Aronson, 1973). Perhaps equally damaging to the perceptions of victim blame is information regarding her rape history. Victims with a rape history seem to be attributed more blame than those victims without such a past. One way that individuals justify this view is to attribute to the previously raped victim characteristics which contribute to repeated offenses against her.

Calhoun, Selby and Warring (1976) examined the social perception of a rape victim's personal characteristics and degree of blame for the rape. The authors examined sex of the undergraduate subjects, victim's rape history, number of rapes in the area, and victim's degree of acquaintance with the rapist.

Subjects observed a videotape of a 25-year-old white female role-playing a rape victim. Prior to viewing the tape, each subject received a case description of the rape incident and of the rape victim. The description varied the victim's previous acquaintance with the rapist, rape history (whether or not she had been raped before) and the number of rapes in the area where the rape occurred. These factors were crossed completely, resulting in a 2 (males vs. female subject) x 2 (raped vs. not raped before) x 2 (none vs. seven other rapes in the area) x 2 (acquainted vs. not acquainted with the rapist) between-subjects design.

After viewing the videotape subjects rated the victim on the following scales: (a) degree to which the rape was caused by her personality traits; (b) degree to which the rape was caused by her behavior on the night of her rape; (c) degree to which she was the kind of person who gets herself into such situations; (d) degree to which the rape was her fault. Subjects also rated the extent to which the rape was due to the "bad luck" of the victim. All ratings were done on a six-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 6 (to a great extent).

The rating of the degree to which the rape was seen as caused by the personality traits of the victim revealed two main effects. First, males indicated that the rape was due to the victim's traits to a greater extent than did the females ( $p < .01$ ). Second, the victim with a prior rape history was judged to possess the personality traits responsible for the rape more than the victim having no rape history.

Main effects for sex of the subject ( $p < .05$ ), information pertaining to the rape history ( $p < .01$ ) and acquaintance ( $p < .05$ ) were found on ratings of the degree to which the rape was caused by the victim's behavior on the night of the rape. Interactions between subject's sex and number of rapes in the area ( $p < .05$ ) and the three-way interaction between sex of the subject, number of rapes in the area, and rape history were significant ( $p < .05$ ).

Males, more than females, saw the victim's behavior as a cause of the rape. Her behavior was seen as a cause to a greater degree when she had been raped before than when she had not, and she was blamed for her behavior more when she was acquainted with the rapist than when she was not acquainted with him. Analysis of the three-way interaction (subject's sex x number of rapes x rape history) indicated that although differences between "raped before" and "not raped before" occurred both for males and females, the differences varied according to the number of rapes in the area. For females, there was no difference in the ratings of victims raped before versus not raped before, when there were no other rapes in the area ( $p < .05$ ); but when there were seven other rapes in the area, females saw the rape as due to the victim's behavior more when the victim had been raped before than when she had not ( $p < .01$ ). For males, there was no difference in ratings of victims raped before and not raped before, when there were seven other rapes in the area ( $p < .05$ ), but when there were no other rapes in the area, males attributed the rape as due more to the victim's behavior when she had been raped before than when she had not ( $p < .05$ ).

Analysis of the ratings of the degree to which the victim was "the kind of person who gets herself in such situations" revealed a main effect for sex of the subject ( $p < .05$ ), as well as for the victim's rape history ( $p < .001$ ). Males saw the victim as the "kind of person" to a

greater extent than did females, and the victim was seen more as the "kind of person" who gets herself in such situations when she had been raped before.

Main effects for sex of the subject ( $p < .01$ ) and for rape history ( $p < .001$ ) were found for responses to the item indicating the extent to which the rape was the victim's fault. Males saw the rape as the victim's fault to a greater degree than females and the victim was seen at fault to a greater extent when she had been raped previously. A three-way interaction between sex of the subject, number of rapes in the area and rape history was significant. Females saw no difference in the victim's rape history when there were no other rapes in the area ( $p < .05$ ), but when there were seven other rapes in the area, females saw the rape as the victim's fault to a greater degree when she had been raped before than when she had not ( $p < .01$ ). For males there was no significant difference in the ratings of victims raped before or not raped before when there were seven rapes in the area but when there were no other rapes in the area males saw the victim as a causative agent to a greater degree when she had been raped before than when she had not ( $p < .01$ ).

No effects occurred for the ratings of the extent to which the rape was caused by "bad luck." However, two significant interactions emerged--sex of the subject with acquaintance of the victim with the rapist ( $p < .05$ ) and the number of rapes in the area with acquaintance of the victim

with the rapist ( $p < .05$ ). For the sex and acquaintance interaction, there was a significant difference between males and females, with females more likely to attribute the rape to "bad luck" than males when the victim was acquainted with the rapist, but there was no reliable sex difference when the victim was not acquainted with the rapist. For the acquaintance with number of rapes in the area interaction, there was a significant difference between no rapes in the area and seven rapes in the area when the victim was not acquainted with the rapist, with the no rapes in the area condition more likely to be seen as "bad luck" ( $p < .05$ ). When the victim was acquainted with the rapist there was no difference produced by information about the number of rapes in the area.

#### Sex of Subject

Rape is a controversial issue that tends to elicit significant attitudinal differences from the general public. Rape is unique in that it is most commonly committed by a male against a female. Of the many factors which may potentially affect the perception of the rape victim, sex of subject would seem to be an important factor. Some would agree that the female as victim, male as aggressor dichotomy in the act of rape might produce an identification of the public with his/her same-sex "actor" in the rape event. This assumption would appear to be consistent with findings reported in the literature. One such finding frequently appearing is that

females recommend harsh sentences for the rapist to a greater degree than do males (Calhoun et al., 1976; Kanekar & Kolsawalla, 1981; Kanekar, Kolsawalla & D'Souza, 1981; Best & Demin, 1982). In a similar vein, Cann et al. (1979) found that females viewed the rapist as more at fault for what happened than did males. Males were apt to view the victim's behavior as contributing more to her rape, perceived the victim as more at fault, and viewed her as having a greater unconscious desire to be raped than did females. Victims were seen as the "type of person" who gets herself into such situations to a greater extent by males than by females. The implications of these sex differences are quite significant. Rape victims often come in contact with police, judges, jurors, and hospital personnel, many of whom are male. If overall, males tend to blame the rape victims more, this could further victimize a woman already victimized by the sexual assault.

#### Rationale

There are a number of important reasons for investigating social attitudes and perceptions of rape. Generalized social attitudes and perceptions of rape offenses and victims would seem to have bearing on such issues as victim's reporting the offense, medical and psychological treatment of rape cases, judicial processes, and victims' subsequent relationships with friends and family. Understanding attitudes held by the public may be of value in explaining people's perceptions



of rape victims. For example, it has been found that sex role attitudes affect perceptions of rape (Resick & Jackson, 1981).

Spence, Helmreich and Stapp (1973) developed the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) which assesses attitudes concerning the rights and roles of women in society. High scorers on the AWS indicate profeminist attitudes regarding the role of women. Low scores indicate more traditional attitudes concerning women's rights and roles in society.

On the intuitive level, it would appear that individuals who profess to profeminist attitudes, in contrast to those individuals professing more traditional attitudes, regarding the role of women in society, would be likely to assign lesser amounts of blame to the rape victim regardless of the circumstances of the rape. Conversely, relative to those with profeminist attitudes, individuals with traditional attitudes would be likely to assign greater amounts of blame to the victim, especially in conditions where the victim has a rape history or is seen as highly provocative. Since the AWS is a measure taken prior to the experimental manipulations, the data was analyzed using high versus low scorers on the AWS. That is, using a median split, the subjects were divided into two groups: namely, high versus low scorers. These groups were substituted for sex as an independent variable.

While research suggests that provocativeness of a victim significantly affects the amount of blame she receives, none

of the studies examined have systematically manipulated a wide spectrum of degrees of provocativeness. For example, Scroggs (1976) defined provocativeness as a function of victim's attire. Kanekar and Kolsawalla (1981) used similar means by describing the victim as either dressed in a sexually provocative manner or not. Kanekar et al. (1981) not only neglected external assessment of the validity of provocative versus unprovocative manipulations, but they also omitted specific operational descriptions of provocative attire. Best and Demin (1982) independently assessed two levels of provocativeness. However, these levels included appeared to sample only the low and moderate range of victim provocativeness, while samples of higher levels of provocativeness were omitted. The present study attempts to cover a broader range of the provocative dimension. Specifically, scenarios varying the victim's pre-rape behavior were independently determined, resulting in three significantly different levels of provocativeness.

Evidence concerning the rape victim's sexual history has been found to effect perceptions of rape victims. Cann et al. (1979) found that victims with sexual experience histories are viewed as "the type of person" who get themselves into rape situations. That is, sexually experienced victims are perceived as possessing qualities which induce rape. Calhoun et al. (1976) obtained similar results in their study looking at social perceptions of a rape victim's

personal characteristics and degree of blame for the rape. Victims with a prior rape history were judged to possess the personality traits responsible for the rape more than the victim having no rape history. Victims were seen as the "kind of person" who get themselves into such situations when they had been raped before.

