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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Early Research in Moral Development

The primary researcher in the area of moral development has been Kohlberg (1969; Colby & Kohlberg, 1987), who believed that moral judgments were concerned with rights and responsibilities and based on situations involving people's actions (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987). His developmental theory was influenced by Piaget's cognitive theory of children's development, which showed that moral responses are organized differently throughout various stages of development (Piaget, 1965). Kohlberg's theory of moral development suggests that moral reasoning is not fixed, but develops through six stages as the individual matures (Kohlberg, 1969).

Longitudinal studies supporting Kohlberg's theory have found that individuals continue to progress through moral development stages throughout adulthood (White, 1988). Kohlberg's initial two stages form the Preconventional level of moral development, and reasoning of this kind is done by children and early adolescents. At Stage 1, a person adheres to rules to avoid negative consequences and physical damage to persons and property. Reasons for doing right are to escape punishment and because of the power of authorities (Kohlberg, 1976). Stage 2 is also at the Preconventional
level and stresses individualism. Rules should be followed if they serve one's own interests while also letting others do the same. Correct behavior is defined by what is fair or equal between people.

The Conventional level of Kohlberg's moral development theory is marked by two stages, and persons at these stages are usually late adolescents and adults. Stage 3 is marked by relational interactions. Being a "good" person means showing concern for others and fostering mutual relationships. Doing the right thing means caring for others and realizing their perspectives. A person at Stage 4 is more concerned with the over-arching social system and duties within society. Right actions constitute upholding the rules of society and meeting obligations to maintain social order.

Stage 5 and 6 make up the Postconventional or Principle level of moral judgment. In Stage 5, utility and social contract take precedence in the individual's concept of what is moral. The awareness that people hold a variety of values and opinions is evident, but the individual realizes that some values, such as life and liberty, should be upheld by any society. Right actions are those which abide by laws designed to preserve the welfare of all. Stage 6 is made up of universal ethical principles which are self-chosen by the individual. These principles include justice, equality of human rights, and the dignity of human beings as individuals. Right actions follow from these principles.
Only a small minority of adults ever reach the last two stages of moral development (Walker, 1984).

**Gender Differences in Moral Development**

Kohlberg and Krammer (1969) found that the mean stage of development reached by men according to Kohlberg's stage schema was Stage 4, while women usually were at Stage 3. Men were also more likely to view a particular situation based on abstract rules. This allowed them to assess easily the hypothetical dilemmas presented in Kohlberg's moral judgment interview (Kohlberg, 1969). However, many women's responses were unscorable according to Kohlberg's system, because women's reasoning in these hypothetical situations seemed to be based on feelings of empathy and were usually contextual, not hypothetical (Gilligan, 1981).

In light of apparent gender differences, Gilligan (1977: 1982) proposed that Kohlberg's model of moral development is plagued with a "masculine bias." She argued that by using an all-male sample, Kohlberg based moral development on a predominantly male ethic of justice. In an ethic of justice, moral dilemmas involve a weighing of abstract human rights and responsibilities. This ethic values the autonomy of the person (Lyons, 1983). However, Gilligan argued that women tend to operate from an ethic of care. She described an ethic of care as that which is "the psychological logic of relationships, which contrasts with the formal logic of fairness" (Gilligan, 1982, p. 73).
Morality is viewed in terms of relationships, and goodness comes from pleasing and helping others.

Women’s Moral Development

To give voice to women’s ethic of care, Gilligan (1982) posited her own cognitive-developmental stage sequence of women’s moral development. Rather than focusing on dilemmas of abstract rights, women are frequently caught between caring for themselves and others in real-life situations. In order to view themselves as "good," women learn that they must care for the needs of others (Gilligan, 1977; 1982). Her theory was based on the work of Chodorow (1976), who argued that the mother-daughter relationship shapes the female personality such that maintaining attachments and relationships become women’s prime motivation. Therefore, what constitutes being "good" for many women is maintaining the well-being of everyone in their relationships.

Gilligan (1977; 1982) theorized that women progress through three levels of moral development, all of which concern the relationship between the self and others. Women move from self-centeredness in the first level, to subordinating one’s needs for the sake of others in the second level, to finally recognizing a responsibility to both the self and others and embracing a principle of nonviolence in the third level. Two transition phases are incorporated between the three levels. An outline of her developmental schema is listed below:
Level I: Orientation to Individual Survival. The self is the only object of concern and survival is most important in making moral decisions.

First Transition: Movement from Selfishness to Responsibility. The self begins to make connections with others. There is now a conflict between serving the self and one’s responsibilities to others.

Level II: Goodness as Self-Sacrifice. The self is seen as playing out the traditional role of women as caretakers. Goodness is equated with sacrifice and the need for approval from others.

Second Transition: From Goodness to Truth. This level includes the care of the self as well as others. Actions are evaluated by their intentions and consequences, not by evaluation from others. A woman must be not only be good but honest and genuine.

Third Level: The Morality of Nonviolence. The conflict between caring for self versus others is resolved by following a principle of nonviolence or not hurting either self or others. This is based on a concept of harmony and compassion rather than Kohlberg’s morality of reciprocity and fairness (Brabeck, 1983).

Lyons (1983) further developed Gilligan’s moral stages by viewing the ethic of justice and ethic of care as two different ways of relating to others. The former focuses on separate/objective values and the latter focuses on connected/care values. The separate/objective orientation
stresses reciprocity and focuses on distancing oneself from others. Impartiality is the perspective from which relationships should be viewed. In contrast, the connected/care orientation focuses on interdependence and concern for others. According to this view, the context of the situation should be taken into account when mediating relationships.

A further revision of Gilligan's model has been completed by Attanucci (1984; 1988), whose interviews of mothers also highlighted women's view of themselves in connection with others and emphasized social roles. According to Attanucci, people view the world in two ways. They have a perspective on the self and a perspective on others. Both the perspective on the self and perspective on others may be further divided into two categories so that both may be framed objectively, in terms of social roles, and subjectively, in the person's own terms. These four categories are illustrated in Table 1.

In Attanucci's first category, Self Instrumental to Others/Others Instrumental to Self, there is no differentiation between the self and a woman's social role since reciprocity is defined by standards of society. The self and the other are performing mutually beneficial functions. There is no acknowledgment of conflict between self and other. An example of this perspective would be if a woman describes her reciprocal relationship between her
self and her husband as "I think I’m a very good mother. He is also a wonderful father."

**TABLE 1**

ATTANUCCI’S FOUR PART SCHEMA OF SOCIAL ROLES AND VIEWS OF SELF AND OTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspectives on Other</th>
<th>Perspectives on Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Role Terms</strong></td>
<td><strong>Own Terms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Reciprocal</td>
<td>3 Selfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self for others</td>
<td>Self for own terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others for self</td>
<td>Others for self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Own Terms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Selfless</td>
<td>4 Mutual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self for others</td>
<td>Self for own terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others in own terms</td>
<td>Others for own terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the second stage, Self Instrumental to Others/Others in Own Terms, the woman moves to other-centeredness so that actions become selfless in order to gain others’ approval and acceptance. She subordinates her own needs and desires to the needs, demands, and expectations of others, often robbing herself of autonomy and harming herself in the process. These women are termed "Self-Sacrifice" by Attanucci. An example of this perspective would be a woman who describes herself as "The important things are with the kids and my husband...Without them I have nothing" (Attanucci, 1988, p. 205).
In the third level of women's moral development, Self in Self's Terms/Others Instrumental to Self, an individual is concerned only with the self, and this is termed the "Instrumental" stage. Others are subordinate to the woman's own personal needs and demands. Women in this stage describe themselves as self-assured and self-protective. Because of this, these women guard against others who might use and/or abuse them. Since a relationship is defined in "self's terms," other people in the woman's relationships are not seen in their own right and she is in danger of losing sight of their needs in her efforts to be autonomous. Such a woman might describe the relationship she has with her child as "...I am strict and loving and often do many of the same things with my children that I enjoyed as a child." The relationship is completely viewed from the woman's own experience.

The highest level of the developmental schema, Self in Self's Terms/Others in Own Terms, includes a balance between the self and other, labeled "Authentic-Care." This is a recognition of both the self and others in their own terms. Unlike the first stage, there is a separation of self and role as both the self and other recognize and understand each other while mutually considering each other's terms. Fairness and honesty are the ultimate values, and the woman must be responsible both to herself and others in her relationships. At this stage the woman is able to be assertive to get her own needs met but is also able to
consider the needs of others (Oliff, 1990). There must also be a dialogue between the self and other to maintain this relationship. Women in this stage recognize problems with either denying one's terms or ignoring the terms of the others, being neither selfless nor selfish. Actions are taken to minimize hurt both for the self and others in relationships. It is in this final stage that women take a perspective beyond conventional role expectations and see both themselves and others as "authentic individuals within a caring, interdependent relationship" (Attanucci, 1984, p. 37). Such women might describe their relationship with their children as "I like to be with my kids, to try to fit time, you know, quality time in with them--things they like to do" [author's emphasis] (Attanucci, 1988, p. 206).

