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Research has linked rape victim-blaming attitudes (VBAs) with gender role stereotyping, negative peer attitudes towards women, and acceptance of interpersonal violence. The current study analyzed longitudinal questionnaire data of college men ($n=166$) from White and Smith’s (2001) study of college student victimization. Results indicate that VBAs can be conceptualized as either overt or covert, and that the covert VBA was more strongly correlated with alcohol use, sexualized peer attitudes, traditional gender stereotypes, need for sexual dominance, and perpetration of dating aggression. The covert VBA was also correlated with rape proclivity one year later, and partially mediated relationships between earlier variables and later rape proclivity. Additionally, endorsement of chivalry moderated the relationship between traditional gender stereotypes and the covert VBA, casting new perspective on the role of chivalry. Overall, results demonstrate the importance of targeting subtle expressions of VBAs in educational programs, and the need for longitudinal studies on rape attitude development.
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INTRODUCTION

Increasing attention has been given to the problem of sexual victimization of female college students in the past two decades. Recent National Crime Victimization Study results indicated that nearly 5 percent of college women are sexually victimized each year, suggesting that one-fourth of college women will become victims in a typical five-year college career (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). However, these crimes are seldom reported to the police, and therefore perpetrators are rarely convicted. In addition, although the majority of sexual perpetrators on college campuses are college men and many universities attempt to provide acquaintance rape education for high-risk groups (e.g. fraternities), factors that influence the development of rape accepting attitudes among college men remain largely unexplored. The purpose of the current study was to evaluate longitudinal correlates of rape supportive attitudes in an attempt to analyze factors that influence shifts in such attitudes, as well as lay the foundation for a theoretical model of rape proclivity that could be tested empirically.

The Problem of Reporting Rape

College students are more likely than members of the general public to avoid reporting sexual victimization to police. Although national crime surveys indicate that 1/3 of sexual assault crimes are reported to the police in the general population (31% on average from 1992 to 2000; Hart & Rennison, 2003), only 12% of college student sexual assaults were reported to police on average from 1992 to 2000 (Hart, 2003). This low rate of reporting among college students could be attributed to a general reluctance to report acquaintance (date) rape. Researchers have found that closeness of the relationship with the offender, among the several reasons listed for not reporting a sexual assault crime to police, was a frequently cited reason. Therefore, it is not surprising that over three-quarters of completed rapes are not reported to police if perpetrated by
a current or former husband or partner (Rennison, 2002).

As female college students are at a higher risk for acquaintance rape than their non-college peers (nonstrangers committed anywhere from 74% to 90% of sexual assaults against college students; Catalano, 2004; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2001; Hart, 2003), familiarity with the perpetrator may block these students from reporting the crime. In addition, the victim may believe that unwanted sexual contact between acquaintances is not legally considered rape or sexual assault because of the nature of the acquaintance relationship, and therefore deny labeling the event as “rape” or “sexual assault” altogether. Shame, self-blame, verbal or physical threats, and/or fear of reprisal, as well as fear of hostility from law enforcement officers, may also impede the reporting of this crime (Rennison, 2002).

The Problem of Rape Conviction

The conviction rate for perpetrators of sexual assault is alarmingly low. According to a recent National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), almost 200,000 rape and sexual assault crimes were committed in 2003, but only 38.5% of these were reported to the police (Catalano, 2004). In contrast, crimes such as robbery and motor vehicle theft are reported to police more frequently (60.5% and 76.8%, respectively; Catalano, 2004). However, past NCVS reports have revealed that approximately half of all perpetrators of rape and sexual assault are ever convicted (Greenfield, 1997). Taken together, these figures provide an estimate that at most, 20% of sexual assault perpetrators will ever be convicted for the crime.

The current question should then focus on the shroud of denial and secrecy that surrounds sexual assault. Why are so few sexual assaults reported in comparison to other criminal offenses, and even fewer sexual assault perpetrators convicted for their crime? Feminist theory is often used to explain the continued existence of sexual assault and to further explore the cultural
attitudes and norms that may influence the attitude that sexual assault is a non-crime.

Rape Myths

Theory

Several theories have been proposed to explain hostility towards women and the perpetration of sexual assault. The three major perspectives include evolutionary, psychiatric, and feminist points of view. The psychiatric perspective proposes that rapists are aggressive towards women as a way of retaliating against past wrongs committed by women. In addition, this perspective endorses the idea that rapists are hostile, deviant, and suffer from mental illness. In contrast, the evolutionary theorists propose that sexual assault is the result of a male drive to maximize reproductive success through promiscuity, and to also control access to one’s own mate through exerting dominance (Anderson, Cooper, & Okamura, 1997). For the purposes of the current project, the feminist perspective will be utilized, which proposes that rape is the result of male domination through sex role socialization, and thus, subsequent sexual domination is seen as the norm in patriarchal societies.

Feminist theorists have openly struggled with the issue of rape for the past three decades, attempting to explain the cultural attitudes that perpetuate the acceptance of rape as a non-crime in America. Some theorists propose that females in a patriarchal society are socialized to desire the subordinate role in sexual relationships with men. Following this line of thought, it is argued that no woman can truly consent to voluntary sexual intercourse with a man in a society in which heterosexual behavior has become normalized and made almost compulsory (such societies are also referred to as heteropatriarchies). Therefore, some theorists take the position that all heterosexual intercourse can be considered rape (Epstein, 1997, in Rogers & Rogers, 2001; Rich, 1980).
Other feminist theories have used a similar, although less intense, approach to explaining rape and have viewed rape as a tool of power. Susan Brownmiller (1975) evaluated rape as a means of domination by one group over another, more recently men over women in patriarchal societies. Through historically portraying rape as a weapon used by the victors of war, anti-civil rights groups, and men as a whole, Brownmiller’s book, *Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape* (1975), triggered a flood of research on current societal and cultural attitudes that condone the act of rape. She considered rape as “nothing more or less than a conscious process of intimidation by which all men keep all women in a state of fear” (p. 15, Brownmiller’s emphasis). Essentially, Brownmiller (1975) argues that although only a handful of men in a given society commit rape, men as a whole benefit from women being in a constant state of fear of becoming rape victims. Tangible benefits include an inherent and expected advantage in dating or sexual situations (also known as male sexual access rights), creating an environment of fear in which women are less likely to leave home alone, and general social silence when men commit spousal rape. Cross-cultural research has indicated that this is a cultural norm unique to patriarchal societies, as rape-prone societies can be predicted by level of endorsement of “macho attitudes” (e.g. acceptance of physical aggression, casual attitudes towards sexuality) and beliefs that endorse women’s inferiority (Reiss, 1986, in Burgess, 1988).

These societal attitudes that work to explicitly and implicitly condone sexual assault are generally referred to in the literature as *rape myths*. According to a multidisciplinary definition constructed by Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994), rape myths are “attitudes and beliefs that are generally false but are widely and persistently held, and that serve to deny and justify sexual aggression against women” (p. 134). At the core of traditional rape myths is the idea that women enjoy rape and secretly want to be raped. More specific examples are statements such as,
“Women fantasize about rape,” “Rape only happens to ‘bad’ women,” or “When a woman says no, she really means yes,” (Garland, 2005). Theoretically, adherence to rape myths functions to allow individuals to shift blame away from the perpetrator and onto the victim. Rape myths may therefore act as “neutralizing cognitions” or thoughts that help a perpetrator justify his/her crime after the fact (Bohner et al., 1998).

A caveat must be introduced at this point. Historically, definitions of rape given by Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994), as well as by Brownmiller (1975) and others, imply that all rape victims are women and all rapists are men, excluding the rising percentage of male victims in both civilian and prison populations. More recently, non-traditional examples of rape myths have been expanded to include rape myths about men, such as the idea that “real men” are never actually raped and that male victims of homosexual rape become homosexuals themselves. Such myths may negatively influence men in that they become even more reluctant than their women counterparts to report being raped to the authorities and to family/friends, or these men undergo secondary trauma when they confide in others. Although this topic demands further exploration and inclusion into the current literature on rape, it is beyond the scope of this paper.

Practical Implications of Rape Myth Adherence

Rape Myths and Rape Survivors

Rape myth adherence (RMA) can have a detrimental impact on the rape victim. Victims who report having higher levels of RMA, particularly attitudes that are self-blaming, are more susceptible to higher levels of psychological distress, use more self-destructive coping methods, have a longer recovery time, and are less likely to report the crime than victims who report lower levels of RMA (Burt & Katz, 1987; Daane, 2005). American society, dubbed by Schwartz (1997) as a “rape-supportive culture,” tends to lend more support towards rape victims who are
perceived as having a conservative lifestyle, experience additional violence during the attack, or are assaulted by a stranger. In contrast, victims of acquaintance rape or those who have been drugged while consuming alcohol are often blamed more in this environment, and also engage in more self-blame (Daand, 2005). Thus, self-blame may reflect larger societal blame.

Anderson, Cooper, and Okamura (1997) also propose that women who experience rape in some form (either personally or vicariously) engage in self-blaming behaviors due to an internal attribution of responsibility. Subsequently, internalizing responsibility may actually increase the degree of trauma experienced by the victim after the rape, suggesting that the potential for developing trauma-related psychopathology might increase among victims with heightened RMA.

Rape Myths and Police Officers

The effect of rape myth attitudes among police officers has been evaluated in terms of victim treatment, credibility given to the alleged victim, and referral of the case to the district attorney. Schuller and Stewart (2000) refer to police as having a “key gatekeeping role” in deciding the future of these cases. A police officer’s decision to move a case forward has been found to be associated with the existence of tangible evidence such as witnesses and physical evidence (see Frazier & Haney, 1996, for a review).

In addition, perceived credibility of the victim plays a role, and officers tend to base this opinion on such factors as emotional presentation, past drug or alcohol abuse, level of relationship with the perpetrator, and the exhibition of potentially “questionable” behavior at the time of the assault, such as flirtatious or alcohol-affected behavior (Baldry, 1996; LeDoux & Hazelwood, 1985; Schuller & Stewart, 2000). The inclusion of such beliefs when judging the credibility of a potential rape victim is indicative of the interaction between rape myth adherence
and situational factors and, depending on certain situational factors, a higher percentage of blame may be placed on certain rape victims. Therefore, women who may make poor choices in terms of alcohol or drug use, or who know their assailants on a more personal level may be seen by law enforcement officials as less credible rape victims. Unfortunately, acquaintance rape that involves the use of alcohol and/or drugs is the prototypical rape scenario on college campuses.

*Rape Myths & Jurors*

It is imperative to note that, in addition to predicting actual rape behaviors, rape myths also influence other areas. Rape myth adherence (RMA) has been found to influence decision-making in jury trials. Jurors who have high RMA are less likely to convict an accused rapist or, upon conviction, more likely to give a lighter sentence than peers with low levels of RMA. They are also more likely than their low RMA peers to let pre-trial attitudes act as the primary influence on the verdict, even in the presence of objective evidence (LaFree, 1983; Spohn & Horney, 1993). RMA, including victim-blaming attitudes (VBAs), allow the blame to be specifically shifted from the perpetrator to the victim. Other studies have shown that endorsement of these specific attitudes (e.g. “Women who dress a certain way are asking for it” and “She could have stopped the rape if she wanted to”) also impacts juror decisions. For example, when a victim is perceived as acting or dressing provocatively before the rape, not only is more responsibility for the rape placed in the hands of the victim, but also a shorter sentence is recommended for the rape perpetrator (Kanekar & Kolsawalla, 1980).