L'Armand and Pepitone (1982) support these findings with regard to past rape history. Victims with rape histories were blamed more and were considered to have suffered less from the assault than were victims with no rape history. Knowledge of a prior rape history of the victim produced damaging perceptions. Victims with a rape history were judged to possess the personality traits responsible for the rape.

The present study will also look at attributions of blame concerning the rape victim by sex of subject. Previous research results have indicated that men and women attribute blame differently. Females are more likely to recommend harsher sentences for the rapist than males (Calhoun et al., 1976). Conversely, males tend to share the rapist's perspective and blame the victim more than do females (Krulowitz, 1982).

#### Purpose of the Study

Research looking at attitudes held by professionals (e.g., police, judges, hospital personnel, counselors), as well as those held by the general public, reveal a tendency

to blame victims of rape for the assault (Krulowitz, 1982). Furthermore, evidence (Calhoun, Selby & Warring, 1976) suggests that in instances where the victim had been raped previously, the tendency to blame the victim is intensified, depending upon the sex of the subject and the number of rapes in the area. This assumption often leads to the belief that the rape victim elicited a violent response from her assailant through her behavior or character. This study manipulated the victim's rape history and degree of provocativeness and investigated how these factors affected attributions of blame.

The first six hypotheses were accepted or rejected based upon the total score resulting from the sum of the nine items on the Rape Questionnaire (RQ).

Hypothesis 1. The more provocative the victim's behavior, the more subjects would attribute responsibility to her for the subsequent rape.

Hypothesis 2. The victim with a rape history would be perceived as more responsible than the victim with no rape history.

Hypothesis 3. Males would assign greater blame to the victim than would females.

Hypothesis 4. An interaction between sex of the subject and rape history was expected. It was hypothesized that relative to females, males would attribute greater blame to the victim with a rape history, while no differential blame would be attributed when the victim does not possess a rape history.

Hypothesis 5. Sex of the subject and the victim's degree of provocativeness were expected to interact. It was hypothesized that relative to females, males would perceive the victim as most responsible in the condition where her pre-rape behavior was most provocative, would perceive the victim as moderately responsible in the condition where her pre-rape behavior was moderately provocative, and would perceive the victim as mildly responsible in the condition where her pre-rape behavior was mildly provocative.

Hypothesis 6. Rape history and provocativeness would interact. It was hypothesized that victims with a rape history relative to victims with no rape history would be attributed the most blame when the victim's pre-rape behavior was at the most intense level of provocativeness, moderate degrees of blame when the victim's pre-rape behavior was at a moderate level of provocativeness, and the least blame when the victim's pre-rape behavior was at the mildest level of provocativeness.

#### Ancillary Hypotheses

To explore the role that attitudes toward women play in subjects' perceptions of rape victims, the high versus low scorers on the AWS were used as an independent variable. This was accomplished by substituting high versus low AWS scorers (based on a median split of the distribution of AWS scorers for each provocativeness x rape history combination) for sex of the subject in the design. The following six

hypotheses were tested based on this revised design using the total score resulting from the sum of the nine items on the Rape Questionnaire.

Hypothesis 7. The more provocative the victim's behavior, the more subjects would attribute blame to her for the subsequent rape.

Hypothesis 8. The victim with a rape history would be perceived as more at fault than the victim with no rape history.

Hypothesis 9. Low scorers on the AWS would assign greater blame to the victim than would high scorers on the AWS.

Hypothesis 10. An interaction between AWS and rape history was expected. It was hypothesized that relative to high scorers, low scorers would attribute greater blame to the victim with a rape history while no differential blame would be attributed when the victim did not possess a rape history.

Hypothesis 11. The AWS and the victim's provocative-ness were expected to interact. It was hypothesized that relative to high scorers, low scorers would perceive the victim as significantly more at fault in the condition where her pre-rape behavior was at high or moderate levels of provocativeness. Low versus high scorers would not assign different degrees of blame to the victim in the condition where her pre-rape behavior was least provocative.

Hypothesis 12. Rape history and provocativeness would interact. It was hypothesized that victims with a rape history would be attributed more blame in the condition where the victim's pre-rape behavior is at high or moderate levels of provocativeness. High versus low scorers would not assign different degrees of blame to the victim in the condition where her pre-rape behavior was least provocative.

## CHAPTER II

## Method

Subjects

Subjects were 144 students enrolled in undergraduate psychology courses at North Texas State University. The sample consisted of 72 males and 72 females.

The mean age of the subjects was 23.31 years (SD = 6.23). Slightly over three quarters of the respondents (76%) were caucasian; 10 percent were black and 10 percent were either asian or hispanic, while the remaining four percent were listed as American Indian or other. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents were single. Fourteen percent were married and eight percent were divorced. Less than two percent were widowed or listed an alternative marital status. The predominant religious preference was Methodist (20%), followed by Baptist (19%) and Catholic (11%). Ten percent listed no religious preference. Of the remaining 22 choices, none constituted more than seven percent of the 144 subjects who responded. Eighty-seven percent of the respondents were currently working on the BA or BS degree. Seven percent were working on the MA or MS, while the remaining six percent were listed as "other." Fifty-four percent of the students were enrolled in an Arts and Science program; 30 percent were enrolled in the Business school, and the remaining 16 percent were divided among the four remaining categories.



## Measures

The Demographic Questionnaire (DQ). The DQ (Appendix A) was an instrument designed to collect demographic information on the subjects. It contained questions pertaining to the subjects' age, sex, ethnic and marital status, religious preference, degree currently working towards, and college of the University in the degree will be awarded.

The Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). The short version of the AWS (Spence et al., 1973), consisting of 25 items, was used, as it was designed, to assess current attitudes held by the subjects toward the role of women in society (Appendix B). Items were rated on a Likert-type scale which had four response alternatives, with 0 representing "Agree Strongly," the most traditional response, and 3 representing "Disagree Strongly," the most contemporary, profeminist response. Total scores range from 0 to 75, with high scores indicating profeminist attitudes. Correlations obtained between scores on the short version and the full scale of the AWS were found to be .968 for males and .969 for females.

Rape Questionnaire (RQ). Compiled by the investigator, the Rape Questionnaire consists of nine items and was designed to assess the attribution of blame toward the victim (Appendix C). The first four items were adapted from Krulewitz (1982), while the remaining five were adapted from Cann et al. (1979). Items were rated on a Likert-type scale, which had seven

response alternatives, with 1 representing "Not at All" and 7 representing "Very Much." Total scores, which were computed by reverse keying items 2 and 3 and then summing the nine items, could range from 9 to 63. Low total scores on this questionnaire indicated the least amount of blame attributed to the victim.

Check Items. Five check items, developed for this study, were appended to the Rape Questionnaire and were used to establish the validity of the intended experimental conditions. Items one, two, and three dealt with the pre-rape setting, rape location, and rapist identity, respectively, and were employed to ascertain the subject's general attention to detail. Items four and five inquired about the actual experimental manipulations and were designed to assess the subjects' ability to discern the presence or absence of a rape history and the level of victim provocativeness (Appendix D).

Provocation Stimuli (PS). Nine written descriptions portraying women in various degrees of provocativeness were prepared. Each scenario described a woman 23 years of age. The woman's activity and attire were varied in each of the scenarios. Twenty-seven male and 34 female undergraduates enrolled in introductory psychology courses (mean age = 24 years) read the scenarios and rated the degree of provocativeness of the woman in each situation. Each scenario was rated on a Likert-type scale, with 1 representing "Not at all

provocative" and 5 representing "Highly provocative." The scenarios, their means, and standard deviations, are listed in Table 1 (Appendix E). A repeated-measures analysis of variance of the ratings (Table 2, Appendix F) revealed no main effect for sex nor significant interaction between sex and degree of provocativeness. A main effect for the provocativeness dimension did occur. The Duncan range test (Table 3, Appendix G) revealed that several scenes were rated significantly different with respect to victim's provocativeness. Three scenarios were selected on the basis of their being (a) significantly different from each other and (b) representative of three degrees of provocativeness, namely: low provocativeness, moderate provocativeness, and high provocativeness. The scenarios, presented in increasing levels of provocativeness, were

Low Provocativeness ( $M = 1.33$ ,  $SD = .65$ ). Linda, a 23-year-old woman is studying in the school library. She has on jeans, a shirt and sneakers. She is sitting with her legs propped on an adjacent chair with a book open across her knees.

Moderate Provocativeness ( $M = 2.84$ ;  $SD = 1.08$ ). Joan, a 23-year-old woman is sitting at the bar, with her legs crossed, sipping a drink. She has on a low-cut dress, sheer stockings, and strapless sandals.

High Provocativeness ( $M = 4.02$ ;  $SD = 1.50$ ). Jackie, a 23-year-old woman is dancing on a stage at a topless club. She has on a g-string, fishnet stockings, and high heels.