In this four-stage sequence women move from the traditional feminine role to inclusion of themselves as part of the people for whom they care. Attanucci (1988) found that women describe themselves differently (in one of the four categories) when viewing themselves in relation to their husbands, children, and own mothers.

Criticisms of Gilligan's Moral Development Stages

A major criticism of Gilligan's ethic of care schema concerns her contention of a male bias in the measurement of moral reasoning. This bias implies that men score higher than women on traditional morality of justice measures. Yet research examining gender differences in moral reasoning as measured by Kohlberg (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987) has not
demonstrated consistent evidence for gender differences (Rest, 1979). For instance, Walker (1984), in an extensive review of the literature, failed to find consistent differences between men and women. Haan, Smith, and Block (1968) showed that men tend to score at higher stages, but Walker (1984) concluded that these differences were confounded with other variables such as education and occupational level.

In response to the lack of gender differences found in Kohlberg’s developmental stages, Gilligan and Attanucci (1988a) argued that Gilligan’s theory was not designed to show that women are incapable of reasoning from a justice perspective. Rather, her work points to another "voice" or ethic that Kohlberg has ignored, and that a morality of care along with a morality of justice exists in both sexes. In support of Gilligan’s conclusions, Lyons (1983) found that while both men and women used justice and care orientations, the two modes of morality can be differentiated by gender. A significant portion of women (75%) used the care orientation more frequently than the justice orientation, and 79% of men used consideration of justice and rights more often than a morality of care. However, only 37% of the women interviewed failed to use any consideration of rights, while 36% of the men did not use any response (care) considerations. These results have been supported by Langdale (1983) who showed that women used more considerations of care even when solving the hypothetical
Heinz dilemma, one of Kohlberg's justice/rights dilemmas. Donenberg and Hoffman (1988) concluded that males and females use both strategies when faced with moral dilemmas. However, type of moral reasoning used was once again related to gender, since girls emphasized care more than boys when faced with interpersonal dilemmas.

Further support for Gilligan's developmental theory is found in the work of Oliff (1990). Oliff found that Self-Sacrifice and Authentic-Care women, based on Attanucci's (1984) revision, viewed themselves differently when faced with accepting or refusing a sexual bid. Other empirical support for Gilligan's overall ethic of care theory has come from research on empathy and affiliation studies. Women tend to value relationships more than men (Tavris & Offer, 1977), and are more nurturing (Seward & Seward, 1984). Emotional empathy seems to exist more in women (Hoffman, 1977), although there does not appear to be gender differences in cognitive empathy (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

Gilligan has also been criticized concerning the lack of empirical methodology used in her relational interviews, which provided support for her developmental theory (Vassudev, 1988). For instance, early formulations of her theory stemmed from work with 29 women facing decisions about abortion. Data were collected using unstructured interviews, from which Gilligan (1982) drew excerpts to support her theory. Brabeck (1983) cites problems with the small sample in Gilligan's (1982) study and her lack of
consistent probe questions. Because Gilligan did not include transcripts from her entire interviews, Nails (1983) questioned the representativeness of the narrative excerpts Gilligan used to support her theory. Nails also contended that the probe questions used to elicit information about the respondents' moral orientation may have influenced participants' responses, leading them to give answers which pleased the interviewer. Blasi (1990) also questioned the objectivity of Gilligan's interpretations of interview excerpts, criticizing the lack of a standardized coding system. To highlight the highly subjective nature of Gilligan's interpretations, Broughton (1983), in his analysis of some of her sample excerpts, concluded that even those passages did not support Gilligan's conceptualizations of three developmental levels in her ethic of care theory.

Since many of the criticisms focus on methodology, Gilligan has provided more structured interview procedures and focused on more representative samples (Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988b). As presented in the next section, scoring of interview excerpts have also become more standardized to answer these earlier criticisms.

Development of a Gilligan Scoring System

Due to numerous criticisms concerning Gilligan's methodology, there have been several attempts to standardize her interviewing techniques and scoring system. These methods can be divided into two systems: those that attempt to differentiate between an ethic of justice and an ethic of
care, and those which measure differences within the ethic of care perspective.

To differentiate between the ethics of justice and care, Gilligan initially used an open-ended interview in which women reasoned about real-life dilemmas such as whether or not to have an abortion (Gilligan, 1982). Using this method, she drew narrative excerpts from the interviews to show that women reasoned from an ethic of care as well as justice. However, Yacker and Weinberg (1990) argue that the many hours needed to conduct and score this free-response interview make it difficult and impractical to use.

Gilligan (Gilligan, Brown, & Rogers, 1990) has revised her method of extracting meaningful data from her interviews to meet these criticisms. In her subsequent work, the interviews began with the interviewer asking, "Would you describe a situation when you faced a moral conflict and you had to make a decision but weren't sure what you should do?" (Gilligan, Brown, & Rogers, 1990, p. 127). The interviews were treated as a whole and read four times: (1) for plot and sense of story as told by a narrator, (2) for information about the self or narrator, (3) as a reading for a care perspective, (4) as a reading for a justice perspective.

In another effort to standardize this procedure, Lyons (1982) provided a scoring system for these interviews. Each interview was examined as a whole and was rated as to whether it primarily reflected a care or justice
orientation. In an effort to parallel traditional scoring of moral reasoning, Lyons analyzed the three aspects of responses to the traditional Kohlberg Heinz dilemma (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987): the construction, resolution, and evaluation of the problem. Each statement was coded as fitting into one of these three categories, and as to whether it best reflected a care or justice consideration.

Recent attempts at an objective scoring system to measure both the ethic of justice and care have been undertaken by Nowinski (1986), who also focused on eliciting stories from subjects concerning a moral conflict they may have faced. She examined differences between relational and principled dilemmas in scoring of the stories. However, interrater reliability scores for her scoring system were low. Also, the lack of valid measures used undermine the usefulness of her methodology in further research.

Later methodologies have focused not differentiating a care from a justice orientation, but on determining developmental level within an ethic of care perspective. One pencil-and-paper inventory specifically designed to measure the ethic of care in college student populations is the Revised Relationship Self-Inventory (RRSI) (Strommen et al., 1987; Blank, 1988). This is a 60-item Likert-type scale in which participants are asked to rate self-descriptive statements on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (Not like me at all) to 5 (Very much like me). While the RRSI measures differences between the Separate/Objective
Self and the Relational/Connected Self, there are two subscales within the Relational/Connected Self scale: Primacy of Other Care and Self, and Other Care Chosen Freely (Blank, 1988). Cronbach alpha reliabilities on each of the four scales ranged from .77-.78 for women and .77-.85 for men.

Another recent attempt to measure women's moral development stages is the Self-Descriptive Interview (Oliff, 1990), in which coding of the interview segments uses an objective scoring system (Oliff & Russell, 1990). The interview is conducted with standardized probe questions taken from Attanucci (1984). Rather than asking interviewees to elaborate on a nonspecific moral dilemma they may have faced, the Self-Descriptive Interview asks women to describe their relationships with a significant other (i.e., boyfriend or husband). Every sentence in the respondents' interview is scored as to whether it shows a Instrumental, self-sacrifice, or authentic-care perspective on relationships and the self. Moral developmental stage is determined by a mathematical procedure conducted on each sentence in the interview. Roughly outlined, the formula takes into account: (1) the number of sentences endorsing and criticizing the three types of developmental levels, (2) the degree of criticism or endorsement, and (3) the total number of sentences scored as either Authentic-Care, self-sacrificing, or Instrumental (see Appendix 8).
The Self-Descriptive Interview and objective scoring system seems to improve on the RRSI (Strommen et al., 1987), since information about women's relationships which may be obtained by using an open-question free response format may be lost in the pencil-and-paper format of the RRSI. Secondly, the scoring of every sentence in the Self-Descriptive Interview lessens scorer bias, a criticism of Gilligan's interview scoring methodology (Nails, 1983). Finally, the objective scoring system (Oliff & Russell, 1990) captures the three-stage developmental schema of self-sacrifice, Instrumental, and Authentic-Care outlined by Attanucci (1984).

Women's Moral Development and Sex Roles

Traditional moral development measurement has been linked with sex roles. Kohlberg and Kramer (1969) argued that the third stage of Kohlberg's moral reasoning schema which equates goodness with helping and pleasing others may be functional for women who have pursued a traditional career and stayed at home rather than entered the workforce. Women who have "entered the arena of male activity" tend to progress through higher stages according to Kohlberg's schema and value fairness over care.