Sinclair and Bourne (1998) argue that American society may actually be trapped in a cycle of increasing RMA. These researchers found that men who read vignettes of rape cases and were told that the verdict was “not guilty” reported higher levels of RMA and lower levels of empathy than did men in the control group, who simply read the same vignettes and were given
no verdict. In addition, other studies found that lower RMA is associated with a more positive attitude towards a rape survivor and a more negative view of the perpetrator and the crime (Burt, 1983; Weidner, 1983).

Franiuk, Seefelt, and Cepress (2005) evaluated this effect using real-world vignettes that took the form of newspaper articles about the recent sexual assault prosecution of a professional basketball player. They found that identifiable rape myths were present in 65% of the randomly selected newspaper articles reviewed, particularly myths that perpetuated views of the victim as lying about the incident, being after money, or being mentally unstable. Using random assignment, Franiuk et al. (2005) then assigned participants to one of two conditions in which participants either read a rape myth endorsing article or an article that did not endorse a rape myth. Participants who read a rape myth endorsing article about this particular case were less likely to believe that the defendant was guilty, and more likely to believe that the victim was lying, in comparison to participants who read the non-endorsing article. Thus, repeated exposure to high-profile, not guilty verdicts and/or frequent exposure to rape myths in the media may perpetuate this cycle of increased RMA among males in our society.

Rape Proclivity

Although a simplistic concept on the surface, adherence to these and other rape myths can impact attitudes towards a victim and perpetrator, and also a person’s self-reported likelihood to rape. The term rape proclivity refers to the self-reported likelihood of a person to commit rape. As reported by Mahoney (1983, in Burgess, 1988) 45% of college men surveyed believed that it was acceptable to physically force a woman to engage in intercourse if the woman got him sexually excited. Self-reported rape proclivity has been found to be positively correlated with use of interpersonal violence, violence against women, gender stereotyped
attitudes, and adherence to rape myths (Osland, Fitch, & Willis, 1996). Willan and Pollard (2003) also measured attitudinal correlates of rape proclivity and found that variables such as hostility towards women and high rape myth adherence, as well as initial perceptions of a woman’s intent to engage in sexual intercourse later, were all significantly related to self-reported rape proclivity.

Bohner and his colleagues (1998) went beyond this bidirectional relationship between attitudes and predicted behaviors in their experimental study of rape myth acceptance and reported rape proclivity. An experiment using 125 male students found that although rape myth acceptance and rape proclivity were positively correlated, this correlation was significantly larger for participants who first reported attitudes regarding rape myths, followed by ratings of rape proclivity, than participants in the alternative condition who were first asked about rape proclivity and then about rape myth attitudes. Thus, Bohner et al. (1998) concluded that there may be “a causal influence of rape-related attitudes on behavioural intentions” (p. 266). These authors’ logical conclusion was that several attitudinal and perceptual factors play a role in committing rape, including attitudes towards women, violent tendencies, and rape myth adherence. Results of a recent longitudinal study of adolescent boys supported this causal inference. Lanier (2001) found that adolescent boys who were more accepting of rape myths were more likely to actually commit rape within a one-year period. Specifically, those adolescents who were at least 5 points higher on a 27-point rape myth acceptance scale than their similarly aged peers were 1.9 times more likely to force some type of unwanted sexual act. In addition, the reverse hypothesis, that perpetration increases subsequent rape myth adherence, was not supported. Thus, Lanier (2001) also concluded that rape myth adherence may have a causal influence on rape behaviors.
Peer Influence on Rape Myth Acceptance

Rape myth acceptance may be developed, altered, or perpetuated among college men as a function of the surrounding peer group. According to Schwartz (1997), men who have sexually aggressive peers are more likely to engage in violent or coercive sexual conduct, and this is more likely to happen in arenas where alcohol consumption and patriarchy is routine. Kanin (1984, in Burgess, 1988) found that date rapists generally surrounded themselves at a younger age with a highly sexually-oriented peer group that viewed sexual conquest of women as a way of enhancing self esteem. Schwartz (1997) proposed that sexually aggressive men may actually seek out peer groups that support preexisting behaviors and beliefs, and that alcohol use and rape-supportive peer groups may correlate with sexual aggression. Thus, preexisting sexual aggressions may be strengthened and released within the context of the peer group, in which new coercive strategies are supported and encouraged (Schwartz, 1997). In addition, peer groups in which sexual objectification of women is common can influence perceptions of rape victims. Wyer, Bodenhausen, & Gorman’s (1985) experimental study results indicated that exposure to stimuli portraying women as sex objects increased blame assigned to a rape victim and decreased men’s beliefs in the victim’s credibility. (However, researchers did note that this finding may be more applicable to stranger rape scenarios than acquaintance rape.)

Aggression in Dating & Sexual Relationships

Both empirical and qualitative research on rape has indicated that the endorsement of violence and general hostility towards women is linked to rape myth adherence (RMA; Burt, 1980; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995; Murnen, Wright, & Kaluzny, 2002; Yescavage, 1999). Caron and Carter (1997) found that tolerance of violence was positively associated with tolerance of rape and less negative views of rapists for men in their sample. Additionally, a
relationship was found between attitudes toward violence against women and views that rape is a sexual act instead of an act of violence. These authors concluded that men who tolerate violence against women may be more likely to view rape as a sexual act, and perhaps even “view violence in a sexual light” (Caron & Carter, 1997, p. 585). Qualitative data indicates that men who report heightened sexual aggression made more accusatory statements about a rape victim’s behaviors in a vignette, such as “She allowed heavy petting and paid the price,” and “I think Laurie has no one to blame but herself.” In contrast, sexually nonaggressive men often stated that “no means no” (Yescavage, 1999, p. 809). Sexually aggressive men also tend to hold more traditional gender role stereotypes (Burt, 1980; Malamuth, 1988), which is another variable that is significantly related to RMA and will be discussed in greater detail later.

This attitudinal link between condoning (and perpetrating) both sexual and physical aggression against women has real world implications for female victims. Men who engage in sexually aggressive behavior have been found to be more likely to misperceive the sexual intent of a woman than others (Bondurant & Donat, 1999). In addition, White and Smith (2001) found a significant relationship between being a victim of earlier physical violence and a later victim of sexual violence, as well as the converse, in their longitudinal study of victimization of college women. Thus, physical and sexual aggression not only appear to go hand-in-hand for victimized women, but both may be perpetrated by similar types of perpetrators who equate and justify the two, depending upon certain unique situational variables. Alcohol is one such variable that may influence the use of physical and/or sexual aggression.

Alcohol Use and Rape Myth Acceptance

There has been an increased awareness that alcohol may contribute to aggressive behavior, as well as to misperceptions of sexual intentions (Bushman & Cooper, 1990; Quigley,
Corbett, & Tedeschi, 2002; Ullman, Karabatsos, & Koss, 1999; Zawacki et al., 2003).
Perpetrator alcohol use has been found to be positively correlated with the level of aggression used in a sexual assault (Abbey et al., 2003). In addition, perpetrators who commit some form of sexual assault not only consume more alcohol during sexual interactions, but also have greater misperceptions of the sexual intents of women and see female drinking behavior as a signal of sexual intent (Zawacki et al., 2003). This is consistent with federal reports that a major risk factor for sexual victimization among college women is the frequent use of enough alcohol to become drunk (Fisher, Cullen & Turner, 2001).

In addition, victim intoxication may reduce outsider perceptions of perpetrator responsibility in some situations (Wild, Graham, & Rehm, 1997). Abbey and her colleagues (2001) propose that greater alcohol use, combined with heightened gender role stereotypes and misperceptions of women’s sexual intent, heightens the risk for college men to perpetrate sexual assault. These factors, combined with victim intoxication, may contribute to this misattribution of blame.

The proposed theory of alcohol use and victim-blaming attitudes used in the current project is based on the idea that increased alcohol use indicates a shift in one’s social environment. Frequency and amount of alcohol use can therefore be used as a marker variable, an indicator of the chosen social environment in many cases that may be considered a “risky” social environment (see Ullman, 2003 for review of proposed theories). Participating in binge drinking episodes, especially in the common context of coed social gatherings, increases exposure to scenarios in which the potential male perpetrator may misperceive a woman’s signals. In addition, it increases exposure to situations among peers in which sexual assault has occurred in the context of heavy alcohol use.
In practical terms, a college man who frequently drinks higher quantities of alcohol is more likely to be exposed to an environment that is more highly conducive to sexual assault than the environment of his non-drinking peers. He may be more likely to hear about incidents from friends who had nonconsensual sex with someone who was intoxicated, and to agree with his ingroup, explaining the incident by blaming the intoxicated victim or situational factors. As presented previously, repeated exposure to not guilty verdicts or beliefs may perpetuate greater RMA among men (Sinclair and Bourne, 1989). Thus, repeated episodes of this sort among peers may further polarize 1) negative attitudes towards victims of nonconsensual sex and 2) alternative attributions of the rape that remove responsibility from the perpetrator, both inside and outside of the social drinking context. Therefore, although alcohol use is not itself causally related to victim-blaming attitudes, it may represent an indicator of environmental factors that play a role in rape proclivity.

Gender Stereotypes, Chivalry, and Rape Myth Acceptance

Gender Stereotyping

Gender stereotypes consist of conceptions of appropriate gender roles, and are often implicitly embedded in social scripts, belief systems, and feelings (Ashmore, Del Boca, & Wohleres, 1986). As previously noted, correlational research has indicated that sexually aggressive men also tend to endorse more traditional or stereotypic gender roles (Burt, 1980; Koss, 1981; Malamuth, 1988). Koss (1981) offered the suggestion that acceptance of culturally transmitted gender stereotypes increases the likelihood of holding rape-supportive beliefs. As previously noted, cross-cultural research has indicated that beliefs in women’s inferiority and lower status of women, as well as heightened acceptance of physical aggression, can predict rape-proneness of societies (Reiss, 1986; Lottes, 1984; both in Burgess, 1988). This research is
consistent with feminist theory that points towards the perpetuation of patriarchal social norms as a driving force behind creating a rape-supportive culture.

Hostile and Benevolent Sexism

One area of recent research interest is the differing impact of hostile and benevolent sexism on RMA. Benevolent sexists view women as in need of protection due to their prescribed roles as mothers and wives, and act in a manner that reflects courtesy and protection. In contrast, hostile sexists view women as using their uniquely devious skills and female sexuality to gain sexual dominance and power over men. Glick and Fiske (1996) proposed that it is possible to simultaneously endorse hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes towards women (resulting in “ambivalent sexism”) although the two result in opposite emotional responses towards women. Ambivalent sexists hold both views simultaneously and, based on ambivalent sexism theory, can use and apply such beliefs simultaneously due to subtyping different kinds of women. Therefore, ambivalent sexists may view and treat women differently in varying situations, based on perceptions of women’s behaviors (Glick and Fiske, 1996).