The three scenarios were crossed completely with victim rape history (i.e., raped once before versus never been raped before), resulting in six case reports utilized in the present study. Several minor changes of the original scenarios were made. First, the action in the case reports was described in the past tense. Second, the scenarios were embedded in common rape circumstances (i.e., attack occurring in a parking lot). Third, a uniform first name was given to the victim in each of the six case reports.

Case Reports. The case reports were used to present incidents of rape which, excluding victim information, were identical. The victim information differed along (a) three levels of provocativeness--namely high, medium, and low, and (b) the presence or absence of a rape history. Case reports of the highly provocative victim described the attire of a woman dancing on stage at a topless club. Case reports for the moderately provocative victim described the attire of a woman sitting at a bar. Case reports for the mildly provocative victim described the attire of a woman studying in a library. Each of these case reports included one sentence indicating the presence or absence of a rape history, resulting in a total of six case reports (Appendix H).

Each measure that was completed by the subjects was numbered with an identification code prior to distribution in order to insure confidentiality.

### Procedure

Participants were assured of the anonymity of their responses to the questionnaires and signed a written informed consent statement (Appendix I). All volunteers were asked to complete a questionnaire concerning their attitudes toward the role of women in society and to read a case report and complete a questionnaire concerning the case. Participants completed all measures in one 30-minute session.

Following a brief introduction to the general purpose of the study, subjects were given the Attitudes Toward Women Scale and one of six possible case reports of a rape victim--the order of presentation being counterbalanced among subjects--which they were asked to read and complete in the order given, and return to the investigator. Finally, they were presented with the Rape Questionnaire, which they were asked to complete and return.

A total of 144 subjects were tested. However, since all subjects did not complete every item, cell frequencies in the various analyses ranged from 10 to 13 for the principal analyses.

## CHAPTER III

## Results

Check Items

Frequency counts were run on each of 12 groups of subjects according to the level of victim provocativeness and rape history, in order to establish the validity of the intended experimental conditions. The data indicating the number and percentage of subjects selecting the correct answer based upon the case reports for each treatment cell are presented in Table 4 (Appendix J).

Items one, two, and three were employed to ascertain the subjects' general attention to detail. Item one dealt with the victim's whereabouts prior to the rape. Subjects were fairly attentive to this condition in all instances except that of the highly provocative victim with a rape history condition (Males = 67%, Females = 58%).

Subjects accurately identified the location of the rape (Item 2) as well as the identity of the rapist (Item 3), with males showing an awareness equal to or better than that of females on the latter item.

Items four and five tapped the actual experimental manipulations. Item four indicates the subject's ability to discern the presence or absence of the rape history variable.

Table 5 presents the number and percentages of correct responses to this item by sex and total number of subjects. Ninety-four percent of the subjects correctly reported the presence of a rape history when indeed there was one. Females were slightly more aware of the absence of a rape history than were males, with 92 percent of the females answering correctly, as compared to 86 percent of the males.

Table 5

Numbers and Percentages of Subjects Selecting the Correct Response to Check Item 4 Listed by Sex and Total Number of Subjects

	<u>Rape History</u>		<u>No Rape History</u>	
	n	%	n	%
Males	34	94	31	86
Females	34	94	33	92
All Subjects	68	94	64	89

Both males and females were able to discriminate among the three levels of provocativeness nearly 100 percent of the time. Table 6 presents the number and percentages of correct responses to this item by sex and total number of subjects. The only case in which either sex had difficulty was in the instance of high victim provocativeness, though, despite minor difficulty, 94 percent of the subjects accurately discriminated the provocativeness level.

Table 6

Numbers and Percentages of Subjects Selecting the Correct Response to Check Item 5 Listed by Sex and Total Number of Subjects

	Provocativeness					
	High		Medium		High	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Males	22	92	24	100	24	100
Females	23	96	24	100	24	100
All Subjects	45	94	48	100	48	100

Overall, subjects appeared to have taken note of the important details of the case reports which they read. The results indicate that in most instances both sexes were able to accurately identify the details of the rape.

#### Principal Analysis

Subjects' responses on Rape Questionnaire total scores were compared. Table 7 presents the means and standard deviations for males and females by the victim's level of provocativeness and rape history.

Results of the 2 (subject's sex) x 3 (provocativeness) x 2 (rape history) analysis of variance presented in Table 8, indicated a main effect for provocativeness ( $p < .001$ ) and rape history ( $p < .05$ ).



Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations for Rape Questionnaire Total Scores by Subject Sex, Victim's Level of Provocativeness, and Rape History

		Provocativeness		
		High	Medium	Low
<u>Males</u>				
Rape History	<u>M</u>	29.42	24.75	17.67
	<u>SD</u>	9.45	8.05	4.21
	<u>n</u>	12	12	12
No Rape History	<u>M</u>	29.92	19.67	14.92
	<u>SD</u>	13.64	5.28	4.25
	<u>n</u>	12	12	12
<u>Females</u>				
Rape History	<u>M</u>	27.67	22.17	16.50
	<u>SD</u>	8.50	8.58	5.76
	<u>n</u>	12	12	12
No Rape History	<u>M</u>	21.33	22.83	14.27
	<u>SD</u>	7.18	6.74	3.50
	<u>n</u>	12	12	11

Table 9 presents the means and standard deviations for provocativeness. These data confirm the first hypothesis, which stated that the more provocative the victim's behavior, the more subjects will attribute responsibility to her for the subsequent rape.

Table 8  
ANOVA for Rape Questionnaire Total Scores

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	p
Sex (A)	134.02	1	134.02	2.31	.13
Provocativeness (B)	3032.22	2	1516.11	26.13	.00
Rape History (C)	231.96	1	231.96	4.00	.05
A x B	197.08	2	98.54	1.70	.19
A x C	.33	1	.33	.01	.94
B x C	3.05	2	1.52	.03	.97
A x B x C	239.74	2	119.87	2.07	.13
Error	7600.18	131	58.02		

Table 9  
Means and Standard Deviations of Rape Questionnaire  
Total Scores for Provocativeness Main Effect

	Provocativeness		
	High	Medium	Low
<u>M</u>	27.08	22.35	15.87
<u>SD</u>	10.27	7.27	4.58
<u>n</u>	48	48	47

In addition, Tukey's a tests revealed that the three levels of provocativeness differed from each other at the .001 level. That is, the highly provocative victim condition significantly differed from both the medium and low

provocative victim condition. The medium provocative condition differed from the low provocative condition.

Similarly, a main effect was found for rape history ( $p < .05$ ), indicating support for hypothesis 2, which stated that a victim with a rape history would be perceived as more at fault than the victim with no rape history. Table 10 presents the means and standard deviations for this effect.

Table 10  
Means and Standard Deviations of Rape Questionnaire  
Total Scores for Rape History

	Rape History	No Rape History
<u>M</u>	23.03	20.58
<u>SD</u>	8.81	9.01
<u>n</u>	72	71

No significant main effect emerged for sex of subject; therefore, hypothesis 3 was not confirmed. That is, males and females did not significantly differ in their attributions of blame toward the victim.

Based on the results of the analysis of variance of Rape Questionnaire total scores, no support was found for hypothesis 4, which predicted an interaction between sex of subject and rape history, with males attributing greater blame to the victim with a rape history than females. Hypothesis 5 was not confirmed, in that no interaction

between sex of subject and degree of provocativeness emerged. Finally, the results failed to provide evidence of an interaction between rape history and provocativeness; therefore, hypothesis 6 was rejected.

One of the issues that must be taken into consideration in regards to the Rape Questionnaire total score is the intuitive nature of its additive scoring procedure. The independence of the items remains speculative. By simply summing the nine items and using this total as an index of the extent of attribution of blame toward the victim, some important individual item differences may be masked. In order to explore this possibility, an ancillary MANOVA was performed on the nine Rape Questionnaire items.

Results of the 2 (sex of subject) x 2 (rape history) x 3 (provocativeness) MANOVA are presented in Table 11.

Table 11  
MANOVA for the Nine Rape Questionnaire Items

Source	df	f	p
Sex (A)	9,123	2.77	.01
Provocativeness (B)	18,246	4.63	.00
Rape History (C)	9,123	2.04	.04
A x B	18,246	1.65	.05
A x C	9,123	1.73	.09
B x C	18,246	.64	.86
A x B x C	18,246	.96	.51

Note. Multivariate analysis used Wilk's lambda criterion.

A significant interaction emerged for sex by provocativeness ( $p < .01$ ). In addition, main effects occurred for subject sex ( $p < .01$ ), provocativeness ( $p < .001$ ), and rape history ( $p < .05$ ).

Univariate  $F$  tests for the sex by provocativeness interaction revealed a significant effect for Rape Questionnaire items 1 and 7 (both  $ps < .05$ ). Table 12 presents the means and standard deviations for this interaction for Rape Questionnaire Item 1. Results of Tukey  $a$  tests indicated that for males, the three levels of provocativeness differed. The highly provocative victim condition differed from both the medium and low provocative victim conditions (both  $ps < .001$ ). Similarly, males differentiated between the medium and low provocative victim conditions ( $p < .001$ ). Thus, males wanted the victim to accept more blame as a positive function of provocativeness.