This is true for the ethic of care moral development theory as well. Gilligan's stage theory of moral development and the relationship between the self and others have been shown to be related to traditional sex roles of women (Broughton, 1983). For instance, women who are self-
sacrificing (Level II: Goodness as Self-Sacrifice, Self Instrumental to Others/Others in Own Terms) tend to follow the traditional feminine role of placing others' needs before themselves (Gilligan, 1977; 1982). Ford and Lowery (1986) also found that high femininity was associated with the use of an ethic of care versus justice, but this was evident only in men, since high levels of the care perspective existed in both high and low feminine women. Nevertheless, sex-role orientation has been found to be more predictive of moral orientation than gender (Pratt & Royer, 1982).

Authentic-Care women (Self in Self's Terms/Others in Own Terms) display more assertiveness in getting their own needs met and are more autonomous (Attanuci, 1984), which resembles adherence to non-traditional characteristics of women's prescribed sex roles (Bem, 1974). Since Authentic-Care women are at a higher stage than self-sacrificing women according to Gilligan, some critics have charged that Gilligan is merely exaggerating existing differences between men and women and values nonfeminine behaviors by labeling them as Authentic-Care (Nails, 1983).

Women's Sex Roles, Sexuality, and Rape

Traditional sex roles provide guidelines for dating and sexual behavior (Peplau, Rubin, and Hill, 1977). For instance, the woman's traditional role dictates that she must be attractive but not sexually available, which would cause her to be labelled as "loose." She is also the one
who must control her partner's sexual behavior (Weis & Borges, 1974; Schur, 1983). The traditional sex role calls for a woman to be initially resistant to sex and the man to persist in his advances. This "token resistance" has been documented by Muehlenhard and Hollabaugh (1988), who showed that a woman must not appear eager but should be persuaded by a man either verbally or physically. Only then will sexual activity be acceptable to her. This is similar to Lewin's (1985) concept of the female "stroking function." In order to follow the traditional sex role script, the woman must place the man's needs in front of her own in dating relationships.

It is suggested by numerous theorists that traditional sex roles also play a large part in sexual aggression and acceptance of rape (Brownmiller, 1975; Rose, 1977; Lottes, 1988). Rape behavior is "the logical and psychological extension of a dominant-submissive, competitive, sex role stereotyped culture" (Burt, 1980, p. 229). In support of this, Murnen and Byrne (1991) found that "hyperfemininity," or the endorsement of more traditional roles for women, was associated with greater experience with sexual coercion as measured by the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982).

Non-traditional (more masculine and androgynous) women differ from feminine women in their attitudes towards rape as well (Benshoff, 1977). For instance, relative to traditional women, non-traditional women are less likely to
agree with the statement that all women can be raped (Lester, Gronau, & Wondrack, 1982). Women who follow more traditional roles may also see the possible rape victim as behaving more suggestively in a rape scenario (Coller & Resick, 1987), consistent with a traditional sex role script that includes token resistance. Traditional sex-typed subjects display greater rape myth acceptance, that is, they are more likely to adhere to common societal beliefs which blame the victim for the crime (Shotland & Goldstein, 1983; Coller & Resick, 1987; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987), and blame the rapist less (Acock & Ireland, 1983). Nontraditional sex-typed persons may evaluate date rape more negatively (Check & Malamuth, 1983), but this might interact with subjects' sex, as Muehlenhard (1988) found that traditional men rate rape significantly more justifiable than non-traditional men, but this was not true for traditional women. Finally, a woman who violates traditional sex role norms may be blamed more for her attack and is seen as deserving of less respect (Acock & Ireland, 1983).

Other Differences in Women's Reactions and Perceptions of Sexual Aggression

The incidence of rape in the United States has risen steadily. Studies whose definitions of rape include date rape have shown that 22% of all college age women have been raped (Yegidis, 1986). One in three women will be raped in her lifetime (Russell, 1984). Although these figures may
seem high, the actual incidence of rape may even be much higher. This is due to the vast underreporting of rape to police and research which shows that up to 75% of women who are sexually assaulted fail to use this term to label their experience (Koss, 1985). Rape is a problem which has reached epidemic proportions in the United States and has been now recognized as a national social problem (Griffin, 1971; Koss, in press).

It is not surprising, then, that rape is a "daily part of every woman’s consciousness" (Griffin, 1971, p. 26). Yet, all women do not perceive rape the same way. Women who believe in rape myths are more likely to blame the victim and may rate the victim as more desirous of intercourse in some scenarios (Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987). Muehlenhard and MacNaughton (1988) found that some women may be more vulnerable to sexual coercion because they believe women may be at least partially responsible for sexual assault and lead men on. Of those women who believed this, 40 to 45% reported engaging in unwanted sexual intercourse, while only 13.3% of the women who did not reported giving in to such sexual aggression. However, there does not appear to be a difference between self-reported rape survivors and nonvictims in other rape attitudes (Koss, 1985).

The level of fear of rape is not universal among women either, nor does it vary directly with risk of victimization (Gordon et al., 1980). Ethnic minorities and those with low incomes fear rape the most (Riger & Gordon, 1981), although
research findings conflict as to whether young women (Warr, 1985), or the elderly (Riger & Gordon, 1981) fear rape more.

Women's Moral Reasoning, Sexuality, and Rape

It has been shown that women have differing perceptions of rape and that sex roles may influence these attitudes. Therefore, moral reasoning along a care perspective, which is linked to sex roles, may also affect women's attitudes toward rape and sexuality.

Generally, there is very little research on adult sexuality and moral development, even though sexual conflicts may be one of many ethical dilemmas faced by adults (Butler & Seidenberg, 1973). Research has shown that adolescents may use a lower level of moral reasoning when dealing with sexual dilemmas (Gilligan, Kohlberg, Lerner & Belenky, 1971). There also appears to be sex differences in moral reasoning with regard to sexual dilemmas (which has only been researched in adolescence), perhaps because sexual intercourse affects men and women differently (Linn, 1991). Because of the risk of pregnancy, women may be more concerned with attachment and commitment in a sexual relationship. The use of Kohlberg's moral stages in teaching sex education also implies that moral development and sexuality are linked (Hoffman, Pietrofesa, & Splate, 1974). In support of this, Piper (1986) found that moral development, as measured by the Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1979), was related to the likelihood of engaging in premarital intercourse. Yet, these studies have only
focused on the ethic of justice and sexual development, and have not considered a care perspective.

It appears that the ethic of care, which stresses moral conflicts involving relationships, would be Instrumental in decisions concerning sexually conflictual relationships since sexual intercourse is by nature a social act (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1983). However, the existing research on this type of moral development and sexuality is lacking. Likewise, very little previous research exists which examines the effect of moral development (either a justice or care perspective) on the perception of coercive or aggressive sexuality. Only one study (Oliff, 1990), which studied women’s views of themselves and men in sexually coercive situations, focused on the different levels of a care perspective. She found that self-sacrificing and Authentic-Care women differ in their feelings about themselves and their male partner in sexually coercive situations.
CHAPTER 2
OVERVIEW OF STUDY AND HYPOTHESES

Hypotheses

Although previous research has purported to measure perceptions of sexual assault, views and experiences with sexual assault may only be one component of an over-arching construct of personal experience with sexual coercion. Personal experience with sexual coercion, the attitudes that condone sexual aggression, societal beliefs about rape, and sexist attitudes toward women's role in society may all contribute to the construct of personal experience with sexual coercion. Therefore, any differences between women of varying ethic of care developmental levels should be measured along dimensions of this over-arching construct.

In the present study, sexual victimization was measured by the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982). Attitudes that condone sexual aggression were assessed by the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs scale (Burt, 1980), and Burt's (1980) Rape Myth Acceptance scale measured societal beliefs about rape. Finally, the Attitudes Toward Women Scale-Short Form assessed sexist attitudes toward women's role in society (Spence & Helmreich, 1972).

Factor analysis provides a means of assessing the
multidimensionality of the personal experience with sexual coercion construct. Yet, with the exception of the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale, none of the major sexual aggression instruments have used factor analysis to obtain information about the dimensions of the personal experience with sexual coercion construct. To measure accurately perceptions of this construct, a higher-order factor analysis (a principal components analysis of the factors derived from each scale) must be conducted and women of differing moral developmental levels along a care perspective must be compared across these factors.

Previous research has shown the efficacy of conducting a higher-order factor analysis to assess multidimensional constructs. For instance, in assessing bulimia nervosa, Tobin, Johnson, Steinberg, Staats, and Dennis (1991) found that single-order factor analysis of items within multiple scales measuring bulimia nervosa may have provided a too-limited description of the psychological structure of the disorder. Second-order factor analysis provided a better assessment of the complexity of the construct. Therefore, a second-order factor analysis of scales comprising the personal experience with sexual coercion construct will be conducted and differences between the three developmental levels within a care perspective will be assessed.