Intuition would lead us to believe that individuals who endorse benevolent sexist attitudes towards women (e.g., women are to be cherished, placed on pedestals, etc.) instead of the more hostile attitudes would be less likely to blame a female rape victim. However, research has indicated that the impact of such attitudes on perceptions of a victim varies as a function of the victim’s behavior. If a victimized woman is perceived as acting inappropriately (i.e. outside of traditional sex role norms) and somehow inviting a sexual relationship with the potential rapist, then benevolent sexists view her as more deserving of blame (Abrams, Viki, Masser, & Bohner, 2003). Therefore, although benevolently sexist attitudes may appear on the surface to entail positive, protective feelings towards women, the resulting impact of such attitudes may be
parallel to those that are more hostile in nature.

**Benevolent Sexism and Chivalry**

Little research has been done on current conceptions of chivalry among college men, and whether or not chivalry is truly “dead” among members of this age cohort. Endorsement of chivalrous attitudes is sometimes equated with benevolently sexist attitudes, in that both encourage the protection of women and the granting of certain privileges or roles to one gender over the other. However, chivalry may tap into a different construct than benevolent sexism, in that chivalry encourages specific social courtesies (e.g. opening doors, offering up seats) for acquaintances and strangers alike, particularly in the southern regions of the U.S. This promotes the idea that all women may be more physically fragile, but does not necessarily simulate the broader assumptions that accompany benevolently sexist beliefs, in which only “appropriate” women are to be revered as gentle, caregiving mothers (not career women) who are to be placed on pedestals (and thus given limited mobility). Therefore, college men who endorse chivalry may do so out of habitual behaviors of endorsed social niceties, and may not simultaneously endorse benevolently sexist attitudes.

**A Study of College Female Victimization**

**General Background and Results of Original Study**

White, Smith, and Humphrey (White & Smith, 2001) conducted an NIH-funded, five-year longitudinal study on the physical and sexual victimization of college women, surveying over 2500 college men and women at a state-supported U.S. university. The purpose of this study was to evaluate precursors of physical and sexual violence against young women, including characteristics of the victim, perpetrator, and environment. In general, 88% of the women had experienced at least one incident of physical and/or sexual assault between adolescence and their
fourth year of college, and a full 63% had experienced both. The risk for one type of victimization significantly increased the risk for subsequent victimizations of the same and the other type of victimization. Approximately 8.5% of men reported committing or attempting rape at some point during adolescence, with sexually aggressive behavior declining over time during college, particularly for rape and attempted rape between the third and fourth years. Prior sexual assault perpetration during adolescence was also highly predictive of perpetration among men during the freshman year of college. There was also a steady increase over time among men with regards to involvement in only consensual sexual activities. Most importantly, these trends were evaluated in terms of attrition effects and were found to hold for men who participated in the entire survey as well as for those who dropped out at some point.

Re-evaluation of Data from Men

Although the data from the men’s surveys were analyzed in terms of perpetration rates and risk for later perpetration, as well as attitudinal correlates of perpetration, the trends in attitudes and reported rape proclivity were not evaluated in detail. The purpose of the present study was to use the advantages of the longitudinal data to evaluate shifts and trends in attitudes towards women and sexual assault, as well as behavioral correlates, in order to generate a theoretical multivariate model for victim-blaming rape myth adherence. This information could have important policy implications in terms of educational programs for male college students. If attitudes towards rape victims are firmly in place before beginning college and demonstrate little change, then educational programs should target attitudes among high school populations. On the other hand, if personal attitudes shift during the first few college years, then it would be expected that rape myth attitudes would also demonstrate change. Therefore, it is important to know when and how this change unfolds, and which outside factors (e.g. alcohol use, attitudes toward
gender) are influential in order to form a more timely and effective educational policy.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. Incoming college men who report higher levels of sexualized peer attitude exposure, perpetration of dating aggression, need for dominance in sexual relationships, and/or alcohol use before beginning college will endorse more victim-blaming attitudes by the end of their first year, compared to peers who report lower levels of these variables.

Hypothesis 2. College men who report higher levels of sexualized peer attitude exposure, perpetration of dating aggression, higher need for dominance in sexual relationships, higher alcohol use, and/or more traditional gender stereotypes at the end of freshman year will concurrently endorse more victim-blaming attitudes at the end of their first year than do participants who report lower incidence of these variables.

Hypothesis 3. College men who endorse chivalrous attitudes at the end of freshman year will be less likely concurrently to endorse victim-blaming attitudes than are college men who do not endorse chivalry.

Hypothesis 4. College men who endorse victim-blaming attitudes at the end of their freshman year will report higher rape proclivity at the end of their sophomore year, in comparison to college men who do not blame rape victims.

Hypothesis 5. College men who endorse both traditional gender stereotypes and chivalrous attitudes at the end of their first year will be less likely to endorse victim-blaming attitudes than do college men who only endorse traditional gender stereotypes, and more likely to endorse victim-blaming attitudes than do those who do not endorse either. In other words, chivalrous attitudes will moderate the relationship between traditional gender stereotypes and victim-blaming attitudes at the end of freshman year.
Hypothesis 6. College men who report frequently consuming larger quantities of alcohol will be more likely to report more sexualized peer attitude exposure than do men who do not frequently consume high quantities of alcohol. This finding will be true for each wave of data.

Hypothesis 7. The relationship between alcohol use and victim-blaming attitudes will be mediated by exposure to sexualized peer attitudes. That is, individuals who report frequent alcohol use before or during freshman year and report frequent exposure to sexualized peer attitudes will be more likely to endorse victim-blaming attitudes than individuals who report frequent alcohol use but little exposure to sexualized peer attitudes.

Hypothesis 7a. The positive relationship between alcohol use at the time of freshmen orientation and victim-blaming attitudes at the end of freshman year will be mediated by the amount of exposure to a particular sexualized peer attitude at the time of freshman orientation. That is, individuals who report frequent alcohol use before beginning college and concurrently report frequent sexualized peer attitude exposure will be more likely to endorse victim-blaming attitudes at the end of freshman year than peers who report frequent alcohol use, but infrequent sexualized peer attitude exposure.

Hypothesis 7b. The positive relationship between alcohol use at the time of freshman orientation and victim-blaming attitudes at the end of freshman year will be mediated by the amount of exposure to a particular sexualized peer attitude at the end of freshman year. Thus, it is predicted that college men who report frequent alcohol use before beginning college and report frequent sexualized peer attitude exposure at the end of freshman year will be more likely to endorse victim-blaming attitudes than peers who report frequent alcohol use before beginning college and infrequent sexualized peer attitude exposure at the end of freshman year.

Hypothesis 7c. The positive relationship between alcohol use and concurrent victim
blaming attitudes at the end of freshman year will be mediated by the amount of exposure to a particular sexualized peer attitude at the end of freshman year. In other words, individuals who report frequent alcohol use at the end of their first year and concurrently report frequent sexualized peer attitude exposure will be more likely to endorse victim-blaming attitudes than peers who report frequent alcohol use after the first year, but low exposure to sexualized peer attitude exposure at that time.
METHOD

Original Study Participants

Participants in the original study were recruited from the incoming freshmen classes at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, for a five-year longitudinal study. Each class of participants was surveyed first during freshman orientation, and then once during the Spring semester of each consecutive year. Participants were limited to traditional freshman students (those entering college directly after high school graduation and between the ages of 17 and 20) thus narrowing the focus to men from the same age cohort. The first questionnaire was completed at freshman orientation, and questions focusing on activities during the high school years and current attitudes. Subsequent questionnaires were redistributed at the end of freshman year, the end of sophomore year, and so forth, with questions focusing specifically on the previous twelve month period only.

Three incoming classes of men (1990, 1991, and 1992) were surveyed (total $N = 835$), each three times, and results were combined across years to comprise Wave 1, Wave 2, and Wave 3 of data collection. Approximately 65% of males completed at least the first survey, but the attrition rate was relatively high (yearly retention average was 71%; 22% completed all three phases). The ethnic breakdown of the male sample was 87.4% Anglo-American, 9.3% African American, and 3.3% other ethnicities. No information was available regarding socioeconomic status, parent education level, or parental occupation.

Participants Selected for Current Study

In order to maintain a consistent sample with which to evaluate individuals’ change over time, only data from males who completed three waves of questionnaire data was analyzed. In addition, male participants who did not complete questions regarding victim-blaming on each
subsequent questionnaire were omitted from data analysis. These particular questions were asked by the original researchers only during the first administration of the study questionnaire in the Fall of 1990, thus narrowing the pool for the current study to the incoming class of 1990 and reducing the available sample from $N = 835$ to $N = 336$. The combination of this and the selection criteria for the current study resulted in a final sample size of 166, all of whom completed the first questionnaire in the Fall of 1990 and completed relevant victim-blaming attitude questions on two successive questionnaires. Of the 166 male participants chosen for analysis, 68% were born in 1972, 26% were born in 1971, 5% were born in 1970, and 1% was born in 1973. Eight-five percent of this male sample were European American ($n = 141$), 12% were African American ($n = 20$) and 3% reported that they were of other ethnic backgrounds ($n = 5$).

The reasons for analyzing this particular subsample of the overall dataset are threefold. First, in the original study, data from males was used in order to build a model of female victimization and was not evaluated in its own context. Secondly, the interests in the present study lie specifically in victim-blaming attitudes among males and reasons related to possible attitude shifts, as well as the impact of such attitudes on rape proclivity and theoretical risk for perpetration. Therefore, longitudinal data regarding victim-blaming attitudes is crucial to all analyses. Third, specific data regarding victim-blaming behavior and rape proclivity were available only in selected waves of the questionnaire. In the case of victim-blaming attitudes, only data from the second wave proved to be viable due to suspicion of data entry and coding errors for waves one and three (J.W. White, personal communication, April 28, 2005 and May 13, 2005). In addition, questions regarding rape proclivity were only introduced in the third administration of the questionnaire.
Measures

The following items and scales were analyzed for the purposes of this study, but do not represent the totality of the original questionnaires administered (see Appendix A).

**Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure**

Each participant was asked to gauge how often they heard speculation about “how a particular woman would be in bed.” Responses ranged from 1 to 5, with 1 being never, 3 being monthly, and 5 being daily.

**Aggression in Dating Relationships**

The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979) was used to assess physical assault behavior in dating situations during adolescence and college. Questions were asked in a reciprocal manner, so as to gauge the severity of physical assault experienced and perpetrated by male participants (e.g. how often “I did this to her” and “She did this to me”). Participants then ranked the frequency of violent events on a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = zero times, 3 = 2-5 times, and 5 = more than 10 times). A physical aggression scale was constructed by the original investigators from five specific behaviors and was used in this study to classify participants as perpetrating physical assault in dating situations. Examples of such behaviors include threatening to hit or throw something, pushing, grabbing, or shoving. The physical aggression subscale proved to be moderately reliable in the current study’s sample (Cronbach’s α = .75 to .89). It must also be noted that, due to extensive skew associated with this variable among the subsample chosen for this study, values were statistically trichotomized based on the unique distribution of this variable at each wave. New values ranged from a low score of 1 to a peak physical aggression score of 3.