Females did not differentiate between the medium and high provocative condition. They did, however, perceive differences between the low and medium provocative condition and also between the low and high provocative condition (both  $ps < .05$ ). Females wanted both the medium and high provocative victim to accept greater blame than the amount of self blame expected of the low provocative victim.

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations for Sex by Provocativeness  
for Rape Questionnaire Item 1

Subject Sex	Provocativeness		
	High	Medium	Low
Males			
<u>M</u>	3.71	2.83	1.29
<u>SD</u>	2.07	1.81	.46
Females			
<u>M</u>	2.00	1.92	1.43
<u>SD</u>	1.59	1.41	1.04

Table 13 presents the means and standard deviations for the sex by provocativeness interaction for Rape Questionnaire Item 7. Males perceived some differences in the extent to which the victim's behavior immediately before the assault caused the rape. They differentiated between the high and low provocative conditions and the high and medium provocativeness conditions (both  $p < .001$ ) as well as between the medium and low provocative conditions ( $p < .05$ ). As the level of provocativeness increased, males perceived the victim's pre-rape behavior as more of a causative factor in the rape. Females perceived a difference in pre-rape behavior causality between the low and medium provocative conditions and the low and high provocative conditions, but not between the medium and high provocative conditions ( $p < .001$ ).

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations for Sex by Provocativeness  
Rape Questionnaire Item 7

Subject Sex	Provocativeness		
	High	Medium	Low
Males			
<u>M</u>	4.33	2.29	1.75
<u>SD</u>	1.93	1.33	.94
Females			
<u>M</u>	3.46	3.13	1.22
<u>SD</u>	1.96	1.90	.52

The MANOVA main effect for sex ( $p < .05$ ) was followed up with univariate  $F$  tests. Rape Questionnaire items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 9 were significant (all  $ps < .05$ ). Table 14 summarizes means, standard deviations and univariate results for the nine Rape Questionnaire items by sex.

The data revealed that females wanted the victim to accept less blame (Item 1) for her actions ( $p < .01$ ) and blame the rapist more (Item 2) than did males ( $p < .001$ ). Males thought that the victim blamed the rapist (Item 3) more than females thought she did ( $p < .05$ ). Conversely, females thought that the victim blamed herself (Item 4) more than the males thought she did ( $p < .01$ ). Finally, males more than females, perceived the victim as more at fault (Item 9) for the rape ( $p < .05$ ).

Table 14  
Univariate F Tests for Sex

Rape Question- naire Item	Male <sup>a</sup>		Female <sup>b</sup>		F <sup>c</sup>
	M	SD	M	SD	
Item 1	2.61	1.88	1.79	1.37	8.90**
Item 2	5.63	1.50	6.35	1.12	10.79***
Item 3	6.15	1.31	5.55	1.55	6.35*
Item 4	2.82	1.71	3.72	1.88	8.95**
Item 5	3.17	1.95	2.85	1.77	1.07
Item 6	3.06	1.89	2.66	1.77	1.67
Item 7	2.79	1.82	2.62	1.87	.31
Item 8	1.50	1.26	1.24	.84	2.13
Item 9	2.57	1.81	1.92	1.35	5.72*

<sup>a</sup>n = 72; <sup>b</sup>n = 71; <sup>c</sup>df = 1,41.

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

The MANOVA also revealed a main effect for provocative-ness. The univariate F tests for Rape Questionnaire items 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 were significant (all ps < .01) and are summarized in Table 15.

Subjects wanted the victim to accept more blame (Item 1) as a function of her provocativeness. They wanted the highly provocative victim to accept more blame than either the moderate or low provocative victim (both ps < .001).

Similarly, subjects wanted the moderately provocative victim



to accept more blame than the low provocative victim ( $p < .001$ ).

Table 15  
Univariate  $F$  Tests for Provocativeness

Rape Question- naire Item	Provocativeness						$F^d$
	High		Medium		Low		
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
Item 1	2.85	2.02	2.38	1.67	1.36	.79	10.94**
Item 2	5.42	1.64	6.10	1.28	6.45	.90	7.65**
Item 3	5.79	1.44	5.85	1.56	5.91	1.40	.08
Item 4	3.02	1.72	3.21	1.81	3.57	2.00	1.10
Item 5	4.23	1.92	3.08	1.61	1.68	.98	31.99**
Item 6	3.75	2.02	3.19	1.73	1.62	.82	22.30**
Item 7	3.90	1.97	2.71	1.68	1.49	.80	27.97**
Item 8	1.73	1.65	1.31	.66	1.06	.32	4.93*
Item 9	2.81	2.01	2.44	1.57	1.45	.72	10.04**

$a_n = 48$ ;  $b_n = 48$ ;  $c_n = 47$ ;  $d_{df} = 2,140$ .

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

Results of Tukey a tests for item 2 indicated that subjects wanted the high provocative victim to blame the rapist less than they wanted the low or medium provocative victim to blame him (both  $ps < .001$ ). Subjects also wanted the victim in the medium provocative condition to attribute less blame to the rapist ( $p < .05$ ). That is, subjects

wanted the victim to blame the rapist less as the level of provocativeness increased.

For item 5, Tukey a tests revealed that subjects thought the victim's behavior contributed more to the rape as a function of her level of provocativeness. The highly provocative victim's behavior was perceived as contributing to her rape more than the medium provocative victim's behavior ( $p < .001$ ). In turn, the medium provocative victim's behavior was thought to contribute to her rape more than the low provocative victim's behavior ( $p < .001$ ).

Highly provocative victims and medium provocative victims were seen as the "type of person" who gets into these situations (Item 6) to a greater extent than the low provocative victim (both  $ps < .001$ ). There was also a difference at the .05 level as to "type of person" for the high and medium provocative victims. Thus, as the level of provocativeness increased, so too did the extent to which subjects saw the victim as the "type of person" who gets herself into such situations.

The Tukey a tests indicated that highly provocative victims were viewed as having more of an unconscious desire to be raped (Item 8) than either the moderate or low provocative victims (both  $ps < .001$ ). The difference between the low and medium provocative victims on this dimension was also significant ( $p < .05$ ). Thus the victim was seen as having a greater unconscious desire to be raped as the level of provocativeness increased.

Finally, for item 9, the Tukey a tests revealed that subjects felt that the highly provocative victim and the medium provocative victim were more at fault than the low provocative victim (both  $p$ s < .001). At the .05 level, subjects attributed more fault to the high versus the medium provocative victim. Thus, the extent of victim blame increased as the level of provocativeness increased.

Finally, the MANOVA revealed a main effect for rape history and the univariate  $F$  tests revealed significant effects for Rape Questionnaire Items 1 and 6 (both  $p$ s < .05). Table 16 presents means, standard deviations and the corresponding univariate  $F$  tests.

Table 16

Univariate  $F$  Tests for Rape History

Rape Questionnaire Item	Rape History <sup>a</sup>		No Rape History <sup>b</sup>		F <sup>c</sup>
	M	SD	M	SD	
Item 1	2.49	1.90	1.92	1.41	4.15*
Item 2	5.93	1.45	6.04	1.29	.24
Item 3	5.79	1.48	5.92	1.44	.26
Item 4	3.25	1.84	3.28	1.86	.01
Item 5	3.08	1.81	2.93	1.92	.24
Item 6	3.25	1.79	2.46	1.81	6.80**
Item 7	2.86	1.76	2.55	1.92	1.02
Item 8	1.43	1.10	1.31	1.05	.45
Item 9	2.39	1.73	2.08	1.51	1.25

<sup>a</sup> $n = 72$ ; <sup>b</sup> $n = 71$ ; <sup>c</sup> $df = 1,141$ .

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

Subjects wanted the victim with a rape history to accept more blame for her actions than the victim with no rape history (Item 1). Victims with a rape history were also viewed as the "type of person" who gets herself into such situations more than victims without a rape history (Item 6).

#### Ancillary Hypotheses

Since all subjects completed the AWS prior to the experimental manipulation, exploratory analyses were undertaken to examine the role of AWS on attribution of blame toward the rape victim. To accomplish these analyses, a median split was used to divide subjects within each provocation by rape history treatment combination into high and low AWS subjects. Subjects' sex was ignored in these analyses. This resulted in a 2 (profeminist versus traditional attitudes toward women) x 3 (high, medium, and low levels of victim provocativeness) x 2 (rape history versus no rape history) between subjects design. Hypotheses 7 through 12 were tested in two ways paralleling the previous analyses. First, Rape Questionnaire total scores were subjected to ANOVA. Second, an exploratory MANOVA was performed on the nine Rape Questionnaire items.

Subjects' responses on the Rape Questionnaire total scores were compared. Table 17 presents the means and standard deviations for Rape Questionnaire total scores for the 2 (profeminist versus traditional attitudes) x 3 (victim's level of provocativeness) x 2 (rape history) design.