It is hypothesized that there will be differences between Instrumental, Self-Sacrifice, and Authentic-Care women along the both the first-order and second-order
factors comprising the personal experience with sexual coercion construct. It is predicted that Self-Sacrifice women will be more likely than the other two groups of women to endorse attitudes condoning sexual coercion because of their adherence to the traditional sex-role script of male dominance and female submission. Additionally, Instrumental women are predicted to have the least experience being the victim of sexual coercion given their self-protectiveness in relationships. Self-Sacrifice women should have the most experience with sexual coercion since endorsement of traditional roles for women is associated with greater experience of sexual coercion (Murnen & Byrne, 1991).

Finally, since Authentic-Care women realize the problems associated with being either too selfish or selfless in relationships, they would be most likely to endorse attitudes which state that women and men should be equal in their relationships.

Since the factors defining the personal experience with sexual coercion construct will be generated by the data, more in depth hypotheses concerning these groups cannot be made. In sum, it is hypothesized that there will be significant differences between the different developmental levels of women on the factors derived from a principle component analysis of the scales which measure the personal experience with sexual coercion construct.

Research Paradigm
This study will determine the factor structure of the experience with sexual coercion construct by first examining the existing factor structures of the sexual coercion and attitude questionnaires. Both the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs scale and Rape Myth Acceptance Scales have existing empirical factor structures (Briere, Muehlenhard, & Check, 1985) which were generated from data on an all-male sample of college students. A confirmatory factor analysis will determine whether those factor structures are also in the present study. If a confirmatory factor analysis shows that the existing empirical factor structure provides a poor fit to the present study’s data, then factors produced from a factor analysis on the present study’s data will be used in the final analyses. Once it is had been determined whether to use the existing factor structures or use the new ones, a factor analysis of the other instruments will be conducted.

One preliminary instrument constructed for this study is the Fear and Perception of Rape Scale which measures women’s fear, perception of control over rape, and likelihood of victimization. The concurrent validity of this instrument must be shown before it can be included in the final factor analysis which determines the over-arching personal experience with sexual coercion construct. The construct validity of the Fear and Perception of Rape Scale shall be tested by determining if its empirical factor structure matches theoretical factors. The concurrent validity shall be tested by correlating its factors with
that of the other sexual coercion scale factors. If the Fear and Perception of Rape Scale can demonstrate concurrent validity, then all factors generated from this instrument and all other scales will be factor analyzed to produce a higher order factor structure. Then, the first- and second-order factor-scales will be compared across the three developmental level groups.
Participants

One hundred and fifty-six female students from a mid-sized Midwestern Catholic university participated. All were currently in a romantic relationship with a member of the opposite sex. Subjects received course credit for their participation. Of the total sample, 35 subjects were not included in the analysis due to missing data: 25 subjects whose interviews were not able to be transcribed due to inaudible subject responses; eight subjects had missing questionnaire data; one subject was not currently in a romantic relationship at the time of the interview and one interview was interrupted by a fire drill.

Of the 121 subjects whose transcripts were coded, 23 were found to be at the Instrumental level according to Gilligan’s schema, 39 were at the Self-Sacrifice level, 51 were at the Authentic-Care level and 8 could not be placed in any of the developmental categories. Only women from each of the three levels (N = 113) were compared across variables.

Subjects’ ages ranged from 17-27 years. The mean age of the entire sample (N = 113) was 18.9 years (SD = 1.5).
As shown in Table 2, subjects' ages did not differ across the three groups, \( F(2,112) = 1.28, \) n.s. Regarding ethnicity, 63.7% of the total sample was Caucasian and the next largest minority group represented was Asian-American which made up 15% of the sample. A Chi-square analysis revealed that the three groups did not differ with regard to ethnicity, \( \chi^2(12, \text{ } N = 113) = 14.78, \) n.s.

The majority of the subjects were college freshman (68.1%). A chi square analysis comparing number of freshman across the three developmental levels with number of sophomores and others revealed that the groups did not differ in the number of students at each grade level, \( \chi^2(4, \text{ } N = 113) = 1.57, \) n.s. The majority of the sample (65.5%) were Catholic, followed by 12% of the sample as affiliated with a Protestant denomination. When number of Catholic, Protestant, and other religious affiliations were compared across groups, there were no significant group differences with regard to religious affiliation, \( \chi^2(2, \text{ } N = 113) = 1.01, \) n.s.

Twenty-three percent of the total sample were psychology majors. When number of psychology majors and others were compared across groups a Chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences between groups, \( \chi^2(2, \text{ } N = 113) = 1.86, \) n.s.

There also were no differences between groups with regard to various aspects of socio-economic status. Table 2
| TABLE 2 |
| DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FOR SAMPLE |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental (N=23)</td>
<td>Self-Sacrif. (N=39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age M=19.0 SD=1.5</td>
<td>M=18.6 SD=.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh. 15(65.2%)</td>
<td>31(79.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soph. 4(17.4%)</td>
<td>6(15.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior 2(8.7%)</td>
<td>1(2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior 1(14.3%)</td>
<td>1(14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th year- 1(4.3%)</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian 15(65.2%)</td>
<td>24(61.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-Amer. 1(4.3%)</td>
<td>2(5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Amer. 3(13.0%)</td>
<td>8(20.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic 3(13.0%)</td>
<td>5(12.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 1(4.3%)</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic 17(73.9%)</td>
<td>24(61.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist 1(4.3%)</td>
<td>1(2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist 0(0.0%)</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran 1(4.3%)</td>
<td>1(2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 0(0.0%)</td>
<td>2(5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish 0(0.0%)</td>
<td>1(2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moslem 0(0.0%)</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 4(17.0%)</td>
<td>10(26.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology 3(13.0%)</td>
<td>9(23.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 1(4.3%)</td>
<td>4(10.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2—Continued.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>3(13.0%)</th>
<th>6(15.0%)</th>
<th>8(15.7%)</th>
<th>17(15.0%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0( 0.0%)</td>
<td>4(10.3%)</td>
<td>5( 9.8%)</td>
<td>9( 8.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16(70.0%)</td>
<td>16(41.0%)</td>
<td>23(45.0%)</td>
<td>55(49.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Father's Ed. Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>7(30.4%)</th>
<th>11(28.2%)</th>
<th>15(29.4%)</th>
<th>33(29.2%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>1( 4.3%)</td>
<td>5(12.8%)</td>
<td>9(17.6%)</td>
<td>15(13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Grad.</td>
<td>7(30.4%)</td>
<td>6(15.4%)</td>
<td>12(23.5%)</td>
<td>25(22.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Yrs. Grad.Sch.</td>
<td>3(13.0%)</td>
<td>2(20.5%)</td>
<td>6(11.8%)</td>
<td>17(15.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Degree</td>
<td>5(21.7%)</td>
<td>9(23.1%)</td>
<td>9(17.6%)</td>
<td>23(20.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mother's Ed. Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>7(30.4%)</th>
<th>11(28.2%)</th>
<th>11(21.6%)</th>
<th>29(25.7%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>6(26.1%)</td>
<td>8(20.5%)</td>
<td>10(19.6%)</td>
<td>24(21.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Grad.</td>
<td>7(30.4%)</td>
<td>10(25.6%)</td>
<td>18(35.3%)</td>
<td>35(31.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Yrs. Grad.Sch.</td>
<td>2( 8.7%)</td>
<td>6(15.4%)</td>
<td>8(15.7%)</td>
<td>16(14.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Degree</td>
<td>1( 4.3%)</td>
<td>4(10.3%)</td>
<td>4( 7.8%)</td>
<td>9( 8.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Father's Occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unskilled</th>
<th>1( 4.3%)</th>
<th>2( 5.1%)</th>
<th>2( 3.9%)</th>
<th>5( 4.4%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>0( 0.0%)</td>
<td>1( 2.6%)</td>
<td>0( 0.0%)</td>
<td>1( 0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>0( 0.0%)</td>
<td>0( 0.0%)</td>
<td>1( 2.0%)</td>
<td>1( 0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Manager</td>
<td>4(17.4%)</td>
<td>8(20.5%)</td>
<td>12(23.5%)</td>
<td>24(21.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>9(39.1%)</td>
<td>20(51.3%)</td>
<td>23(45.1%)</td>
<td>52(46.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>7(30.4%)</td>
<td>7(17.9%)</td>
<td>9(17.6%)</td>
<td>23(20.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>2( 837%)</td>
<td>1( 2.6%)</td>
<td>4( 7.8%)</td>
<td>7( 6.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mother's Occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unskilled</th>
<th>2( 8.7%)</th>
<th>5(12.8%)</th>
<th>2( 3.9%)</th>
<th>9( 8.0%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>4(17.4%)</td>
<td>6(15.4%)</td>
<td>15(29.4%)</td>
<td>25(22.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>4(17.4%)</td>
<td>2( 5.1%)</td>
<td>4( 7.8%)</td>
<td>10( 8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Manager</td>
<td>4(17.4%)</td>
<td>4(10.3%)</td>
<td>10(19.6%)</td>
<td>18(15.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>5(21.7%)</td>
<td>16(41.0%)</td>
<td>15(29.4%)</td>
<td>36(31.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>4(17.4%)</td>
<td>3( 7.7%)</td>
<td>5( 9.8%)</td>
<td>12(10.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0( 0.0%)</td>
<td>3( 7.7%)</td>
<td>0( 0.0%)</td>
<td>3( 2.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Numbers in parentheses indicate percentage of subjects within each developmental level.
shows the father's and mother's occupation, and education level by group. There were no significant differences between groups with regard to father's occupation level, $X^2 (12, N = 113) = 6.69$, n.s., or mother's occupation level, $X^2 (12, N = 113) = 17.19$, n.s. Likewise, there were no significant differences between groups father's education level, $X^2 (8, N = 113) = 5.26$, n.s., or mother's education level, $X^2 (8, N = 113) = 2.88$, n.s.