**Desire for Dominance and Submission in Sexual Relationships**
The original investigators used 28 questions to address reasons for engaging in sexual activity. Participants rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = disagree strongly and 5 = agree strongly) their agreement with each statement as a personal reason for engaging in sexual activity. Questions dealt with issues such as the need for intimacy, level of sexual appetite, social pressure, and need for adventure. Agreement with four of these questions in particular indicated the need for dominance over a submissive partner in sexual situations (e.g. “Because I like it when my partner is really open and vulnerable to me” and “Because I like the feeling that I really have someone in my grasp”). A mean score for these four questions was calculated in order to judge the participant’s need for sexual dominance in a sexual relationship, and this subscale will be referred to as “Dominance” henceforth. The Dominance subscale was moderately reliable in the current study (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .74$ to .79).

Another set of four questions was used to measure preference for personal submissiveness in sexual situations (e.g. “Because I enjoy the feeling of being overwhelmed by my partner” and “Because sex allows me to feel vulnerable”). Mean score for these questions were inverted and then added to the Dominance score to create a separate score with a range of 2 (low) to 10 (high). This score indicates a desire for dominance without reciprocal submissiveness in sexual activity and was used as an indicator of the need for sole dominance in sexual activity. This score will be referred to as “Dominance Without Submission” henceforth.

**Alcohol Use**

Participants ranked the frequency of alcohol use on a 5-point scale of severity (0 = never drinking/not drinking in past year and 5 = drinking more than twice a week). One question addressed the frequency of alcohol use through asking, “How often do you drink alcohol?” A separate question assessed binge drinking by asking how many times a participant had five or
more drinks in a row during the past month (0 = never and 5 = ten or more times). The resulting Alcohol Use score, a product of frequency and binge drinking scores, gives a more precise estimate of the type of drinking behavior in which a participant most often engages. Thus, a low Alcohol Use score designates a person who may drink only one or two drinks very rarely. However, a higher Alcohol Use score gives an illustration of a person who drinks five or more drinks at a time at least once per week.

*Traditional Gender Stereotypes and Endorsement of Chivalry*

The original measure of traditional gender role endorsement was created by the principal investigators, based on four subscales of the Multicomponent Female-Male Relations Attitude Inventory (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1987, in White & Smith, 2001; referenced in Ashmore, Del Boca, & Bilder, 1995): 1) Acceptance of Traditional Gender Stereotypes, 2) Women Taking Initiative in Dating and Sexual Relationships, 3) Endorsement of Chivalry, and 4) Acceptance of Male Heterosexual Violence. For the purposes of this study, subscale 1 (Traditional Gender Stereotypes) was used to measure negative traditional gender role attitudes. Subscale 3 (Endorsement of Chivalry) was used to measure attitudes and behaviors that focuses primarily on the protection of women.

Participants were asked to respond on a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = agree strongly and 5 = disagree strongly) to questions such as, “Men are more independent than women,” for the Traditional Gender Stereotype subscale, and questions such as “A man should protect a woman from physical harm, even at his own expense,” for the more protective Endorsement of Chivalry subscale. The Traditional Gender Stereotypes subscale demonstrated moderate internal consistency in the current study (Cronbach’s α = .81). Internal consistency for the four items of the Endorsement of Chivalry subscale was relatively low (Cronbach’s α = .66), although this
does not discount the practical use of this subscale (Streiner 2003a and 2003b). This topic will be addressed in more detail in the discussion.

One purpose of this study is to separate potentially different relationships of hostile gender stereotypes and chivalrous attitudes to tendencies to blame a rape victim. Some scales place all of the above items together, and then relate an overall sexism score to violent attitudes/actions towards women, which can be counterproductive if endorsement of chivalrous attitudes in and of itself does not relate to actual violence, violent attitudes towards women, or benevolent sexism.

In order to generate consistency of directionality of the results, all points on the original scale (1 = agree strongly, 5 = disagree strongly) were reversed for all applicable items (such that 1 = disagree strongly, 5 = agree strongly, etc.). This will also allow for ease in comparing these scale results with other measure within this study that use a “high equals more” interpretation of numerical values.

**Victim-Blaming Attitudes**

Victim-blaming attitudes were assessed using three questions from the Acceptance of Male Heterosexual Violence subscale of the Multicomponent Female-Male Relations Attitude Inventory (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1987, in White & Smith, 2001; referenced in Ashmore, Del Boca, & Bilder, 1995). Participants were asked to respond on a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = agree strongly and 5 = disagree strongly) to the following questions: “In most cases, when a woman gets raped, she was asking for it” (Ask For It) and, “If a woman is making out and she lets things get out of hand, it’s her own fault if the man forces sex on her” (Her Fault). However, due to the small number of questions used to assess for victim-blaming, each question was used as a separate indicator of rape myth adherence. One question (“In forcible rape, the victim never
causes the crime.”) was removed from the analysis, as it demonstrated a lack of cohesion with the other two items and added little psychometric value to the measurement of victim-blaming attitudes. The questions used in the analysis will be referred to as “Ask For It” and “Her Fault” henceforth.

In a similar manner, all points on the original scale (1 = agree strongly, 5 = disagree strongly) were reversed for all applicable items (such that 1 = disagree strongly, 5 = agree strongly, etc.) to allow for ease in comparing these scale results with other measures used.

Rape Proclivity

Participants ranked their own rape proclivity in six hypothetical situations (e.g. “She gets you sexually excited.”) on a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = very likely and 5 = never). However, in this case as well, all points on the original scale were reversed for all applicable items (such that 1 = never, 5 = very likely, etc.). These questions were included only on the Wave 3 questionnaire, were administered at the end of the sophomore year. A mean score for these six situations was calculated as an indicator of overall rape proclivity, and this index demonstrated good reliability in the current study (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .89$).

Design and Procedure

White, Smith, and Humphrey (White & Smith, 2001) used a longitudinal design and replicated this design over three waves for male participants. In the initial survey, administered at orientation, questions dealt primarily with experiences during high school and current attitudes. However, in subsequent questionnaires, participants were given a reference point in order to limit responses only to the previous year. For a more detailed description of specific research design components, see the final report by White and Smith (2001).

Researchers obtained a federal Certificate of Confidentiality in order to further reassure
students as to the confidentiality of the research questions, particularly those dealing with self-reported sexual assault perpetration. Surveys were administered during freshman orientation by trained student orientation leaders, therefore making the survey an integral part of orientation and increasing the compliance rate. Those who did not attend orientation were contacted by phone. Signed consent was obtained, as well as student contact information. In addition, students were asked to provide investigators with the name, address, and phone number of someone who would know how to contact the student during the following year. As this design required that students be contacted yearly and that each questionnaire be matched, each student was given a code number, accessible only to the principal investigators and the data manager. Follow-up sessions were held each spring, with students given the option of participating on campus or via the mail. This was particularly helpful for those students who no longer attended the university. Participants were given $15 for each follow-up survey.

Although data was entered carefully, several items within certain subscales required reverse coding, particularly items within the Ashmore & Del Boca (1987) scale that addressed victim-blaming attitudes, traditional gender stereotypes, and endorsement of chivalry. After evaluating the basic descriptive statistics of the original data set and communicating with the original author (J.W. White, personal communication, April 28, 2005 and May 13, 2005), it was determined that several minor errors had been made when reverse-coding data from Wave 1 and Wave 3. Therefore, specific data from Waves 1 and 3 regarding traditional gender attitudes, endorsement of chivalry, and victim-blaming attitudes was not used in this project due to questions about its integrity.
Data Analysis

Attrition Analyses

A series of attrition analysis were conducted to compare means of attritors and non-attritors on the following scales: Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure, Aggression in Dating Relationships, Dominance, Dominance without Submission, and Alcohol Use. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to evaluate potential differences on these scales between attritors ($n = 170$) and non-attritors ($n = 166$) at Wave 1.

Analysis of Ethnic Similarities and Differences

The ethnic makeup of the chosen subsample was compared with the overall sample of male participants. A Pearson chi-square analysis was used to compare percentages of Anglo-Americans and African Americans in the subsample ($n = 166$) with attritors ($n = 170$). However, given the relatively small number of African American male participants in the subsample ($n = 20$) compared to their European American counterparts ($n = 141$), statistical tests of comparison were not conducted (see Table 1 for overall $M$, $SD$, and Table 2 for separate $M$, $SD$).

Hypothesis Testing

Several correlation matrices were constructed relating each scale mentioned in the hypotheses to others to check for possible multicollinearity. Matrices included comparisons of scales within waves, and also between waves 1 and 2, waves 2 and 3, and waves 1 and 3. The resulting information was used to address Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6, and informed regression analyses were used to test Hypotheses 5 and 7.

Hierarchical multiple regressions were used to test moderator and mediator models proposed in Hypotheses 5 and 7. Victim-Blaming Attitudes were entered as the dependent variable, with demographic variables controlled as needed. Moderator and mediator models were
tested using techniques suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986), and are elaborated further in the results section for Hypotheses 5 and 7.
RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics & Reliability Analysis

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, and Cronbach’s alphas for each measure for Waves 1, 2, and 3. Although Cronbach’s alphas for some scales may appear to be lower than convention prescribes (e.g. $\alpha = .66$ for Endorsement of Chivalry; corrected item-total $r = .29$ to $.46$), this is not unusual given the number of items per scale (ranging from four to six in this study) and the relatively small sample size ($N = 166$). Therefore, these scales still demonstrate usefulness and an appropriate amount of reliability, given their limitations (Streiner, 2003a, 2003b).

Table 2 lists means and standard deviations for Anglo-American and African-American participants separately for each primary measure at Waves 1, 2, and 3.

Attrition Analysis

An attrition analysis, using a MANOVA, was conducted to evaluate potential differences between attritors ($n = 170$) and non-attritors ($n = 166$) on the following scales and items at Wave 1: Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure, Aggression in Dating Relationships, Dominance, Dominance without Submission, and Alcohol Use. Attritors did not differ significantly from non-attritors on Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure, $F (1, 335) = 1.99, p = ns$, Dominance, $F (1, 335) = 2.81, p = ns$, Dominance without Submission, $F (1, 335) = 2.55, p = ns$, or Alcohol Use, $F (1, 335) = .78, p = ns$. However, attritors did report engaging in significantly more physical violence in dating relationships ($M = 1.49, SD = .77$) than participants who were selected for analysis ($M = 1.34, SD = .62$), $F (1, 335) = 4.32, p < .05$.

Analysis of Ethnic Similarities & Differences

Crosstabs and a Pearson chi-square analysis indicated that participants who were selected
for the final analysis ($n = 166$) differed significantly in ethnic makeup from the participants who were not selected or who attrited early on ($n = 170$), $\chi^2 = 14.23, p < .001$. The sample selected for analysis had greater numbers of self-identified European Americans ($n = 141, 84.9\%$) and African Americans ($n = 20, 12\%$) than those not selected ($n = 114, 80.9\%$ and $n = 8, 5.7\%$, respectively). However, those not selected for analysis were more likely to self-identify as other ethnicity ($n = 19, 13.5\%$) than those selected ($n = 5, 3\%$)

**Bivariate Analyses**

Pearson’s $r$ was used to analyze the relationships between variables within and across waves. Tables 3, 4, and 5 indicate within-wave correlations, and Tables 6, 7, and 8 indicate across-wave correlations. In addition, these matrices were consulted for confirmation of significant correlations between variables before mediator and moderator models were tested, following the principles outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986).