Table 17

Means and Standard Deviations for Rape Questionnaire Total Scores by Subjects' AWS Scores, Victim's Level of Provocativeness, and Rape History

		Provocativeness		
		High	Medium	Low
High AWS Scorers				
Rape History	<u>M</u>	26.00	18.92	15.46
	<u>SD</u>	6.62	6.27	4.84
	<u>n</u>	12	12	13
No Rape History	<u>M</u>	21.83	18.82	13.20
	<u>SD</u>	6.82	4.90	3.39
	<u>n</u>	12	11	10
Low AWS Scorers				
Rape History	<u>M</u>	30.45	28.00	19.00
	<u>SD</u>	10.52	7.96	4.60
	<u>n</u>	12	11	10
No Rape History	<u>M</u>	29.42	23.50	15.69
	<u>SD</u>	14.13	6.15	3.92
	<u>n</u>	12	10	13

Results of the 2 (AWS) x 3 (provocativeness) x 2 (rape history) ANOVA, presented in Table 18, indicated main effects for provocativeness ( $p < .001$ ), rape history ( $p < .05$ ), and AWS ( $p < .001$ ).

Table 18  
ANOVA of Rape Questionnaire Total Scores

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	p
AWS (A)	970.98	1	970.98	18.18	.00
Provocativeness (B)	2942.97	2	1471.49	27.56	.00
Rape History (C)	238.18	1	238.18	4.46	.04
A x B	97.65	2	48.83	.91	.40
A x C	4.08	1	4.08	.08	.78
B x C	2.00	2	1.00	.02	.98
A x B x C	80.87	2	40.44	.76	.47
Error	6727.96	126	53.40		

Table 19 presents the means and standard deviations for provocativeness. This result supports hypothesis 7, which stated that the more provocative the victim's behavior, the more subjects will attribute responsibility to her for the subsequent rape.

Table 19  
Means and Standard Deviations of Rape Questionnaire  
Total Scores for Provocativeness

	Provocativeness		
	High	Medium	Low
<u>M</u>	33.19	30.16	24.60
<u>SD</u>	8.14	5.80	3.44
<u>n</u>	48	44	46

In addition, Tukey a tests revealed that the three levels of provocativeness differed from each other at the .001 level. That is, the highly provocative victim condition differed from both the medium and low provocative victim conditions. The medium and low provocative victim conditions also differed. As the level of provocativeness increased, attribution of blame toward the victim increased.

Similarly, the main effect for rape history ( $p < .05$ ) indicated suport for hypothesis 8, which stated that a victim with a rape history would be perceived as more at fault than the victim with no rape history. Table 20 presents the means and standard deviations for rape history.

Table 20  
Means and Standard Deviations of Rape Questionnaire  
Total Scores for Rape History

	Rape History	No Rape History
<u>M</u>	30.09	28.49
<u>SD</u>	7.06	7.01
<u>n</u>	70	68

Finally, a main effect for AWS ( $p < .001$ ) indicated support for hypothesis 9, which stated that those individuals having traditional attitudes toward the role of women would assign greater blame to the victim than would those individuals holding profeminist attitudes toward the role of women. Table 21 presents the means and standard deviations for traditional (low AWS scorers) versus profeminist (high AWS scorers).

Table 21  
Means and Standard Deviations of Rape Questionnaire  
Total Scores for AWS

	AWS	
	Traditional	Profeminist
<u>M</u>	31.12	27.53
<u>SD</u>	7.77	5.81
<u>n</u>	68	70

Based on the results of the analysis of variance on the Rape Questionnaire total score, no support was found for hypothesis 10, which predicted an interaction between AWS and rape history, with those individuals having traditional attitudes attributing greater blame to the victim with a rape history than those individuals having profeminist attitudes. Hypothesis 11 was not confirmed, in that no interaction between AWS and degree of provocativeness emerged. Finally, the results failed to provide evidence of an interaction between rape history and provocativeness, and therefore hypothesis 12 was rejected.

As specified, an ancillary MANOVA was performed on the nine Rape Questionnaire items in order to explore the possibility that individual item differences might be masked. Results of the 2 (AWS) x 2 (rape history) x 3 (provocativeness) MANOVA are presented in Table 22. No significant interactions occurred.



Table 22

## MANOVA for the Nine Rape Questionnaire Items

Source	df	f	p
AWS (A)	9,118	3.55	.00
Provocativeness (B)	18,236	4.84	.00
Rape History (C)	9,118	2.07	.04
A x B	18,236	1.08	.38
A x C	9,118	.85	.58
B x C	18,236	.57	.97
A x B x C	18,236	.71	.81

Note. Multivariate analysis used Wilk's lambda criterion.

The MANOVA main effect for AWS ( $p < .001$ ) was followed up with univariate  $F$  tests. Rape Questionnaire items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 were significant (all  $ps < .05$ ). Table 23 summarizes the means, standard deviations, and univariate results for the nine Rape Questionnaire items by AWS.

The data revealed that those individuals with traditional attitudes toward women wanted the victim to accept more blame (Item 1) for her actions ( $p < .05$ ) and blame the rapist less (Item 2) than did those with profeminist attitudes ( $p < .001$ ). Profeminist respondents, however, felt that the victim blamed herself for the rape (Item 4) more than did traditional respondents ( $p < .05$ ).

Table 23  
Univariate F Tests for AWS

Rape Questionnaire Item	<u>Traditional</u> <sup>a</sup>		<u>Profeminist</u> <sup>b</sup>		F <sup>c</sup>
	M	SD	M	SD	
Item 1	2.51	1.79	1.83	1.39	6.33*
Item 2	5.57	1.59	6.34	1.03	11.45***
Item 3	5.84	1.44	5.90	1.45	.05
Item 4	2.94	1.76	3.57	1.87	3.96*
Item 5	3.41	2.02	2.59	1.54	7.35**
Item 6	3.38	1.95	2.27	1.44	14.48***
Item 7	3.16	1.95	2.23	1.55	9.69**
Item 8	1.59	1.30	1.17	.80	5.21*
Item 9	2.65	1.74	1.70	1.15	14.30***

<sup>a</sup>n = 68; <sup>b</sup>n = 70; <sup>c</sup>df = 1,136.

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

Traditional subjects, more than profeminist subjects, indicated that the victim was the "type of person" (Item 6) who gets herself into these situations (p < .001) and additionally, had a greater unconscious desire to be raped (Item 8) (p < .05). Similarly, those with traditional attitudes felt that the victim's pre-rape behavior was a greater contributing factor (Item 5) than did those with profeminist attitudes (p < .01). Finally, traditional subjects, more than profeminist subjects, thought that the victim's behavior immediately before the assault (Item 7)

caused the rape ( $p < .01$ ) and similarly, that the victim was more at fault (Item 9) ( $p < .001$ ).

The MANOVA also revealed a main effect for provocativeness ( $p < .01$ ). The univariate  $F$  tests for Rape Questionnaire items 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 were significant (all  $p$ s  $< .05$ ) and are summarized in Table 24.

Table 24  
Univariate  $F$  Tests for Provocativeness

Rape Question- naire Item	Provocativeness						$F^d$
	High <sup>a</sup>		Medium <sup>b</sup>		Low <sup>c</sup>		
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
Item 1	2.79	1.99	2.36	1.57	1.36	.79	10.77**
Item 2	5.40	1.65	6.05	1.31	6.45	.90	7.40**
Item 3	5.77	1.45	5.93	1.50	5.91	1.40	.18
Item 4	3.06	1.71	3.11	1.79	3.57	2.00	1.10
Item 5	4.17	1.89	3.13	1.55	1.68	.98	31.79**
Item 6	3.70	2.01	3.16	1.73	1.62	.82	22.23**
Item 7	3.83	1.97	2.75	1.67	1.49	.80	26.98**
Item 8	1.74	1.56	1.31	.67	1.06	.32	4.96*
Item 9	2.72	1.93	2.34	1.45	1.45	.72	9.54**

<sup>a</sup> $n = 48$ ; <sup>b</sup> $n = 48$ ; <sup>c</sup> $n = 47$ ; <sup>d</sup> $df = 2, 135$ .

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

Results of Tukey a tests for Item indicated that subjects wanted the high and the medium provocative victims to accept

more blame than the low provocative victim ( $p < .001$ ). At the .05 level, subjects wanted the high provocative victim to accept more blame than the medium provocative victim.

Subjects also wanted the low and medium provocative victim to blame the rapist (Item 2) more than they wanted the high provocative victim to blame him ( $p < .001$ ). In turn, subjects wanted the medium provocative victim to blame the rapist less than the low provocative victim ( $p < .05$ ).

Results of Tukey a tests for Item 5 indicated that the victim's behavior was seen as contributing to her rape as a positive linear function of her level of provocativeness (all  $ps < .001$ ). The high provocative and medium provocative victims were seen as the "type of person" who gets into rape-prone situations (Item 6) to a greater extent than the low provocative victim (both  $ps < .001$ ). At the .01 level, the three levels of provocativeness differed such that the high provocative victim was seen as the "type of person" to a greater extent than the medium provocative victim.

The Tukey a tests indicated that the high provocative victim had a greater unconscious desire to be raped (Item 8) than either the low or medium provocative victims (both  $ps < .001$ ).