**Procedure**

In the present study, each of the participants met individually with one of four interviewers who had been trained to administer the Self-Descriptive Interview (Oliff, 1990). Each interviewer was trained by completing at least three practice interviews and these interviews were transcribed and discussed among interviewers. Interviewers jointly produced standardized follow-up probe questions for each question. These were discussed and transcripts were compared across interviewers to assure standardization of both primary and follow-up questions.

After the participant gave written consent (Appendix 1), the Self-Descriptive Interview was conducted which lasted from 20 to 45 minutes. In each session, the researcher asked interview questions and probes, listed in Appendix 4. All interviews were tape-recorded. The average number of interviews conducted by any one interviewer was 39. Interviewer 1, 2, 3, and 4 conducted 67, 48, 30, and 11 interviews, respectively. To determine the existence of
interviewer bias with regard to developmental level, a Chi-square analysis on all transcripts which reflected a developmental level (N = 113) was conducted. Since interviewer 4 had less than two interviews per developmental category, a Chi-square analysis was only conducted on the three other interviewers. Results indicated there were no significant differences between the three primary interviewers (who had 49, 38, and 17 interviews) on the distribution of developmental level assigned to the subjects they interviewed, $\chi^2 (5, N = 113) = 5.03$, n.s.

Once the interview portion of the study was completed, participants were asked to sign a second consent form detailing the second portion of the study (see Appendix 1). They then filled out a research packet containing the following items: demographic questionnaire, Rape Myth Acceptance Scale, Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale, Sexual Experiences Survey, Attitudes Toward Women Scale—Short Form and Fear and Perception of Rape Scale. The research packets were presented on a computer screen using the computer program QFAST (Psychometric Software, 1993). Questions were presented one at time on the computer screen, and the subject was asked to type the letter corresponding to her desired response. Once the participants completed both the interview and research packet, they were thanked and debriefed. (See Appendix 9 for debriefing sheet.)

The Self-Descriptive Interview Scoring Procedure
Scoring of Gilligan's (1982) developmental level schema was done using Oliff and Russell's (1990) Analysis of Self-Descriptive Interview Sentences: An Objective Scoring Manual. A written transcript of each interview was divided into segments. Generally, a segment was considered to be: (1) any whole thought, (2) a filler word or phrase such as "um," "you know," "oh," etc., (3) a sentence fragment such as "I-I went to the store" (considered two segments), or (4) an independent clause in a sentence. The other rules coders used to divide transcripts into segments are listed in Appendix 5.

There could be multiple segments per sentence and only the subject's words, not the interviewer's, were segmented. The total number of segments in a transcript ranged from 42 to 465 (M = 187.43, SD = 82.99). The total number of scorable segments (which could be coded under one of the three developmental categories) ranged from four to 58 (M = 22.63, SD = 12.54). The ratio of scorable segments to total segments ranged from .02 to .34 (M = .13, SD = .05). There were significant differences between women of differing developmental levels on the total number of segments per transcript, F (2,110) = 4.31, p < .05, and the number of scorable segments per transcript, F (2,110) = 3.74, p < .05. However, when number of scorable segments were compared across groups with total number of segments used as a covariate, there were no significant differences between the three developmental groups, F (2, 109) = .76, n.s.
After transcripts were divided into segments, two coders determined the developmental level of each transcript. First, the developmental level of the sentence was scored. Primarily, the rater looked for self-descriptive sentences which could be assigned to one of four categories (three developmental and one unrelated-to-concept): Instrumental, Self-Sacrificing, Authentic-Care, and Unrelated-to-Concept. Sentences which were scored as Instrumental show that the woman is self-confident and self-assured. Her own needs and desires supersede the needs and desires of others. Self's terms are uncompromising and may be selfish. For example, an Instrumental self-descriptive statement might be "I have a right to my own opinion, to say what I think, and people better start listening" (Oliff & Russell, 1990, p. 3).

Self-Sacrificing segments describe the self as being subordinate to others' needs and demands, often at the expense of the self. A woman denies her own power and responsibility in a relationship and may lose sight of her self or become "selfless." An example of a Self-Sacrifice sentence is "I like to give a lot of myself for other people" (Oliff & Russell, 1990, p. 8).

Sentences under the Authentic-Care category show that the woman has an understanding of herself and others, and she engages in interdependent relationships. Sentences describe attempts to recognize both the self's and others' needs. For instance, a typical sentence scored in this
category would be "I said I can’t and he (boyfriend) was upset, so I did as much as I could, but I could only do so much" (Oliff & Russell, 1990, p. 12).

Sentences which did not fit under any of the above developmental categories were labelled Unrelated-to-Concept and not scored. These sentences were scored as such when the woman described her self in a way which did not directly mention her relationship with others in the sentence ("I like to study in the evenings") or described her boyfriend without making specific references to how she feels about him or reacts to his behavior ("My boyfriend is majoring in chemistry").

Once the sentence was scored for developmental category, each sentence was scored as to whether the woman endorsed or criticized the developmental category. For instance, in the sentence "I would do anything for anybody" (Oliff & Russell, 1990, p. 24), the woman is endorsing her selflessness or Self-Sacrificing behavior. The sentence "I started to believe what he (ex-boyfriend) was telling me 'I couldn’t do anything right anymore, I’m not good at anything’"(Oliff & Russell, 1990, p. 24), is scored as a criticism of the Self-Sacrificing perspective.

After scoring the evaluation aspect, the degree to which the individual endorses or criticizes a particular developmental level was scored. There are three levels of degree: (1) "very"—where the statement expresses a general, unqualified, global statement of her attitudes toward
herself-in-relation-to-other; (2) "some"—where the statement indicates a moderate degree to which the sentence exemplifies a particular developmental category; (3) "little"—where the sentence describes a highly qualified attitude toward the self-in-relation-to-other. "Little" degree sentences often contain modifying adjectives such as "I can be somewhat stubborn" or "At times I can be stubborn." An example of a high degree (very) statement would be "I just do what I like to do and I don’t worry about anyone else" (Oliff & Russell, 1990, p. 30). A moderate (some) statement example is "I know my personality, and I can usually get his (boyfriend) to do what I want" (Oliff & Russell, 1990, p. 31). Finally, a low degree (little) statement would be "I can be a little self-conscious at times" (Oliff & Russell, 1990, p. 31).

All the sentences are scored on coding sheets such as the one in Appendix 6. Number of scorable segments were summarized using the summary sheets listed in Appendix 7. The rater counted the number of codable segments in each developmental level. On the basis of the predominant developmental level, the rater used the formulas listed in Appendix 8 to ascertain whether that number of segments endorsing the primary developmental level is greater than or equal to two times a weighted sum of the other two developmental level segments.

Reliability of Coders
In order to assure that transcripts were coded reliably, there were two raters. The two coders rated four practice transcripts discussing differences between ratings on each segment of each transcript. Reliability between raters was assessed by: (1) Determining the agreement between raters regarding developmental level of the segment, (2) If the category matched, determining agreement between raters with regard to whether the subject endorsed or criticized the developmental category specified in the segment, (3) Determining the correlation coefficient corresponding to the degree to which the individual endorsed or criticized a specified segment, (4) Determining the agreement between raters with regard to the overall developmental level of the transcript.