Within-wave correlation matrices revealed several important patterns (see Tables 3, 4, and 5). First, correlations between Dominance and Dominance without Submission within each wave are such that they are virtually indistinguishable statistically as a result of scale item redundancy ($r = .88$ to $.92$). In addition, the Dominance without Submission variable is viewed by the author as having more interesting features with regard to underlying rape myth theory. Therefore, only the latter variable (Dominance without Submission) was included in subsequent hypothesis testing. Also, the two victim-blaming attitudes were moderately positively correlated ($r = .53$, see Table 4). Alcohol Use was consistently and significantly correlated only with Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure for all three waves (see Tables 3, 4, 5). In addition, although there was a small correlation between Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure and Aggression in Dating within each wave, a consistently larger correlation was found between the former variable
and Dominance without Submission within all three waves (see Tables 3, 4, 5). Within Wave 2, small but significant correlations were found between Traditional Gender Stereotypes and Sexualized Peer Attitudes, Aggression in Dating, and Dominance without Submission, but not between Traditional Gender Stereotypes and Alcohol Use (see Table 4).

Across-wave correlation matrices (see Tables 6, 7, and 8) indicated that some variables were more stable with time than others. Sexualized Peer Exposure was moderately correlated with its Wave 2 and Wave 3 counterparts ($r = .49$ to $.51$, $p < .01$), as was Dominance without Submission ($r = .50$ to $.63$; see Tables 6 and 7). However, the pattern for Alcohol Use was more variable, as Alcohol Use at Wave 1 was highly correlated with Alcohol Use at Wave 2 ($r = .64$, $p < .01$), but less predictive of Alcohol Use at Wave 3 ($r = .37$, $p < .01$; see Tables 6 and 7).

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 stated that incoming college men who report higher levels of sexualized peer attitude exposure, perpetration of dating aggression, need for dominance in sexual relationships, and/or alcohol use will endorse more victim-blaming attitudes by the end of their first year of college. Inconsistent with Hypothesis 1, Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure at Wave 1 was not significantly correlated with the victim-blaming attitude Ask For It at Wave 2 ($r = .10$, $p = ns$). However, partially consistent with Hypothesis 1, Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure at Wave 1 was positively correlated with the victim-blaming attitude Her Fault at Wave 2 ($r = .22$, $p < .05$). There was no significant relationship between Aggression in Dating Relationships at Wave 1 and either Ask For It or Her Fault at Wave 2 ($r = .03$ and $r = .05$, respectively, both $p = ns$; see Table 6).

Dominance Without Submission at Wave 1 correlated positively with both Ask For It and
Her Fault at Wave 2 \( (r = .19 \text{ and } r = .18, \text{ respectively, both } p < .05) \). There was no significant relationship between Alcohol Use at Wave 1 and Ask For It at Wave 2 \( (r = .04, p = ns) \), although there was a positive correlation between Alcohol Use at Wave 1 and Her Fault at Wave 2 \( (r = .16, p < .05, \text{ see Table 6}) \).

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypothesis 2, similarly to Hypothesis 1, stated that college men who, at the end of their first year, endorse more sexualized peer attitude exposure, perpetration of dating aggression, higher need for dominance in sexual relationships, higher alcohol use, and/or more traditional gender stereotypes will concurrently endorse more victim-blaming attitudes at the end of their first year than do participants who do not express victim-blaming attitudes. However, results for Hypothesis 2 were mixed. There was no significant relationship between Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure and the victim-blaming attitude Ask For It within Wave 2 \( (r = .12, p = ns) \); however, there was a significant positive correlation between Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure and the victim-blaming attitude Her Fault within Wave 2 \( (r = .19, p < .05) \). In a similar pattern, there was no significant relationship between Aggression in Dating Relationships at Wave 2 and Ask For It at Wave 2 \( (r = .10, p = ns) \). However, there was a significant positive correlation between Aggression in Dating Relationships and Her Fault at Wave 2 \( (r = .23, p < .01; \text{ see Table 4}) \).

Dominance Without Submission at Wave 2 correlated positively with both Ask For It and Her Fault at Wave 2 \( (r = .16 \text{ and } r = .18, \text{ respectively, both } p < .05) \). However, there was no significant relationship between Alcohol Use and either Ask For It or Her Fault at Wave 2 \( (r = .04 \text{ and } r = .09, \text{ respectively, both } p = ns) \). Finally, consistent with the second hypothesis, there was a significant positive correlation between Traditional Gender Stereotypes and both types of
victim-blaming attitudes at Wave 2 (r = .24, p < .05 for Ask For It; r = .30, p < .01 for Her Fault; see Table 4).

**Hypothesis 3**

Hypothesis 3 stated that college men who endorse chivalrous attitudes at the end of freshman year will be less likely concurrently to endorse victim-blaming attitudes than are college men who do not endorse chivalry. Consistent with this hypothesis, there was a significant negative correlation between Endorsement of Chivalry and the victim-blaming attitude Ask For It at Wave 2 (r = -.25, p < .01). In addition, there was a significant negative correlation between Endorsement of Chivalry and Her Fault at Wave 2 (r = -.20, p < .05; see Table 4).

**Hypothesis 4**

Hypothesis 4 stated that college men who endorse victim-blaming attitudes at the end of their freshman year will report higher rape proclivity at the end of their sophomore year, in comparison to college men who do not blame rape victims. However, results for the fourth hypothesis are mixed. No significant relationship was found between Ask For It and Rape Proclivity (r = .12, p = ns). However, a significant positive correlation was found between Her Fault at Wave 2 and reported Rape Proclivity at Wave 3 (r = .24, p < .05).

**Hypothesis 5**

Hypothesis 5 stated that college men who endorse both traditional gender stereotypes and chivalrous attitudes at the end of their first year will be less likely to endorse victim-blaming attitudes than are college men who only endorse traditional gender stereotypes, and more likely to endorse victim-blaming attitudes than those who do not endorse either. In other words, chivalrous attitudes would moderate the relationship between traditional gender stereotypes and victim-blaming attitudes at the end of freshman year.
This moderator model was tested using the product variable approach proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986). As previously stated, there was a significant positive relationship between Traditional Gender Stereotypes and both types of victim-blaming attitude (Ask For It and Her Fault), and a significant negative relationship between Endorsement of Chivalry and both types of victim-blaming attitude within Wave 2 (see Table 4). In addition, correlation analyses and two separate scatterplots indicated that there were significant positive and linear relationships between the individual variables (Traditional Gender Stereotypes, Endorsement of Chivalry) and the product of standardized scores of these two variables ($r = .67$ and $.69$, respectively, both $p < .01$; see Table 9). T-scores were used instead of z-scores in this calculation, as the use of z-scores would have resulted in negative values and thus an inaccurate numerical reflection of the model. Therefore, Baron and Kenny’s (1986) product variable approach was appropriate for testing a potential moderator model.

Two separate hierarchical multiple regression analyses were used to evaluate the moderating effects of Endorsement of Chivalry on the relationship between Traditional Gender Stereotypes and both victim-blaming attitudes (Ask For It and Her Fault). Given that neither ethnicity nor age correlated significantly with the dependent variables, these demographics were not controlled for in this or subsequent regression analysis. Traditional Gender Stereotypes and Endorsement of Chivalry were entered at Step 1. The product of standardized scores from the Traditional Gender Stereotypes and Endorsement of Chivalry scales was entered as a separate variable in Step 2 to evaluate a potential moderating effect of chivalrous attitudes on the relationship between Traditional Gender Stereotypes and both types of victim-blaming attitudes.

When Ask For It was entered as the dependent variable in the hierarchical regression, results indicated that Traditional Gender Stereotypes and Endorsement of Chivalry separately
accounted for significant portions of unique variance ($\beta = .22$ and -.23, respectively, both $p < .01$). However, results also indicate that Endorsement of Chivalry significantly moderated the relationship between Traditional Gender Stereotypes and the victim-blaming attitude Ask For It ($\beta = 1.33, p < .01, \text{Adj } R^2 = .13$; see Table 10).

A similar pattern was found when Her Fault was entered as the dependent variable. Traditional Gender Stereotypes ($\beta = .29, p < .001$) and Endorsement of Chivalry ($\beta = -.18, p < .05$) separately account for significant portions of unique variance. However, Endorsement of Chivalry significantly moderated the relationship between Traditional Gender Stereotypes and the victim-blaming attitude Her Fault ($\beta = .97, p < .05, \text{Adj } R^2 = .13$; see Table 11).

**Hypothesis 6**

Hypothesis 6 predicted that college men who report frequently consuming larger quantities of alcohol will be more likely to report frequent sexualized peer attitude exposure than are men who do not consume high quantities of alcohol frequently, and that this finding would be true for each wave. Consistent with Hypothesis 6, correlation analyses indicate that there is a significant relationship between Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure and Alcohol Use at Wave 1 ($r = .27, p < .05$), Wave 2 ($r = .34, p < .01$), and Wave 3 ($r = .17, p < .05$; see Tables 3, 4, and 5).

**Hypothesis 7**

Hypothesis 7 predicted that individuals who report frequent alcohol use before or during freshman year and report frequent exposure to sexualized peer attitude will be more likely to endorse victim-blaming attitudes than individuals who report frequent alcohol use but little exposure to sexualized peer attitudes. Because Alcohol Use was initially proposed as a useful indirect indicator of a rape-condoning atmosphere, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis
was used to evaluate the possibility that Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure (another indicator of social environment) at Wave 1 and/or Wave 2 mediates the relationship between Alcohol Use at Wave 1 and either type of victim-blaming attitude at Wave 2.

Examination of the correlation matrices indicated that Alcohol Use at Wave 1 was significantly positively related to only one victim-blaming attitude (Her Fault) at Wave 2 \( (r = .16, p < .05; \text{see Table 6}) \). There was also a significant relationship between Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure at Wave 1 and Wave 2 with Alcohol Use at Wave 1 \( (r = .27 \text{ and } .24, \text{respectively, both } p = .05) \) and Her Fault at Wave 2 \( (r = .22 \text{ and } .19, \text{respectively, both } p < .05) \). The victim-blaming attitude Ask For It was not included in this mediator analysis due to the lack of a significant correlation between this variable and Alcohol Use. In addition, there was no significant relationship between Alcohol Use at Wave 2 and either Victim-Blaming Attitude at Wave 2, and thus, that mediator model was not tested.

Two separate hierarchical regression analyses were used to evaluate any mediating role of Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure. Her Fault at Wave 2 was used as the dependent variable, Alcohol Use at Wave 1 was entered at Step 1, and Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure (at either Wave 1 or Wave 2) was entered at Step 2. Results indicate that Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure at Wave 1 partially mediates the relationship between Alcohol Use at Wave 1 and the victim-blaming attitude Her Fault at Wave 2 \( (\beta = .20, p < .05, \text{Adj } R^2 = .04; \text{see Table 12}) \). In addition, the second regression analysis indicates that Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure at Wave 2 also partially mediates the relationship between Alcohol Use at Wave 1 and Her Fault at Wave 2 \( (\beta = .16, p < .05, \text{Adj } R^2 = .04; \text{see Table 13}) \).