Both the high and medium provocative victim's pre-rape behaviors were seen as contributing more to the rape (Item 7) (both  $ps < .001$ ) than the pre-rape behavior of the low provocative victim. Similarly, the high provocative victim's

behavior was seen as contributing more to the rape than was the behavior of the medium provocative victim ( $p < .001$ ).

The high and medium provocative victims were perceived as more at fault (Item 9) than the low provocative victim ( $p < .001$ ). The high provocative victim was also seen as more at fault than the medium provocative victim ( $p < .05$ ).

Finally, the MANOVA revealed a main effect for rape history and the univariate  $F$  tests revealed a significant effect for Rape Questionnaire item 6 ( $p < .05$ ). Table 25 summarizes the means standard deviations and corresponding univariate  $F$  tests.

Table 25  
Univariate  $F$  Tests for Rape History

Rape Questionnaire Item	Rape History <sup>a</sup>		No Rape History <sup>b</sup>		$F^c$
	M	SD	M	SD	
Item 1	2.37	1.80	1.96	1.43	2.26
Item 2	5.91	1.46	6.01	1.31	.28
Item 3	5.75	1.49	5.99	1.39	.87
Item 4	3.30	1.84	3.21	1.84	.09
Item 5	3.06	1.76	2.93	1.91	.17
Item 6	3.17	1.75	2.46	1.78	5.65*
Item 7	2.83	1.70	2.54	1.93	.85
Item 8	1.43	1.11	1.32	1.07	.32
Item 9	2.26	1.57	2.07	1.52	.49

<sup>a</sup> $n = 72$ ; <sup>b</sup> $n = 68$ ; <sup>c</sup> $df = 1,136$ .

\* $p < .05$ .

For Item 6, a significant difference emerged between rape history and no rape history conditions for "type of person" ( $p < .05$ ). That is, victims with a rape history were seen as the "type of person" who get themselves into these situations to a greater extent than victims with no rape history.

### CHAPTER III

#### Discussion

This study investigated the impact of rape history and provocativeness on male and female observers' perceptions of the victim and her assailant. All participants completed the Rape Questionnaire, which was designed to measure attributional dimensions of blame assigned to the rape victim. Manipulation checks indicated that observers accurately discerned the experimental conditions.

#### Principal Analysis

In the MANOVA, the observer sex main effect and the victim provocativeness interaction are consistent with other findings (Krulowitz, 1982). Males, more than females, ascribe to victims' acceptance of blame in proportion to her degree of provocativeness prior to the attack. An interesting aspect of this interaction concerns the female observers' proclivity for viewing the medium and high provocative victim's behavior as equally causative and, similarly, equally self-blameworthy. Female observers may believe that even the moderately provocative victims are knowingly placing themselves in a potentially dangerous and powerless position and therefore are as responsible for the assault as are highly provocative victims. Possibly, for female observers some threshold may exist above which they are likely to disregard the degree of victim provocativeness and make blanket judgments about

rape victim's self blameworthiness. This suggests that relative to men, women observers may be less empathic toward and more critical of rape victims if pre-attack victim behavior exceeds some standard of provocativeness.

The present findings indicate that observer sex influences attributions of blame. In general, females tend to be more empathic toward the victim and more accusatory of the assailant than are males. The phenomenon of the "psychological rape experience" (Krulowitz, 1982) may assist in accounting for these differences. This notion asserts that the emotional subjective experience of sexual assault as threatening, dangerous, and as helplessness-inducing is one that females may apprehend better than males. As such, female observers may be more capable of vicariously experiencing the specific emotional, mental, and physical consequences of a rape experience.

Conversely, compared to females, male observers assigned more blame to the victim and thought the victim blamed the attacker more. These findings appear consistent with the gender differences found by others (Calhoun et al., 1976; Krulowitz, 1978). Males may be more likely to have had the experience of being attracted by a seemingly "available" member of the opposite sex only to have their advances rebuffed. Resulting feelings (e.g., frustration, humiliation) may precipitate a wish to strike back at females. Males may view the rapist's assault as an extreme example



of vindictively motivated behavior, and therefore may be unwilling to place all the blame on the assailant. This is not to suggest that the male observers in this study condone rape, but rather that to some degree they may identify or empathize with the rapist's motivations.

The implications of these sex differences may be significant for the rape victim. Many victims' initial post-rape contact involves medical or legal professionals who are often males. To the extent that service providers of each gender subscribe to different perspectives about rape, the female victim may encounter more initial acceptance from women service providers.

Observers in this study evaluated the victim's degree of provocativeness and attributed blame accordingly. Consistent with others' findings (Scroggs, 1976; Kanekar & Kolsawalla, 1981; Kanekar et al., 1981; Best & Demin, 1982), observers attributed increasing amounts of blame to the victim as her level of provocativeness intensified. Plausibly, observers shift the weight of blame attribution more from the assailant to the victim as the victim's provocation increases. Thus, at higher levels of provocativeness, the victim may no longer be perceived as "helpless," but as cunning or perhaps simply careless. In either case, observers may view the more provocative victim's behavior as instigative via flirtation or teasing.

Scrogg's (1976) notion of legitimacy and implicit consent may be helpful in understanding these findings. He suggests that a rape occurs only if the woman involved does not consent to intercourse. A rape victim's provocativeness however, may be regarded as indicative of her declaring consent or availability. As such, more provocative victims may be regarded as more legitimate sex objects. It seems to follow that victims are held increasingly responsible for the rape to the extent that they are perceived as acting in a provocative manner and are therefore attributed more blame for their behavior.

The implications of this finding suggests that rape victims who are viewed as more provocative may expect less empathic treatment. Since the current study sampled undergraduate students' attributions of victim responsibility, it remains to be determined whether victims would be perceived similarly by others with whom they have differential relationships (e.g., friends, family, mental health service-providers).

Victim's rape history was a factor that observers considered when assigning blame. Results of this study add support to others' findings that increasing blame is attributed to rape victims to the extent that they are perceived to possess qualities which make them more likely targets for the assault (Cann et al., 1979; Amir, 1971). Victims with a rape history were more often judged to possess such

rape-inducing qualities, and consequently were blamed more than were victims with no rape history

Observers might expect victims with a rape history to have learned from their experience in such a way that they could have avoided the second rape. In the case of the recidivist rape victim, observers may assume that the victim possesses qualities which elicit repeated assault. Indeed, this notion appears congruent with data suggesting that multiple-incident rape victims are less well adjusted and perhaps less able to accurately judge potentially dangerous situations (Ellis, Atkeson, & Calhoun, 1982).

This would seem to suggest that recidivist victims may be considered to be in need of differential kinds of intervention. Victims with a rape history may require at least the level of care that first-time victims receive during the acute phase of the post-rape trauma. Observers may consider victims to be in need of directive interventions, such as helping the multiple-rape victim to more accurately discriminate between dangerous versus non-dangerous people and situations.

#### Ancillary Findings

To explore the role that attitudes toward women play in observers' perceptions of rape victims, high (profeminist) versus low (traditional) scorer (based upon a median split) on the AWS were used as an independent variable. This 2 (high versus low AWS scorer) x 3 (high versus medium versus low provocativeness) x 2 (prior versus no prior rape history)

design was analyzed via a MANOVA performed on the nine Rape Questionnaire items. No interactions were observed, but main effects emerged for the three independent variables.

Basically, the main effects for provocativeness and rape history paralleled the findings reported for the principal analyses. Discussion, therefore, will consider the effect of attitudes toward women.

Profeminists (high scorers on the AWS) and traditional (low scorers on the AWS) individuals differed in their views regarding rape victims on all but one item (the degree to which observers thought the victim blamed the rapist for what happened). Generally, individuals with profeminist views held the attacker more responsible for the rape, while observers holding more traditional views concerning women's role in society considered the victim more culpable.

### Implications

These findings reflect the attributions of undergraduate students who may not have had direct work experience with rape victims. Similarly, given the educational level of the majority of participants, it can most probably be assumed that none were professional counselors. Consequently, the generalizability of these results to other samples should be done with care.

Despite this limitation, some cautious generalizing may be appropriate to the extent that it calls attention to potential biases associated with attitudes toward rape victims.

Holmstrom and Burgess (1979) have suggested that the post-rape adjustment by victims is facilitated by nonjudgmental support from friends and family. The present findings suggest that victims who come in contact with individuals of either gender subscribing to more or less traditional attitudes toward women may encounter something other than nonjudgmental support. To the extent that this holds true, community-based educational efforts in the area of rape victim treatment should attempt to challenge and clarify attitudinal biases that distort the nature of rape.

Both professionals and paraprofessionals (e.g., doctors, counselors, rape hotline volunteers, etc.) having regular contact with victims of rape should be particularly aware of such counterproductive biases. These results suggest that helper's gender and the attitudes toward women he or she possesses influence attributions toward the rape victim. These biases may be psychologically nonfacilitative for a victim, to the extent that they distort the victimization. The respect, support, and understanding considered necessary and therapeutic to the victim's post-rape adjustment (Holmstrom & Burgess, 1978) may not reach beneficial levels if sex or attitudinal biases impinge on the helper-victim working relationship (e.g., level of regard). This would seem to suggest the need for continuing education and skill maintenance training in the area of rape victimization and crisis intervention for those individuals having regular contact with rape victims.