Agreement between raters on developmental level of the segment was measured using Cohen's kappa (K) which is the measure of the raters' agreement over and above the agreement expected for independent ratings (Hays, 1963). On the practice interviews a kappa of .89 was obtained with regard to segment developmental level. There was 100% agreement between raters as to whether a particular segment endorsed or criticized a specified developmental category (K = 1). A correlation of .65 between raters was obtained with regard to the degree of endorsement or criticism of specified category. Finally, with regard to overall developmental level of the transcript, there was 100% agreement between raters.
After reliability was reached for the practice interviews, one rater coded all 113 of the research transcripts while the second rater coded every 10th transcript. The interrater reliability measurements previously specified were determined for every 10th transcript. There was a $90.3\%$ agreement between raters on developmental level of each segment ($K = .85$) for the 11 transcripts coded by both raters. These transcripts had a total of 1745 segments. On the segments which raters coded identical developmental level, there was 100% agreement as to whether it was an endorsement or criticism of that statement. The raters did not correlate highly on degree of endorsement or criticism of each developmental level ($r = .52$). However, the two raters were in 100% agreement as to the overall developmental level of each transcript.

Materials

Demographics Questionnaire. Items on this questionnaire included: age, year in school, major, ethnicity, religious affiliation, degree of religiosity, and length of present relationship (see Appendix 2). Also, subjects indicated their mother’s highest level of education, father’s highest level of education, mother’s occupation, and father’s occupation.

Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMA). Rape myths are those beliefs which blame the woman for her sexual assault and see rape as acceptable in some situations (Burt, 1980). Rape myth adherence has commonly been measured using the 19-item
Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Burt, 1980). The first 10 items are in a Likert-type format as subjects indicated their adherence (from 1 "strongly agree" to 7 "strongly disagree") to various statements about rape. Such statements included "In the majority of rapes, the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation," and "Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve." Items 11-19 assess respondents' beliefs about the prevalence of rape and likelihood of believing various rape victims' claims.

Check and Malamuth (1983) found that those who held these rape myths indicated that they would be more likely to identify with the rapist and blame the victim when presented with a rape scenario than those who did not adhere to these myths. Men are more likely than women to hold rape myths (Malamuth & Check, 1981; Blumberg & Lester, 1991), although differences among women have been found. The acceptance of interpersonal violence, distrust of the opposite sex, and sex role stereotyping correlate with scores on the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale for both men and women (Burt, 1980). Blaming the victim has also be linked to greater acceptance of rape myths (Blumberg & Lester, 1991).

Internal consistency or item-to-total correlations have been consistent ($r=.75$) across studies using the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Burt, 1980; Margolin, Miller, & Moran, 1989). Burt (1980) reported a Cronbach's alpha of .88 when the scale was administered to both male and female subjects.
The Rape Myth Acceptance Scale has been criticized with regard to its lack of predictive validity (Deitz et al, 1982), and lack of cross-cultural applicability (Lee & Cheung, 1991). Briere, Malamuth, and Check (1985) also criticized Burt's (1980) use of item analysis in her construction of the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. Burt used item-to-scale correlations to determine what items should be included in her scale. Therefore, it was impossible to tell whether her scale measured a single construct or multiple ones. Using data from a sample of 452 male undergraduate students, Briere, Malamuth, and Check (1985) conducted a factor analysis using a varimax rotation on all factors exceeding unity. Factor analysis of the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale indicated four factors: (1) "Disbelief of rape claims," (2) "Victim response," (3) "Rape reports as manipulation," and (4) "Rape only happens to certain kinds of women."

Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale (ASB). Burt (1980) generated this scale in conjunction with the RMA, and data indicate scores on the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs scale correlate positively with rape myth acceptance. In this 9-item survey, participants were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with statements supporting the ideology or underlying attitudes which condone rape. These include statements which show that intimate relationships should be based on manipulation and exploitation. The scale is in a Likert-type format as subjects indicated their
adherence (from 1 "strongly agree" to 7 "strongly disagree") to various statements excusing or supporting violence and manipulation in relationships. Scores on the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs scale have predictive validity in predicting future male aggression (Malamuth & Check, 1982). Also, Adversarial Sexual Beliefs scores correlate negatively with feminist attitudes in women (Senn & Radtke, 1990).

Burt (1980) found that item-to-total correlations range from .42 to .58. A Cronbach's alpha of .80 was reported from data obtained from both men and women.

**Sexual Experiences Survey (SES).** Experience with past sexual coercive behavior was also researched in the present study. To measure this, the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982) was used. This scale is based on the assumption that rape is only one action on a continuum of male behavior which ranges from verbal persuasion to threat or use of force to obtain sexual intercourse (Weis & Borges, 1973). It was constructed to detect hidden rape victims and offenders in a normal population (Koss & Oros, 1982). Each question in this 13-item scale is answered yes or no as women indicate whether they have been in a variety of sexually coercive and assaultive situations.

Koss and Gidycz (1985) found that internal consistency (Cronbach alpha) scores ranged from .74 (women) to .89 (men) when the Sexual Experiences Survey was administered to 448 introductory psychology students. Percent of item agreement
between two administrations of the Sexual Experiences Survey that were a week apart was 93%.

To test the validity of the Sexual Experiences Survey, Koss and Gidycz (1985) administered the instrument to 386 students who also were interviewed regarding the experiences they originally listed on the Sexual Experience Survey. The correlation between the women's level of victimization based on self-report from the Sexual Experiences Survey and responses to the interviewer was .73 ($p < .001$). Of those women who had indicated on the Sexual Experiences Survey that they were rape survivors, only 3% of those changed their responses when interviewed. The correlation between the men's self-report of sexual coercion and interview responses was .61 ($p < .001$). Of those who indicated past sexual coercion, 34% gave lower responses of past sexual aggression when interviewed, while 3% gave higher responses of past sexual aggression in their responses to the interviewer.

**Attitude Toward Women Scale-Short Form (AWS).** This instrument measures nontraditional attitudes toward women and sex roles (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). It is a 4-point Likert-type scale in which respondents indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with 55 statements about women's rights in various situations: educational, social, sexual, and marital. The higher the scores the less traditional the attitudes toward women.
Spence and Helmreich (1973) have found six factors of the AWS: (1) Vocational, Educational, Intellectual Roles, (2) Freedom and Independence, (3) Dating, Courtship, and Etiquette, (4) Drinking, Swearing, Jokes, 5) Sexual Behavior, 6) Marital Relationships and Obligations. Erickson (1977) found significant differences between women of different ego developmental levels on factors 1, 2, 5, and 6 of the AWS.

Muehlenhard and Scardino (1985) reported a test-retest reliability coefficient of .94 for a two-week period. In testing the AWS on an Australian college student sample, Rowland (1977) found test-retest reliability for males of .92 and for females of .93 for the one-year period. Muehlenhard and Miller (1988) found an intratest reliability coefficient alpha of .91. A shorter 25-item version of AWS correlates highly with the original scale ($r=.95$) (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973). The Cronbach’s alpha for the short scale was .89. This version of the AWS was used in the present study.

Numerous studies have tested the validity of the AWS scale. Benson and Vicent (1980) found that the AWS correlated with Tavris’ (1973) Women’s Liberation Movement Scale and correlated negatively with scores on Sexist Attitudes Toward Women Scale. Likewise, the short version of the AWS correlated with the occurrence of liberated behavior (Ghaffaradili-Doty & Carlson, 1979). Rossi and Rossi (1985) found differences between men and women on
scores of the short version of the AWS. Baucom and Sanders (1978) found higher scores indicated higher endorsement of feminism ideals. Nontraditional mothers, as scored on the AWS, had higher occupational achievement that those women with traditional scores (Slevin & Wingrove, 1983). Likewise, female students scored significantly higher on the AWS than housewives (Halas, 1974). Regarding other correlates of the AWS, Dambrot, Papp, and Whitmore (1984) found that age and lower levels of education were related to lower (more traditional views of women) AWS scores.

Concerning criticisms of the AWS, Goldberg, Katz and Rappeport (1979) question the AWS’s validity because of the role that social desirability plays in the scores. Rossi and Rossi (1985) also suggested that social desirability contaminated the scores on the short version of the AWS, leading to a restricted range in scores.

Preliminary/Experimental Instruments

The Fear and Perception of Rape Scale. There was one scale included in the research packet which will serve to aid further studies. Data collected from this instrument was not be included in the final analysis, unless it demonstrated sufficient concurrent validity.