Exploratory Analyses - Ethnicity

All proposed hypotheses were tested again using only Anglo-American men in the
subsample (n = 141) to ensure applicability of findings to Anglo-American college men. African-American and participants of other ethnic origin were not analyzed separately due to a small sample size (n = 25) and the lack of generalizability of findings from such a select few. In general, the findings were replicated among this Anglo-American subsample. Any differences were slight and at the hundredth decimal place, and therefore did not notably impact overall effect size.

Exploratory Analyses – Other Mediators

Given the initial findings, it was appropriate to use further regression analyses to explore potential mediator models to explain Rape Proclivity at Wave 3, and incorporate several variables from Wave 1 and Wave 2. The first exploratory model was used to examine potential mediating effects of the victim-blaming attitude Her Fault on the relationship between Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure, Aggression in Dating Relationships, and Dominance without Submission at Wave 1 with Rape Proclivity at Wave 3. These variables were included due to their significant correlation with Rape Proclivity at Wave 3, and the significant relationship between Her Fault at Wave 2 and Rape Proclivity at Wave 3.

A hierarchical regression analysis was used to test this first exploratory model. Rape Proclivity was identified as the dependent variable. The variables Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure, Aggression in Dating Relationships, and Dominance without Submission were entered together at Step 1, and the victim-blaming attitude Her Fault was entered at Step 2. Results indicate that only Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure and Aggression in Dating Relationships separately account for significant portions of the variance when predicting Rape Proclivity (β = .18, p < .05, and β = .20, p < .01, respectively; see Table 14). However, the victim-blaming attitude Her Fault also mediates the relationship between Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure and
Rape Proclivity, but this mediating effect does not hold for Aggression in Dating Relationships ($\beta = .18$, $p < .05$, Adj $R^2 = .11$; see Table 14).

The second exploratory model evaluated the potential mediating effect of Her Fault at Wave 2 on the relationship between Sexualized Peer Attitudes and Traditional Gender Stereotypes at Wave 2 and Rape Proclivity at Wave 3. Again, these variables were included due to their significant relationships with Rape Proclivity at Wave 3. Regression results indicate that when Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure and Traditional Gender Stereotypes were entered together to predict Rape Proclivity, only Traditional Gender Stereotypes account for a significant portion of the variance ($\beta = .12$, $p = ns$ and $\beta = .16$, $p < .05$, respectively). In addition, the victim-blaming attitude Her Fault only partially mediates the relationship between Traditional Gender Stereotypes and Rape Proclivity ($\beta = .19$, $p < .05$, Adj $R^2 = .06$; see Table 15).

The potential that these variables at Wave 2 could in turn mediate the relationship between victim-blaming attitudes at Wave 2 and Rape Proclivity at Wave 3 was also explored. However, results of regression analyses did not support this possibility.
DISCUSSION

Overall, results from this study indicate that college men who endorse certain attitudinal (e.g. traditional gender stereotypes) and environmental (e.g. alcohol use) variables before and during their first year of college are more likely to adhere to rape myths at the end of their first year, and report higher levels of rape proclivity at the end of their second year. One of the most interesting findings, however, is that endorsement of chivalry may act as a positive “buffer” between traditional gender stereotypes and negative attitudes towards rape victims, which contrasts with ambivalent sexism theory proposed by Glick and Fiske (1996). Another significant finding came from evaluating separately the different roles of the two types of victim-blaming attitudes (VBAs; Ask For It and Her Fault), and discovering that one type of VBA mediates the relationship between earlier environmental and behavioral variables and later reports of rape proclivity, whereas another might not do so consistently. This latter finding perhaps has the most practical implications for education and policy.

Conceptualizing these two rape myth attitudes as overt or covert aids in the interpretation of many results from this study. The first VBA (Ask For It) stated that when a woman gets raped, she is asking for it. This can be viewed as a more overt rape myth attitude, as it appears to be highly pejorative and would likely be endorsed by college men who openly admit to holding highly negative attitudes towards rape victims. In contrast, the second VBA (Her Fault) involves more situational and behavioral cues, stating that it is a woman’s fault when a man forces sex on her if she lets a kissing session “get out of hand.” This VBA reflects a more covert attitude, in that college men who would not endorse the first attitude may actually blame rape victims, given special circumstances. Such a distinction becomes important when evaluating the “prototypical” college acquaintance rape scenario, which parallels the second VBA scenario (Her Fault) and
generally involves more covertly held attitudes. For the reader’s convenience, a brief overview of variables that correlate significantly with overt and covert victim-blaming attitudes separately is provided in Table 16.

Although the original hypotheses were organized chronologically by separate data waves, results indicate that particular variables are linked statistically and conceptually across waves, and therefore should be discussed together. Therefore, environmental and behavioral variables will be discussed first, followed by attitudes toward gender, predictions of rape proclivity, and the mixed results regarding physical and sexual aggression.

Alcohol & Peer Influence

College men who used alcohol frequently before entering college and were exposed to sexualized peer attitudes before and during their freshman year were more likely to endorse the more covert (but not the overt) VBA, as predicted in Hypothesis 1. In addition, it appears that exposure to sexualized peer attitudes both before and during freshman year partially mediates the relationship between early alcohol use and later endorsement of the covert VBA, as predicted by Hypothesis 7 (see Figure 1). In other words, college men who reported frequent alcohol use before beginning college and frequent exposure to sexualized peer attitudes either before or during their first year of college were more likely to endorse the covert VBA than alcohol-using peers who did not report this type of peer environment. Thus, the level of alcohol use alone may be insufficient for predicting later negative attitudes towards rape victims; their perceptions of peer group attitude towards women affect the significance of this relationship as well. In addition, it must be noted that alcohol use and sexualized peer attitudes are heavily intertwined, in that there was a strong relationship between these two variables within each wave of data collection, as predicted by Hypothesis 6.
Three important implications can be drawn from this information. First, these findings support the theory proposed by Abbey and her colleagues (2001), as well as Ullman (2003), that alcohol use serve as a marker variable for a certain social environment that relates to victim-blaming attitude adherence. A second implication is that alcohol use and peer group attitudes are important environmental variables that may contribute significantly to attitudes towards rape victims and frequently go hand-in-hand. Although results are preliminary in that only a single question was used to ascertain the level of sexualized peer group attitudes, these findings indicate that these types of peer group attitudes are very stable over time and work to mediate the relationship between alcohol use and negative attitudes towards rape victims. The question remains as to whether negative attitudes towards rape victims are strengthened by peers who are actively selected because they support such attitudes, or whether peer groups in college work to shape later attitudes. In reality, the relationship is likely bidirectional, but further research using longitudinal and/or experimental designs could highlight further answers.

A third implication from these findings is that alcohol use and sexualized peer attitudes are related only to endorsement of the covert VBA. Therefore, college men who report alcohol use early into their college career, and are surrounded with peers who often sexualize women, are not particularly likely to claim that rape victims “ask for it.” They are, however, more likely to blame a rape victim if some consensual physical contact has already occurred and the victim is attempting to say no. This is one common date rape scenario, and is particularly applicable to college students, given the high incidence of acquaintance rape among this population (Catalona, 2004; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner; Hart, 2003).

Gender Stereotyping & Chivalry

Consistent with previous research, college men who held traditional gender stereotypes at
the end of freshman year (e.g. men are more independent, women are more sensitive) were more likely to endorse concurrently both types of VBA in this study, consistent with Hypothesis 2. This adds credence to feminist theory that places patriarchal social norms as a major force behind creating a rape-supportive culture (Brownmiller, 1975; Koss, 1981). However, one of the most interesting findings in this study was that college men who endorsed chivalrous attitudes were not more likely than their non-chivalrous peers to blame rape victims. In fact, consistent with Hypothesis 3, such men were less likely to endorse either type of VBA. In addition, holding such chivalrous beliefs was associated with a lower likelihood that participants who also held traditional ideas about gender would blame the rape victim. However, without such chivalrous beliefs, men who endorsed traditional gender stereotypes were more likely to endorse VBAs. These results, which are consistent with Hypothesis 5, indicate that the endorsement of chivalry may act as an “attitude buffer” between traditional gender stereotypes and hostile attitudes towards rape victims.

These findings regarding chivalry conflicts with previous research that indicated a positive relationship between benevolent sexism and negative views of rape victims (Abrams, Viki, Masser, & Bohner, 2003). One explanation of this finding is that chivalry can be conceptualized as a reflection of habitual behaviors of social niceties, but as a separate concept from benevolent sexism. This explanation is further substantiated by the finding that chivalry was negatively correlated with both the overt and covert VBA. Ambivalent sexism theory would posit that a benevolent sexist would condemn violence against women, but only when the victim is perceived to be acting according to “appropriate” stereotypical norms for women’s behavior. In a scenario in which the woman is acting in an overtly sexual manner or does not succeed in her role as the guardian of her own chastity (as with the covert VBA scenario), benevolent
sexists would be likely to view her as deserving of blame (Abrams, Viki, Masser, & Bohner, 2003). In contrast, this was not the case with college men in this study who endorsed chivalry. Therefore, chivalry may not be accurately conceptualized as a subtype of benevolent sexism, and should be studied in its own right as a separate set of attitudes and behaviors.

**Rape Proclivity**

Although a causal relationship between rape myth adherence and later rape proclivity could not be determined from this data, interesting findings regarding rape proclivity were generated from this study. College men in the current study who endorsed the covert VBA at the end of their freshman year were more likely to report higher rape proclivity at the end of their sophomore year than did their peers who did not endorse this VBA, as predicted by Hypothesis 4. This result is consistent with findings by Willan and Pollard (2003), who reported that high rape myth adherence was significantly related to self-reported rape proclivity.

Additionally, no significant relationship was found between the *overt* victim-blaming attitude and later rape proclivity, which was inconsistent with Hypothesis 4. It became apparent that the role of the covert VBA needed to be evaluated further, along with other attitudes, in later self-reports of rape proclivity. Participants who reported both frequent exposure to sexualized peer attitudes (either before and/or at the end of their first year of college) and adherence to the covert VBA at the end of the first year were more likely to report higher rape proclivity at the end of their second year than were their peers who reported a similar peer environment, but did not endorse the covert VBA. Therefore, adherence to the covert VBA worked to partially mediate the relationship between earlier sexualized peer attitude exposure and reported rape proclivity at the end of the second year. A similar mediating role for the covert VBA was found for the relationship between traditional gender stereotypes and later self-reports of rape proclivity.
among college men. The combination of these findings further supports the notion that victim-blaming attitudes play different roles, and that perhaps covert VBAs play a more significant role than overt VBAs in later behaviors of college men when combined with particular types of peer influence and attitudes towards gender (see Figure 2 for a diagrammatical representation of combined findings).