These results may also have implications for the legal profession. In this study, attributions of blame were significantly affected by the presence of rape history and by higher degrees of victim provocativeness. In either or both of these cases, victims were considered to be more culpable than if these variables were not present or at lower levels. To the extent that rape history or victim provocation information is admitted into the courtroom, the victim may be attributed more blame. Similarly, male jurors (Scroggs, 1976) may hold rape victims more responsible for the assault than female jurors. This would seem to suggest that the type of evidence considered admissible in a court of law may influence the court's decision-making. Similarly, judges and lawyers need to be aware of the juror characteristics that could affect the outcome of a rape trial.

Future research needs to focus more directly on the helping professions involved in rape victim intervention and treatment. Of particular practical value would be an investigation of the extent to which the attitudinal proclivities of professional counselors and other service providers translate into effectiveness in dealing with rape victims. The present findings suggest that multiple-incident rape victims may be judged more harshly by professionals than are one-time rape victims (Ellis et al., 1982). It would thus be especially relevant to examine the extent

to which knowledge of a victim's rape history affects the judgments of blame.

Much has been discovered about the experience of the rape victim and subsequent attributions of blame. Still, as the number of women victimized each year continues to grow, ("Crime rate," 1985), continued research in and attention to attributional processes and their implications for the aftermath and resolution of victims' post-rape emotional conflicts should continue.

## Appendix A

## Biographical Data

Please fill in the blanks or check the alternative that best describes yourself.

1. Form No.: \_\_\_\_\_ (Leave this space blank)

2. Your age: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Your sex (check one):

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Male  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Female

4. Ethnic status (check one):

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1) American Indian/Alaskan Native  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Black, Non-Hispanic American  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (3) White, Non-Hispanic American  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Asian American  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Hispanic American  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Other

5. Marital status (check one):

- |                     |                         |
|---------------------|-------------------------|
| _____ (1) Single    | _____ (4) Divorced      |
| _____ (2) Married   | _____ (5) Widow/Widower |
| _____ (3) Separated | _____ (6) Other         |

7. Religious preference (check one):

- |                                   |                                |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| _____ (1) Assembly of God         | _____ (14) Hindu               |
| _____ (2) Baha'i Faith            | _____ (15) Islam               |
| _____ (3) Baptist                 | _____ (16) Jehova'a Witness    |
| _____ (4) Bible Church (Indep.)   | _____ (17) Lutheran            |
| _____ (5) Catholic                | _____ (18) Methodist           |
| _____ (6) Disciples of Christ     | _____ (19) Pentecostal United  |
| _____ (7) Christian Science       | _____ (20) Presbyterian        |
| _____ (8) Church of Christ        | _____ (21) Seven Day Adventist |
| _____ (9) Church of God           | _____ (22) Unitarian           |
| _____ (10) Latter Day Saints      | _____ (23) Agnostic            |
| _____ (11) Church of the Nazarene | _____ (24) No preference       |
| _____ (12) Episcopal              | _____ (25) Atheist             |
| _____ (13) Fundamental (Indep.)   | _____ (26) Other               |



7. Degree currently working toward (check one):

- |                                    |                                    |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (1) BA/BS | <input type="checkbox"/> (3) Ph.D. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (2) MA/MS | <input type="checkbox"/> (4) Other |

8. College of the University your degree will be in (check one):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (1) Arts & Sciences | <input type="checkbox"/> (5) Library Sciences |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (2) Business        | <input type="checkbox"/> (6) Music            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (3) Education       | <input type="checkbox"/> (7) Graduate         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (4) Home Economics  | <input type="checkbox"/> (8) Undecided        |

## Appendix B

Form No. \_\_\_\_\_

## Instructions

The statements below describe attitudes toward the role of women in society that different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feelings about each statement by indicating in the space next to each statement item to what extent you agree or disagree with each item. Use the following scale:

- 0 = Agree Strongly
- 1 = Agree Mildly
- 2 = Disagree Mildly
- 3 = Disagree Strongly

- \_\_\_\_\_ 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 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.

0 = Agree Strongly  
1 = Agree Mildly  
2 = Disagree Mildly  
3 = Disagree Strongly

- \_\_\_ 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 place or to have quite the same freedom of action as men.
- \_\_\_ 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 fiances.
- \_\_\_ 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 is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men.
- \_\_\_ 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.

0 = Agree Strongly  
1 = Agree Mildly  
2 = Disagree Mildly  
3 = Disagree Strongly

\_\_\_\_\_ 25. The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.

## Appendix C

## Rape Questionnaire

These statements concern the case of Jackie B. which you have just read. Imagine that you are a counselor at the sexual abuse care center and Jackie B. has come to talk to you. Describe your perceptions of Jackie B. and your reactions to her by reading and responding to the following. For each statement, indicate your response by placing a number in each of the spaces provided. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. Use the following scale:

- 1 = Not at All
- 2 = A Little
- 3 = Mildly So
- 4 = Somewhat So
- 5 = Moderately So
- 6 = A Lot
- 7 = Very Much

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. If Jackie B. had come to talk to you: How much would YOU want her to accept blame for her own actions?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. If Jackie B. had come to talk to you: How much would YOU want her to blame what happened on the man?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. How much do YOU think Jackie B. blames the man for what happened?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. How much do YOU think Jackie B. blames herself for what happened?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. To what extent do YOU think Jackie B.'s behavior contributed to her rape?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. To what extent do YOU think Jackie B. is the type of person who gets herself into these situations?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. To what extent do YOU think Jackie B.'s behavior immediately before the assault caused the rape?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. To what extent do YOU think Jackie B. had an unconscious desire to be raped?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. To what extent do YOU think Jackie B. is at fault?

If you have any comments about or reactions to this research which you would like to give to Deborah Schult, you can write them below and on the back of this page, or you can contact Deborah Schult at North Texas State University, Psychology Department, phone (817) 565-2671.

Thank you for your assistance.

Deborah G. Schult

## Appendix D

For the following items, please check the statement that best describes the case of Jackie B. you have just read

1. Prior to the rape, Jackie B. was in a:

- 1. library
- 2. bar
- 3. club
- 4. restaurant
- 5. none of the above

2. Jackie B. was raped in:

- 1. the garage
- 2. the alley
- 3. the parking lot
- 4. the car
- 5. none of the above

3. Jackie B. was raped by:

- 1. her date
- 2. an acquaintance
- 3. a man she had noticed earlier that evening
- 4. a friend of her roommates
- 5. none of the above

4. Prior to the current rape, Jackie B. had been raped:

- 1. once before
- 2. twice before
- 3. never before
- 4. no information given in case report

5. On the evening she was raped, Jackie B. was wearing:

- 1. jeans, shirt and sneakers
- 2. a lowcut dress, sheer stockings and strapless sandals
- 3. a g-string, fishnet stockings and high-heels
- 4. sweat pants, sweat shirt and jogging shoes

## Appendix E

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Scenarios Listed in  
Ascending Order From Low to High Provocation

Scenario	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. Linda, a twenty-three year old woman is studying in the school library. She has on jeans, a shirt and sneakers. She is sitting with her legs propped on an adjacent chair with a book open across her knees.	1.33	.65
2. Susan, a twenty-three year old woman is eating at a restaurant. She has on slacks, a blouse, and leather pumps.	1.39	.69
4. Diane, a twenty-three year old woman is jogging in the park. She has on sweat pants, sweat shirt and running shoes.	1.39	.84
5. Janet, a twenty-three year old woman is in her apartment, curled up in the corner of the couch reading a magazine. She has on slippers and a bathrobe and is sipping tea.	1.74	1.12
9. Patti, a twenty-three year old woman is driving a convertible and has stopped at an intersection where the light has turned red. She's wearing a very revealing sundress and sandals.	2.75	1.16
7. Joan, a twenty-three year old woman is sitting at the bar, with her legs crossed, sipping a drink. She has on a low cut dress, sheer stockings and strapless sandals.	2.84	1.08



---

Scenario	Mean	Standard Deviation
3. Donna, a twenty-three old woman is waitressing at a cocktail bar. She is wearing tight fitting pants, a low cut blouse and high heels.	2.89	1.11
8. Nancy, a twenty-three old woman is shopping at the grocery store. She has on thongs, and a fish net covering over her bikini.	3.21	1.18
6. Jackie, a twenty-three old woman is dancing on stage at a topless bar. She has on a g-string, fishnet stockings and high heels.	4.02	1.50

---

## Appendix F

Table 2

Results of ANOVA for Scenario by Sex

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Subjects					
Sex	3.24	1	3.24	.75	.391
Within Cells	255.54	59	4.33		
Within Subjects					
Scenario	488.26	8	56.03	75.17	.000
Sex by Scenario	6.82	8	.85	1.14	.333
Within Cells	351.84	472	.75		

Appendix G

Table 3

Results of the Duncan Range Test

Scenarios	1	2	4	5	9	7	3	8	6
Means	1.33	1.39	1.39	1.73	2.75	2.84	2.88	3.21	4.02
1 1.33		.06	.06	.40*	1.42***	1.51***	1.55***	1.88***	2.69***
2 1.39				.34*	1.36***	1.45***	1.49***	1.82***	2.63***
4 1.39				.34*	1.36***	1.45***	1.49***	1.82***	2.63***
5 1.73					1.02***	1.11***	1.15***	1.48***	2.29***
9 2.75						.09	.13	.47**	1.29***
7 2.84							.04	.37*	1.18***
8 3.21								.33*	1.14***
6 4.02									.81***

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

## Appendix H

Subjects read one of the following six vignettes.