This scale purports to measure women’s personal fears and concerns regarding rape victimization (see Appendix 3). Specifically, it assesses fear of rape and its correlates across various situations. Measurement of variables which contribute to rape fear, such as perceived likelihood of
victimization, personal control over rape, and perceived ability to fend off a would-be rapist, are also included in the instrument. Ten questions assessing rape fear and contributing variables comprised the first portion of the Fear and Perception of Rape Scale (Jones, 1991). Seven of the first 10 questions on the FPRS were adapted from Heath’s (1982) scale. In the original FPRS (Jones, 1991), however, there were four questions measuring fear of rape: fear of stranger, acquaintance, nighttime, and daytime rape. The specificity of these four questions were thought to more accurately tap fear of rape than merely asking how afraid women were walking around alone at night, which has previously been the most common measure used to assess fear of sexual assault (Riger & Gordon, 1981). One problem with the earlier version of the FPRS was that it did not differentiate between acquaintance and date rape. Therefore, a question assessing fear of date rape was also included in the present study. Participants circle the number from 1 (extremely afraid) to 9 (not at all afraid) which applies to them.

The final five items on the FPRS assess women’s beliefs about current rape statistics. Participants are asked to write in the percentage they believe to be accurate for: the percentage of women raped by a stranger, total percentage of women raped in their lifetime, those raped by an acquaintance, percentage able to fend off a would-be rapist, and percentage of those raped after dark. In the present
study, a question assessing perception of the percentage of women raped on a date was also included.

To test the concurrent validity of the Fear and Perception of Rape Scale, a factor analysis on all items will be conducted. It was hypothesized that the items will cluster into four factors: fear of rape, likelihood of victimization, controllability over rape victimization, and rape statistical knowledge. Also, the FPRS will demonstrate concurrent validity if there is a significant negative correlation between items measuring rape fear and items assessing rape myth adherence on the RMA. Rape myths have been associated with a personal defensiveness such that endorsement of the statement, "rape can only happen to bad women" implies that the subject does not think sexual victimization could happen to her. If the subject does not believe rape could happen to her then she should fear being a victim less. Therefore, higher rape myth scores are predicted to be associated with lower rape fear scores.

It is also predicted that there will be a significant positive correlation between rape fears, likelihood of being raped, and past experience with sexual coercion as measured by the Sexual Experiences Survey. Kilpatrick, Veronen, and Resick (1979) showed that women who have more experience with sexual coercion may fear specific situations which remind them of their past victimization and this may generalize into a pervasive fear of sexual assault victimization.
Items on the Attitude Toward Women Scale were not expected to correlate with factors of the Fear and Perception of Rape Scale. Jones (1991) found that a significant positive correlation between self-report of women's level of femininity and fear of stranger rape but not for overall fear of rape. However, femininity in this study referred to adherence to traditional sex-roles (such as being submissive) while the AWS-Short Form measures a belief in traditional views about women and does not assess how much a respondent adheres to those traditional roles.
CHAPTER 4

STATISTICAL ANALYSES

Preparation of Data for Factor Analysis

Due to differences in the number of subjects in each of the developmental categories and the assumption of group mean differences in each of the factors, scores for all the rape perception items (from the RMA, ASB, SES, and FPRS) were transformed before being factor analyzed to determine overall factor structure. To prepare for this factor analysis and subsequent between group investigation, means of each item within each developmental level were determined. Then, the subject's group mean was subtracted from each subject's item score. These transformed difference scores were factor analyzed to ascertain the underlying factor structure of each sexual coercion measure.

A principal components analysis was conducted on transformed items within each instrument using SPSS's (1988) FACTOR program. Since the factors within each scale were assumed to be intercorrelated, an oblique rotation of factors was conducted (see Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991 for rationale of oblique rotation). Factors were extracted using three criteria: (1) Inclusion of factors having an eigen value greater than 1 (Kaiser, 1960), (2) Inclusion of factors by the scree test, in which all factors placed
before the leveling off of eigenvalues are retained (Cattell, 1966), (3) Inclusion of those factors which are interpretable and are not redundant with other factors in the factor structure (Gorsuch, 1983).

Assessment of Existing Empirical Factor Structures of the ASB and RMA

An assessment of the existing empirical factor structures of the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs scale and Rape Myth Acceptance Scale was then conducted. A confirmatory factor analysis procedure determined whether the present study's factor structure of the RMA and ASB fit the factor structure reported by Briere, Malamuth, and Check (1985). This was done by conducting a Goodness of Fit Analysis on the factor models. If existing factor models from the RMA and ASB fit the present data, then the existing factors would be used as first-order factor-scales in the present study and compared between groups. If the existing models provided a poor fit, then the factor structure obtained in the present sample was used in the second-order factor analysis.

Factor Analysis of Scales Without Previous Existing Factor Structures

A principal components analysis was conducted on the remaining sexual coercion measures: The Sexual Experiences Survey, Attitudes Toward Women Scale-Short Form, and Fear and Perception of Rape Scale. An oblique rotation was used
because the factors underlying the scales were believed to be intercorrelated.

**Determination of Concurrent Validity of FPRS**

The concurrent validity of the experimental measure, the Fear and Perception of Rape Scale, was tested to determine whether it should be included in the final factor analysis. This was done by testing assumptions about its existing factor structure and determining if its empirical factors correlated with other coercion measure factors as predicted.

**Investigating Group Differences: First and Second-Order Factor-Scales**

To assess group differences, unit weighting was done on each factor. First z-score values for each raw scored item were obtained. Unit weighting the z-score values of each item in each of the factors would generate factor scores which would include group differences previously taken out when determining each scale's factor structure. Unit weighting was done by assigning a weight of 1 to all items positively loading on a given factor (factor loadings greater than or equal to .40), a weight of -1 for all factors negatively loading on a given factor (factor loadings greater than or equal to the absolute value of -.40), and a weight of 0 assigned to all other items. The unit weights are then multiplied by the z-score value of each item and their products are added together with all other unit weight products for a given factor. Therefore,
each factor score was a sum of each item's unit weight (1, -1, or 0 corresponding to its loading on that factor) times that item's z-score value. Since these scores were the sum of only the items which loaded highly on each factor the resulting first-order factors were actually "factor-scales" and shall be referred to as such.

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) determined group mean differences, if any, for each of the first-order factor-scales. Then each of the first-order factor-scales were factor analyzed to produce factors making up the personal experience with sexual coercion construct. Groups were then compared on these second-order factors using a Multivariate Analysis of Variance.
CHAPTER 5
RESULTS

Assessment of Existing Empirical Factor Structures of the ASB and RMA

Table 3 and 4 show the factor structure of the ASB for the all-male sample of Briere, Malamuth, and Check (1985) and the present study's all-female sample, respectively. A Goodness-of-fit analysis revealed that the two orthogonal factor model used in the Briere, Malamuth, and Check's (1985) study provided a relatively poor fit to the present study's data. It explained only 84% of the variance of ASB items. A model which explains greater than or equal to 90% of the data is considered a relatively good fitting model. The ratio, $\chi^2/df$, was 3.9, also indicating a relatively poor goodness of fit, since as this ratio decreases, approaching zero, the better the model's fit. A $\chi^2/df$ less than two is generally considered a good fit of a given model. Therefore, other possible models for the factor structure of the ASB were explored.

Both a one-factor solution and two-factor model using oblique rotation accounted for 88% of the variance of the items, not an optimum fit but better at explaining the present study's factor structure than the existing empirical
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Men are only out for one thing.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In a dating relationship a woman is largely out take advantage of a man.</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A lot of women seem to get pleasure putting men down.</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Many women are so demanding sexually that a man just can’t satisfy them.</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A man’s got to show the woman who’s boss right from the start or he’ll end up henpecked.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A lot of men talk big, but when it comes down to it, they can’t perform well sexually.</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Most women are sly and manipulating when they are out to attract a man.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Women are usually sweet until they’ve caught a man. but then they let their true self show.</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A woman will only respect a man who will lay down the law to her.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Factor 1 = Male Dominance Justified; Factor 2 = Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Justified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Men are only out for one thing.</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In a dating relationship a woman is largely out take advantage of a man.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A lot of women seem to get pleasure putting men down.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Many women are so demanding sexually that a man just can’t satisfy them.</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A man’s got to show the woman who’s boss right from the start or he’ll end up henpecked.</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A lot of men talk big, but when it comes down to it, they can’t perform well sexually.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Most women are sly and manipulating when they are out to attract a man.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Women are usually sweet until they’ve caught a man. but then they let their true self show.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A woman will only respect a man who will lay down the law to her.</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Total Variance

- Factor 1 = Justification of Exploitation/Manipulation in Relationships
- Factor 2 = Justification of Male Dominance
model. This two-factor model shown in Table 4 indicates a first factor accounting for 31.1% of the total variance. It is titled "Justification of Exploitation/Manipulation in Relationships" because it included five items with high positive loadings: Women are Sweet Until They’ve Caught a Man (.73), Women are Sly and Manipulating (.72), Men Talk Big But Can’t Perform Sexually (.70), Women are Out to take Advantage of Men (.56), Women get Pleasure Putting Men Down (.55), and Men are Only After One Thing (.49). Factor-Scale 1 could be epitomized: Manipulation and exploitation in a romantic relationships are acceptable.