However, it is important to note that the current study measured rape proclivity as the overall score across six hypothetical situations that involved variables such as alcohol use, previous sexual behavior of the woman, and perceived sexual intent. Although the reliability for this six-item scale was relatively high (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .89$), victim-blaming attitudes may be differentially associated with each scenario. Thus, it is critical to further evaluate the specific types of scenarios in which covert VBAs may play a large role in the decision-making process of college men who endorse such attitudes.

The Role of Sexual Needs & Dating Aggression

Dominance and Dominance without Submission were almost indistinguishable concepts in this study. College men who reported a need for sexual dominance were more likely to report a very low preference for any type of reciprocal submission in the bedroom compared to their peers who did not report a need for sexual dominance. In addition, this type of sexual preference was highly stable throughout the first and second years of college.

With regard to VBAs, college men who reported this need for dominance without submission before beginning college were more likely to endorse both types of VBA at the end of the first year than were peers who did not report a high need for dominance without submission, consistent with Hypothesis 1. However, it appears that need for dominance without reciprocal submission at the end of the first year was unrelated to endorsing the overt VBA,
which was inconsistent with Hypothesis 2.

Dating aggression also had only a small and varying relationship to victim-blaming attitudes and rape proclivity. College men who reported committing physical dating aggression during their freshman year were more likely to endorse the covert (but not overt) VBA, which partially upholds Hypothesis 2. However, the perpetration of physical dating aggression during high school was unrelated to later endorsement of VBAs, inconsistent with predictions of Hypothesis 1, although dating aggression during high school was significantly related to rape proclivity at the end of sophomore year. It must be noted that one interesting difference between participants selected for this analysis and those who dropped out of the study is that attritors engaged in significantly more dating aggression in high school than did those who continued in this study. Therefore, although dating aggression did not reveal itself to be critical to a majority of the correlation and regression analyses in this study, this may be due to characteristics of the selected sample, not the salience of this construct to victim-blaming attitudes in the larger college male population. This result could also be due to the low occurrence of dating aggression (indicated by the heavy skew) in the selected subsample, which required that the results be trichotomized, thus resulting in a loss of variance.

These results give only modest support to previous research findings and theories that sexual and physical aggression towards women is linked to rape myth adherence (Burt, 1980; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995; Murnon, Wright, & Kaluzny, 2002; Yescavage, 1999). Although dating aggression and need for sexual dominance without reciprocal submission were correlated with one another at the end of the first and second years of college, there was no stable prediction pattern among the two for either VBAs or later rape proclivity.
A Note on Ethnic Similarities & Differences

Although the sample selected for this study had a higher percentage of African American participants than did the attritors, one drawback to this study was the lack of ethnic diversity. However, even though it was not possible to compare statistically the results from African American and European American college men, it was found that inclusion or exclusion of African American participant data did not significantly alter the results of hypothesis testing. In addition, the finding that African American men reported drinking less alcohol than their European American peers was not surprising, and replicates previous findings by Engs and Hanson (1985, in Schwartz, 1997) in which almost 42% of African American students reported abstaining from alcohol, compared to only 15% of European Americans being abstainers. Thus, the models generated from this study may or may not be generalizable to the African American population, particularly with regard to the role that alcohol use may play in peer group selection and social influence on rape myth attitude adherence.

Strengths & Limitations

Strengths of this study include its relatively unique longitudinal design and a general lack of attrition effects. Although causal relationships could not be determined given the study design, it is important to utilize data collection techniques that look at attitude adjustment over time, as most previous studies regarding rape myth adherence have used a cross-sectional design. Despite a large attrition rate, attritors generally did not differ from non-attritors on early measures (except on physical dating aggression) therefore making results more generalizable to the college population.

Also, several predictor variables from a variety of different domains were measured, which allowed for a more thorough analysis of predictors of rape myth adherence and self-
reported rape proclivity than evaluating only one or two predictors using a cross-sectional design. Furthermore, many of these variables proved to be relatively stable over time. Future research should evaluate the independent and combined impact of these variables on rape myth attitudes and proclivity using modeling techniques such as structured equation modeling, in order to make the most out of such data (see Figure 3 for suggested model).

One perceived drawback of some measures used was their relatively low internal consistency reliability. However, it must be taken into account that some of the scales used were comprised of very few items (four to ten in most cases), which automatically works to lower reliability estimates. In addition, the reliability estimates listed were for the smaller subsample \( n = 166 \), which could also explain these relatively low reliability estimates (Streiner, 2003a, 2003b).

Further longitudinal research that uses better, well-validated measures of victim-blaming attitudes, traditional gender role stereotypes, and endorsement of chivalry is needed in order to replicate and extend these findings. The measure chosen by the original researchers to evaluate these particular variables has been revised, expanded, and published under the new title of the Gender Attitude Inventory, and has been found by its authors to have improved internal consistency and temporal stability (Ashmore, Del Boca, & Bilder, 1995). Also, although this measure was administered for three consecutive waves, results from the first and third waves were deleted from analysis due to data entry and reverse coding tactics that were suspect (J. W. White, personal communication, April 28, 2005 & May 13, 2005).

Finally, although several significant findings were reported in this study, effect sizes for particular results were relatively low. This is not surprising, given the study design and the wealth of variables that play a role in attitude development. However, it is important not to
overstate the implications of individual findings within this study. Instead, several such findings should be combined to demonstrate their overall impact.

Specific Implications for Future Research

Consistent with previous research, endorsement of rape myth attitudes continues to be an important issue for college men. However, given that sexual assault education and rape awareness on campus has increased in the past two decades, college men may no longer adhere to overtly negative attitudes towards rape victims and may be more likely to report that they believe “no means no.” Therefore, it becomes necessary to further evaluate types of rape myth adherence in order to target more subtle, underlying beliefs that are expressed more covertly and may be more ambiguous. As can be seen in this study, there is a significant difference in the relationships between the variables measured and overt versus covert VBAs, including later rape proclivity (see Table 16). Peer attitudes, dating aggression, need for sexual dominance, alcohol use, and even rape proclivity, were more likely to be significantly related only to endorsement of the covert VBA. The fact that rape myths may be separated by subtype may explain conflicting findings in the literature concerning the relationship between rape myths as a whole and variables that are theoretically related.

In addition, future research should evaluate the impact of covert and overt attitudes on type of rape proclivity and/or type of perpetration. Adherence to covert rape myths appears to lend itself to greater incidence of alcohol-related acquaintance rape, whereas adherence to overt rape myths may lend itself to a different type of rape proclivity. In addition, it is unknown whether the internalization of different types of rape myths by sexual assault survivors leads to differing recovery patterns. Some rape victims may reject overt beliefs that the assault was their fault, but may accept more covert attitudes that somehow they should have been able to control.
the situation through not consuming alcohol or not initiating any type of physical intimacy. At present, the type of rape myth (overt or covert) endorsed by victims that is more detrimental to a healthy recovery process is unknown.

Further delineation of chivalry and benevolent sexism as defined constructs within the feminist literature is required. Often, such terms either are used interchangeably or chivalry is subsumed under the rubric of benevolent sexism. However, these two constructs may have very different practical implications and can be interpreted another way. Endorsement of chivalry, due to its underlying assumptions about female fragility, undoubtedly encourages behaviors that favor one sex over another. However, as seen with the results of this study, chivalrous college men did not demonstrate the same beliefs towards rape victims that benevolent sexists would have demonstrated. Therefore, despite the sexism that unavoidably accompanies chivalrous beliefs, the protective role of such beliefs as a buffer between gender stereotyping and rape myth adherence cannot be ignored.

Also, if chivalry and benevolent sexism are assumed to be the same construct and measured on the same scale, the results may work to cancel one another out with regard to rape myth attitudes. It is important to separate these concepts and carefully interpret the implications of chivalrous behavior, particularly in environments that reinforce these behaviors as part of the polite social norm. In this respect, the newly revised measure of chivalry published by Ashmore, Del Boca, and Bilder (1995) in the form of the Gender Attitudes Inventory may be useful for studying chivalry among the college population.

Given that several of these behaviors and attitudes were apparent in this sample at freshman orientation, it is important to evaluate the development of these same behaviors and attitudes in high school. There is a lack of research on high school students and their attitudes
towards rape victims, although the incidence of sexual assault has increased among this age group.

Another important task for researchers is to evaluate the generalizability of findings regarding rape myth attitude adherence and later rape proclivity to ethnic minority college men. For example, alcohol use may play a lesser role in rape myth attitude development among African American and/or Muslim men. In addition, although the relationship between acculturation and attitudes towards rape has been evaluated among Asian college students (Mori, Bernat, & Glenn, 1995), we known very little about other ethnic populations and therefore have difficulty generalizing rape myth theory to all college men or providing adequate sexual assault education.

Implications for Policy & Prevention

Awareness of acquaintance rape has increased on many college campuses. However, it is important that these covert attitudes also be targeted in sexual assault education for this group in order to go beyond the “no means no” form of education. Those who report that rape is never the fault of the victim may still endorse belief systems that include more subtle attitudes, such as the belief that any sexual initiation, promiscuity, or intoxication indicates blanket permission. Therefore, when targeting those who “should” attend such educational programs, it is important that measures include variations of rape attitudes that are both overt and subtle. This lesson also applies to those who work with rape victims in the realm of law enforcement, as endorsement of rape myths can significantly impact police officer treatment of victims.

Finally, as seen with this study, specific types of environmental and attitudinal variables, particularly alcohol use, sexualized peer environments, and adherence to traditional gender stereotypes, are related to greater covert victim blaming and a greater risk for rape proclivity.
among college men. Many rape prevention programs focus on traditional gender role beliefs, but not on the combined role of alcohol and peer influence. Given the educational opportunities and heightened exposure to new ideas that accompany the college environment, rape prevention programs that go beyond reducing traditional gender attitudes to target alcohol use, peer influence, and subtle victim-blaming belief patterns may be most beneficial for reducing rape proclivity.
Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics for Primary Measures (N = 161 to 166)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cronbach’s α</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cronbach’s α</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cronbach’s α</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression in Dating&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance w/o Submission</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Gender Stereotypes&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement of Chivalry&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization Blaming Attitudes&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask For It&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her Fault&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape Proclivity&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Indicates single item  
<sup>b</sup> Variable was trichotomized to reduce skew  
<sup>c</sup> Data listed only for available waves.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure^b</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression in Dating^c</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance without Submission</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use^b</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Gender Stereotypes^d</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement of Chivalry^d</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim-Blaming Attitudes^d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask For It^b</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her Fault^b</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape Proclivity^d</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a European Americans (n = 141), African Americans (n = 20)
^b Indicates single item
^c Variable was trichotomized to reduce skew.
^d Data listed only for available waves.
Table 3

*Correlations among Measures at Wave 1 (N = 166)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sexualized Peer Att. Exposure</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aggression in Dating⁵</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>(.81)ᵇ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dominance</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>(.74)ᵇ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dominance without Submission</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Alcohol Use</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05    **p < .01

⁵ Variable was trichotomized to reduce skew
ᵇ Indicates Cronbach’s alpha
Table 4

*Correlations among Measures at Wave 2 (N = 166)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sexualized Peer Att. Exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aggression in Dating(^a)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dominance</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dominance without Submission</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Alcohol Use</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Traditional Gender Stereotypes</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Endorsement of Chivalry</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ask For It</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Her Fault</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Variable was trichotomized to reduce skew
\(^b\) Indicates Cronbach’s alpha