Case Report: Jackie B. (Low Provocativeness/Rape History)

Jackie B. is a twenty-three year old woman. Prior to the rape, she had been studying in the library. She had on jeans, a shirt and sneakers and had been sitting with her legs propped on an adjacent chair with a book open across her knees. At approximately 11:00 p.m. Jackie walked alone toward her car which was parked in the lot behind the library. As she was about to unlock the car door, a man she had noticed in the library suddenly appeared, grabbed her arm and tried to kiss her. She screamed and tried to pull away but he pushed her between two parked cars, shoving her down onto the ground, where he forced sexual intercourse with her. Jackie reported that she had been raped once before.

Case Report: Jackie B. (Low Provocativeness/No Rape History)

Jackie B. is a twenty-three year old woman. Prior to the rape, she had been studying in the library. She had on jeans, a shirt and sneakers and had been sitting with her legs propped on an adjacent chair with a book open across her knees. At approximately 11:00 p.m., Jackie walked alone toward her car which was parked in the lot behind the library. As she was about to unlock the car door, a man she had noticed in the library suddenly appeared, grabbed her arm and tried to kiss her. She screamed and tried to pull away but he pushed her between two parked cars, shoving her down onto the ground, where he forced sexual intercourse with her. Jackie reported that she had never been raped before.

Case Report: Jackie B. (Moderate Provocativeness/Rape History)

Jackie B. is a twenty-three year old woman. Prior to the rape, she had been sitting at a bar, with her legs crossed sipping a drink. She had on a lowcut dress, sheer stockings and strapless sandals. At approximately 11:00 p.m., Jackie walked alone toward her car which was parked in the lot behind the bar. As she was about to unlock the car door, a man she had noticed in the bar suddenly appeared, grabbed her arm and tried to kiss her. She screamed and tried to pull away but he pushed her between two parked cars, shoving her down onto the ground, where he forced sexual intercourse with her. Jackie reported that she had been raped once before.

Case Report: Jackie B. (Moderate Provocativeness/No Rape History)

Jackie B. is a twenty-three year old woman. Prior to the rape, she had been sitting at a bar, with her legs crossed sipping a drink. She had on a lowcut dress, sheer stockings and strapless sandals. At approximately 11:00 p.m. Jackie walked alone toward her car which was parked in the lot behind the bar. As she was about to unlock the car door, a man she had noticed in the bar suddenly appeared, grabbed her arm and tried to kiss her. She screamed and tried to pull away but he pushed her between two parked cars, shoving her down onto the ground, where he forced sexual intercourse with her. Jackie reported that she had never been raped before.

Case Report: Jacke B. (High Provocativeness/Rape History)

Jackie B. is a twenty-three year old woman. Prior to the rape she had been dancing on stage on a topless club. She had on a g-string, fishnet stockings and high heels. At approximately 11:00 p.m. Jackie walked alone toward her car which was parked in the lot behind the club. As she was about to unlock the car door, a man she had noticed in the club suddenly appeared, grabbed her arm and tried to kiss her. She screamed and tried to pull away but he pushed her between two parked cars, shoving her down onto the ground, where he forced sexual intercourse with her. Jackie reported that she had been raped once before.

Case Report: Jack B. (High Provocativeness/No Rape History)

Jackie B. is a twenty-three year old woman. Prior to the rape she had been dancing on stage at a topless club. She had on a g-string, fishnet stockings and high heels. At approximately 11:00 p.m. Jackie walked alone toward her car which was parked in the lot behind the club. As she was about to unlock the car door a man she had noticed in the club suddenly appeared, grabbed her arm and tried to kiss her. She screamed and tried to pull away but he pushed her between two parked cars, shoving her down onto the ground, where he forced sexual intercourse with her. Jackie reported that she had never been raped before.

## Appendix I

## USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS

## Informed Consent

Participants's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

1. I hereby give consent to Deborah G. Schult to supervise my participation in the study entitled "Study of Reactions to Rape Victim."
2. I understand that my participation will involve the following:
 

First, provide demographic information (e.g., age, sex, etc.), but no information that will make by identification possible.

Second, complete a scale concerning attitudes about the role of women in society.

Three, read a case report of a rape incident.

Four, provide my reactions to the reported incident.
3. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to discontinue my participation without any penalty.
4. I understand that this procedure is investigational and is intended to help professionals to better understand observers' reactions to rape victims.
5. This research is being conducted by Deborah G. Schult under the direction of Lawrence J. Schneider, Ph.D., of the Psychology Department, North Texas State University. Any inquiries regarding this research can be answered by contacting Deborah Schult at (817) 565-2671.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Appendix J

Table 4

Numbers and Percentages of Subjects Selecting the Correct Responses to Check Items 1 through 5 Based Upon the Case Reports Read

Item	Rape History						No Rape History					
	Provocativeness			Provocativeness			Provocativeness			Provocativeness		
	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low
n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
MALE												
Item 1	8	67	10	83	12	100	8	67	9	75	12	100
Pre-Rape Setting												
Item 2	12	100	9	75	10	83	11	92	11	92	12	100
Rape Location												
Item 3	11	92	12	100	12	100	10	83	12	100	12	100
Rapist Identity												
Item 4	11	92	12	100	11	92	10	82	10	82	11	92
Rape History												
Item 5	10	93	12	100	12	100	12	100	12	100	12	100
Victim Attire												
FEMALE												
Item 1	7	58	12	100	12	100	9	75	12	100	12	100
Pre-Rape Setting												





## References

- American Psychological Association. (1975). Report of the task force on sex bias and sex-role stereotyping in psychotherapeutic practice. American Psychologist, 30, 1169-1175.
- Amir, M. (1971). Patterns in forcible rape. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berger, V. (1977). Man's trial, women's tribulation: Rape cases in the courtroom. Columbia Law Review, 77, 1-103.
- Best, J.B., & Demin, H.S. (1982). Victim's provocativeness and victim's attractiveness as determinants of blame in rape. Psychological Reports, 31, 255-258.
- Calhoun, L. G., Selby, J. W., & Warring, L. J. (1976). Social perception of the victim's causal role in rape: An exploratory examination of four factors. Human Relations, 29, 517-526.
- Cann, A., Calhoun, L. G., & Selby, J. W. (1979). Attributing responsibility to the victim of rape: Influence of information regarding past sexual experience. Human Relations, 32, 57-67.
- Crime rate takes tumble: Victimitizations lowest in twelve years of reporting. (1985, October). Denton Record Chronicle, p. 1B.
- Ellis, E. M., Atkeson, B. M., & Calhoun, K. S. (1982). An examination of differences between multiple- and single-incident victims of sexual assault. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 91, 221-224.

- Holmstrom, L. L., & Burgess, A. W. (1978). The victim of rape: Institutional reactions. New York: Wiley.
- Holmstrom, L. L., & Burgess, A. W. (1975). Assessing trauma in the rape victim. American Journal of Nursing, 75, 1288-1292.
- Jones, C., & Aronson, E. (1973). Attribution of fault to a rape victim. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 26, 415-419.
- Kanekar, S., & Kolsawalla, M. B. (1981). Factors affecting responsibility attributed to a rape victim. Journal of Social Psychology, 113, 285-286.
- Kanekar, S., Kolsawalla, M. B., & D'Souza, A. (1981). Attribution of responsibility to a rape victim. British Journal of Social Psychology, 20, 165-170.
- Krulowitz, J. E. (1982). Reactions to rape victims: Effects of rape circumstances, victim's emotional response, and sex of helper. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29, 645-654.
- Krulowitz, J. E., & Payne, E. J. (1978). Attributions about rape: Effects of rapist force, observer sex, and sex role attitudes. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 8, 291-305.
- L'Armand, K., & Pepitone, A. (1982). Judgements of rape: A study of victim-rapist relationship and victim sexual history. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8, 134-139.

- Resick, P. A., Calhoun, K. S., Atkeson, B. M. & Ellis, E. M. (1981). Social adjustment in victims of sexual assault. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49, 705-712.
- Resick, P. A., & Jackson, T. L. (1981). Attitudes toward rape among mental health professionals. American Journal of Community Psychology, 9, 481-490.
- Scroggs, J. R. (1976). Penalties for rape as a function of victim provocativeness, damage, and resistance. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 6, 360-368.
- 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.