* \(p < .05\)  ** \(p < .01\)
Table 5

*Correlations among Measures at Wave 3 (N = 166)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sexualized Peer Att. Exposure</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aggression in Dating</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dominance</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dominance without Submission</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Alcohol Use</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rape Proclivity</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05   **p < .01

`a` Variable was trichotomized to reduce skew

`b` Indicates Cronbach’s alpha
Table 6

Correlations between Measures at Wave 1 (Y axis) and Wave 2 (X axis) (N = 166)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Traditional Gender Stereotypes&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Endorsement of Chivalry&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Ask For It&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Her Fault&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sexualized Peer Att. Exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aggression in Dating&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dominance</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dominance without Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Alcohol Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05    ** p < .01
<sup>a</sup> Wave 2 correlates
<sup>b</sup> Variable was trichotomized to reduce skew
Table 7

Correlations between Measures at Wave 1 (Y axis) and Wave 3 (X axis) (N = 166)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1(^a)</td>
<td>2(^a)</td>
<td>3(^a)</td>
<td>4(^a)</td>
<td>5(^a)</td>
<td>Rape Proclivity (^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aggression in Dating(^b)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dominance</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dominance without Submission</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Alcohol Use</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* *p < .05  **p < .01
\(^a\) Wave 3 correlates
\(^b\) Variable was trichotomized to reduce skew.
Table 8

Correlations between Measures at Wave 2 (Y axis) and Wave 3 (X axis) (N = 166)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aggression in Dating&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dominance</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dominance without Submission</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Alcohol Use</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Traditional Gender Stereotypes</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Endorsement of Chivalry</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ask For It</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Her Fault</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  **p < .01
<sup>a</sup> Wave 3 correlates
<sup>b</sup> Variable was trichotomized to reduce skew.
Table 9

*Correlations between Individual Variables and Product Scores for Moderator Analysis (N = 166)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Traditional Gender Stereotypes (W2)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Endorsement of Chivalry (W2)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Product of Standardized 1 and 2</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05   **p < .01
Table 10

Hierarchical Regression Results for Moderator Analysis - Dependent Variable: Ask For It (N = 165)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zero-order $r$</th>
<th>Step 1 $\beta$</th>
<th>Step 2 $\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Gender Stereotypes (W2)</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement of Chivalry (W2)</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-1.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Gender Stereotypes $\times$ Endorsement of Chivalry</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.33**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(2, 163)$</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.15***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(3, 162)$</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.40***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05    **p < .01    ***p < .001
Table 11

Hierarchical Regression Results for Moderator Analyses – Dependent Variable: Her Fault (N = 165)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zero-order r</th>
<th>Step 1 β</th>
<th>Step 2 β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Gender Stereotypes (W2)</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement of Chivalry (W2)</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.89*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Gender Stereotypes X Endorsement of Chivalry</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.97*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$                      | .12          | .14      |
Adjusted $R^2$            | .11          | .13      |
$R^2$ change              | .03*         | .02*     |

$F(2, 163)$                | 11.27***     |
$F(3, 162)$               | 8.88***      |

*p < .05    **p < .01    p < .001
Table 12

*Hierarchical Regression Results for First Mediator Model – Dependent Variable: Her Fault (N = 165)*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zero-order r</th>
<th>Step 1 β</th>
<th>Step 2 β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use (W1)</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure (W1)</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(1, 164)$</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.38*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(2, 163)$</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.31**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01
Table 13

*Hierarchical Regression Results for Second Mediator Model – Dependent Variable: Her Fault (N = 165)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zero-order r</th>
<th>Step 1 β</th>
<th>Step 2 β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use (W1)</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure (W2)</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(1, 164)$</td>
<td>4.40*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(2, 163)$</td>
<td>4.40*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Table 14

Hierarchical Regression Results for First Exploratory Mediator Model – Dependent Variable: Rape Proclivity (N = 164)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zero-order $r$</th>
<th>Step 1 $\beta$</th>
<th>Step 2 $\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure (W1)</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression in Dating Relationships (W1)</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance without Submission (W1)</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her Fault (W2)</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$     .11       .14

Adjusted $R^2$ .09 .11

$R^2$ change .11*** .03*

$F(3, 160)$ 6.24***

$F(4, 159)$ 6.25***

*p < .05   **p < .01   ***p < .001
Table 15

Hierarchical Regression Results for Second Exploratory Mediator Model – Dependent Variable: Rape Proclivity (N = 163)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zero-order r</th>
<th>Step 1 $\beta$</th>
<th>Step 2 $\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure (W2)</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Gender Stereotypes (W2)</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her Fault (W2)</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(2, 161)$</td>
<td>4.07*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(3, 160)$</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.55**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05    **p < .01
Table 16

Significant Correlations for Overt and Covert Victim-Blaming Attitudes at Wave 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ask For It (Overt)</th>
<th>Her Fault (Covert)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure (W1)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure (W2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression in Dating (W1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression in Dating (W2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance without Submission (W1)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance without Submission (W2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use (W1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use (W2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Gender Stereotypes (W2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement of Chivalry (W2)</td>
<td>X (-)</td>
<td>X (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape Proclivity (W3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(W1) Freshman orientation  (W2) End of freshman year  (W3) End of sophomore year
(-) Indicates a negative relationship
Figure 1. Sexualized Peer Attitude Exposure at Wave 1 and Wave 2 illustrated as mediators between Alcohol Use at Wave 1 and the covert VBA at Wave 2.
Figure 2. Overt VBA as a potential mediator between several variables at Wave 1 and Wave 2, and Rape Proclivity at Wave 3.
Figure 3. Model for further research.
Truncated Questionnaire Items
Taken from ICPSR 3212 by White, Humphrey, & Smith (White & Smith, 2001)

What is your race or ethnic background?
1 White, Nonhispanic
2 Black, Nonhispanic
3 Hispanic
4 Asian or Pacific Islander
5 American Indian or Alaskan Native

Currently, when you are with your friends, how often do you hear talk that speculates “How a particular woman would be in bed?”
1 Never
2 A few times a year
3 Monthly
4 Weekly
5 Daily

The way that people can behave when showing anger toward a romantic partner or trying to get their way are listed below. For each of the following behaviors, show how frequently YOU have used (use) it with romantic partners and then how frequently romantic partners used it with you.

How often have these things happened during high school (or in the past year)?

1 = 0
2 = Once
3 = 3-5 times
4 = 6-10 times
5 = More than 10 times

Threatened to hit or throw something.
   I did this to her.  1 2 3 4 5
   She did this to me.  1 2 3 4 5

Threw something at the other person.
   I did this to her  1 2 3 4 5
   She did this to me.  1 2 3 4 5

Pushed, grabbed, or shoved.
   I did this to her.  1 2 3 4 5
   She did this to me.  1 2 3 4 5

Hit (or tried to hit) the other person but not with anything.
   I did this to her.  1 2 3 4 5
   She did this to me.  1 2 3 4 5

Hit (or tried to hit) the other person with something hard.
   I did this to her.  1 2 3 4 5
   She did this to me.  1 2 3 4 5
People have various reasons for engaging in sexual activity. Below are various reasons students have given for their sexual activity. Please rate each one in terms of how much you agree that it is a reason for your sexual activity.

1 = Disagree strongly
2 = Disagree moderately
3 = Neither disagree or agree
4 = Agree moderately
5 = Agree strongly

(DOMINANCE)

Because I like the feeling that I really have someone in my grasp.

Because in the act of sex more than any other time I get the feeling that I can really influence how someone feels and behaves.

Because I like it when my partner is really open and vulnerable to me.

Because when my partner finally surrenders to me I get this incredibly satisfying feeling.

(SUBMISSIVE)

Because I enjoy the feeling of being overwhelmed by my partner.

Because sex allows me to feel vulnerable.

Because I enjoy the feeling of giving in to my partner.

Because I like the feeling of being out of control and dominated by another.

For the next set of questions, choose the one answer that describes your drug or alcohol usage most accurately.

How often do you drink alcohol?
1 I never drink or have not drunk in the past year
2 I drink less than once a month but at least once in the past year
3 I drink one to three times a month
4 I drink one to two times a week
5 I drink more than two times a week

In an average month, how many times do you have five or more drinks in a row?
1 Never
2 One time
3 Two to five times
4 Six to nine times
5 Ten or more times
This section of the questionnaire is designed to obtain people’s beliefs about a number of issues concerning men and women in America today. Read each statement carefully and decide the extent to which you agree or disagree. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. We are interested in your own personal attitudes. Please be sure to answer every question, even if you are not sure.

1 = Agree strongly
2 = Agree moderately
3 = Neither disagree or agree
4 = Disagree moderately
5 = Disagree strongly

Note: Numbers indicate original numeric placement of items. Parentheses indicate specific subscale groupings. In addition, all results were reversed during data analysis such that 1 = Disagree strongly, 2 = Disagree moderately, 3 = Neither disagree or agree, 4 = Agree moderately, and 5 = Agree strongly.

*indicates items reverse-scored by original investigators

(TRADITIONAL GENDER STEREOTYPES)
1. Women are generally more sensitive to the needs of others than men are.
6. Men are more competitive than women.
8. Men are more sure of what they can do than women are.
11. Women tend to subordinate their own needs to the needs of others.
14. On the average, men are more arrogant than women.
16. Men are more independent than women.
18. Women are more helpful than men.
21. Compared to men, women tend to be gullible.
24. Compared to men, women are more able to devote themselves completely to others.
25. Men are generally more egotistical than women.

(ENDORSEMENT OF CHIVALRY)
2. Chivalrous gestures toward women on the part of men should be encouraged.
* 5. Chivalry is generally demeaning to women.
10. Men should continue to show courtesies to women such as holding open the door or helping them on with their coats.
*15. Special attentions like standing up for a woman who comes into a room or giving her a seat on a crowded bus are outmoded and should be discontinued.
*19. Social courtesies should not favor one sex over the other.
25. A man should protect a woman from physical harm, even at his own expense.

(ASK FOR IT)
7. In most cases, when a woman gets raped, she was asking for it.

(HER FAULT)
17. If a woman is making out and she lets things get out of hand, it’s her own fault if the man forces sex on her.
There are a number of circumstances under which some people think it is OK to have sex with a woman who didn’t want to (i.e., resisted verbally and/or physically). How likely is it you would have sex with a woman when did didn’t want to if each of the following happened? Let:

0 = No Response
1 = Very likely
2 = Somewhat likely
3 = Somewhat unlikely
4 = Very unlikely
5 = Never

(Note: These results were reversed during data analysis such that 1 = Never, 2 = Very unlikely, 3 = Somewhat unlikely, 4 = Somewhat likely, and 5 = Very likely.)

You spend a lot of money on her.

She’s had sexual intercourse with other guys.

She previously had sexual intercourse with you.

She is stoned or drunk.

She gets you sexually excited.

She said she’s going to have sex with you and then changes her mind.
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