### TABLE 5

GOODNESS-OF-FIT ANALYSES FOR ADVERSARIAL SEXUAL BELIEFS SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>RMSR</th>
<th>GFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero Factors</td>
<td>1251.5</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Factor</td>
<td>156.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Orthogonal Factors</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(original model)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two oblique Factors</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2$/df = ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom; RMSR = root mean square residual; GFI = goodness-of-fit index.
The second factor-scale is titled "Justification of Male Dominance" because of positive loadings on two items: A Man Must Show a Woman Who's Boss (.84) and A Woman Will Only Respect a Man who Lays down the Law to Her (.73). This factor-scale suggests that a man must dominate a woman to earn her respect. This factor accounts for 13.7% of the total variance.

There was a moderate positive correlation ($r = .29$) between factor-scales 1 and 2 of the ASB. This suggests that the more women endorse adversarial sexual beliefs, the more they endorse a belief in male dominance, and vice versa.

Regarding the existing empirical factor structure of the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale, a Goodness-of fit analysis also showed that the factor structure of RMA in Briere, Malamuth, and Check’s (1985) all-male sample provided a relatively poor fit for the data of the present study. The four-factor solution of Briere, Malamuth, and Check’s study is listed in Table 6, while the data obtained from the present study’s all-female sample are listed in Table 7.

A Goodness-of-fit analysis, shown in Table 8, reveals that the original structure of orthogonal factors only accounts for 70% of the variance in the data and has a $\chi^2/df$ ratio of 3.4. Using the original four factors with oblique rotation actually provided a better fit for the data since it accounted for 77% of the variance and had a $\chi^2/df$ ratio of 2.3. Other possible models for the RMA were explored which
# Table 6

## Factor Loadings for the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale—Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Any female can be raped.</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One reason that women falsely report a rape is that they frequently have a need to call attention to themselves.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rape if she really wants to.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When women go around braless or wearing short skirts and tight tops, they are just asking for trouble.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In the majority of rapes, the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If a girl engages in necking or petting and she lets things get out of hand, it is her own fault if her partner forces sex on her.</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A woman who is stuck-up and thinks she is too good to talk to guys on the street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6--Continued.
10. Many women have an unconscious wish to be raped, and may then unconsciously set up situations in which they are likely to be attacked.

11. If a woman gets drunk at a party and has intercourse with a man she’s just met there, she should be considered "fair game" to other males at the party who want to have sex with her too, whether she wants it or not.

12. What percentage of women who report a rape would you say are lying because they are angry and want to get back at the man they accuse?

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

14. A person comes to you and claims they were raped. How likely would you be to believe their statement if the person were:


Factor 1 = Disbelief of Rape Claims; Factor 2 = Victim Responsible for Rape; Factor 3 = Rape Report as Manipulation; Factor 4 = Rape Only Happens to Certain Women.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Any female can be raped.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One reason that women falsely report a rape is that they frequently have a need to call attention to themselves.</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rape if she really wants to.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When women go around braless or wearing short skirts and tight tops, they are just asking for trouble.</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In the majority of rapes, the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If a girl engages in necking or petting and she lets things get out of hand, it is her own fault if her partner forces sex on her.</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve.</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A woman who is stuck-up and thinks she is too good to talk to guys on the street deserves to be taught a lesson.</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7--Continued.
10. Many women have an unconscious wish to be raped, and may then unconsciously set up situations in which they are likely to be attacked. .51 -.04 .23 -.11

11. If a woman gets drunk at a party and has intercourse with a man she's just met there, she should be considered "fair game" to other males at the party who want to have sex with her too, whether she wants it or not. .33 .54 .11 .31

12. What percentage of women who report a rape would you say are lying because they are angry and want to get back at the man they accuse? -.09 .04 .80 -.03

13. What percentage of reported rapes would you guess were merely invented by women who discovered they were pregnant and wanted to protect their own reputation? .20 -.12 .79 .08

14. A person comes to you and claims they were raped. How likely would you be to believe their statement if the person were: 
   your best friend? -.26 -.17 -.30 .08
   Indian woman? -.89 .09 -.06 .07
   a neighborhood woman? -.78 -.09 -.12 .00
   a young boy? -.82 -.15 .13 -.07
   a black woman? -.95 -.06 .08 .12
   a white woman? -.91 .04 -.03 .08

Percentage of Total Variance 35.1% 11.7% 7.1% 6.6%

Factor 1 = Beliefs of Rape Claims and Women's Wishes to Be Raped; Factor 2 = Women's Actions Asking for Rape; Factor 3 = Women Use Rape as Manipulation; Factor 4 = Women's Actions Influence Rape Blame.
also did not fit the present data, therefore a new factor structure was obtained by a principal components analysis using oblique rotation.

### TABLE 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>RMSR</th>
<th>GFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero Factors</td>
<td>1251.5</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Factor</td>
<td>524.5</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two oblique Factors</td>
<td>369.3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three oblique Factors: I, III (II &amp; IV)</td>
<td>363.8</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Four Factors (orthogonal)</td>
<td>521.1</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Four Factors (oblique)</td>
<td>335.7</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $\chi^2$/df = ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom; RMSR = root mean square residual; GFI = goodness-of-fit index.

The first factor-scale of the RMA in the present study accounted for 35.1% of the total variance and is titled "Belief of Rape Claims and Women's Wishes to Be Raped." It contained one item which loaded positively on the factor: Women have an Unconscious Wish to Be Raped (.51) and five items which had high negative loadings: Belief of Black
Woman's Rape Claim (−.95), Belief of White Woman's Rape Claim (−.91), Belief of Indian Woman's Rape Claim (−.89), Belief of Young Boy's Rape Claim (−.82), and Belief of Neighborhood Woman's Rape Claim (−.78). Factor-Scale 1 could be epitomized: The more women believe that women want to be raped, the less they believe any victim. Likewise, the more they believe in rape claims the more they disbelieve the rape myth that all women desire to be raped.

The second factor-scale of the RMA accounted for 11.7% of the variance and is labelled "Women's Actions Asking for Rape." It includes three items which all had high positive loadings: Women Who Dress Seductively Are Asking to Be Raped (.89), Any Woman Can Be Raped (.81), and A Woman Who has Casual Sex at a Party Can by Raped by Other Males There (.54). This factor can be epitomized: The more women believe that all women can be raped the more they also believe that women's actions or dress may cause their own victimization, and vice versa.

Factor 3 was titled "Women Use Rape as Manipulation" and included three items which all had positive loadings: Report of Percentage of Rape "Victims" Who Actually Claim Rape Because they are Angry at a Man (.80), Report of Percentage of Rape "Victims" Who Actually Claim Rape Because they are Pregnant (.79), and Women Who are Too Stuck-up or Conceited Deserve to Be Raped (.59). This factor-scale indicates that the more women believe that females deserve to be raped the less they believe their claims of being
victimized, and vice versa. This factor accounted for 7.1% of the total variance.

Factor-Scale 4 of the RMA was titled "Women's Actions Influence Rape Blame" and accounted for 6.6% of the total variance. It included three items which all loaded negatively on this factor: A Woman Who Goes Home with a Man On a First Date Wants Sex (-.74), A Woman Who Hitchhikes Deserves Rape (-.57), and A Woman Who Leads a Man on by Engaging in Sex Play Deserves Rape (-.56). This factor can be epitomized: Women's actions can provoke rape and blame.

Factor-Scale 1 of the RMA correlated positively with Factor-Scale 2 of the RMA (r = .43) and Factor-Scale 3 of the RMA (r = .44). This means that a disbelief in rape claims and belief that women want to be raped is associated with a notion that women are asking for rape and cry rape only to get something they want. Also, the less women believe that women secretly want to be raped the more they believe the rape claims of victims and disbelieve the myths that women ask to be raped or use rape only as manipulation.

Factor-Scale 1 of the RMA also had a moderate negative correlation between it and Factor-Scale 4 of the RMA (r = -.44). This suggests that the more women disbelieve in rape claims and believe that women want to be raped, the more they believe that women's actions should be held against them in deciding rape blame. Likewise, the more one believes that women's actions to do not cause them to get
raped, the more one would believe rape claims and not think that women actually wish to be raped.

There was a moderate positive correlation between Factor-Scale 2 and 3 of the RMA ($r = .36$). This suggests that the more women believe that women are asking for rape the more they endorse the notion that women only use rape as manipulation and should be punished. There was a moderate negative correlation between Factor-Scale 2 of the RMA and Factor-Scale 4 of the RMA ($r = -.44$). The more women believe that women's actions show that they are asking for rape the less they believe that women's actions should not be held in deciding rape blame, and vice versa.

Factor-Scale 3 and Factor-Scale 4 of the RMA correlated negatively with each other ($r = -.37$). The more women believe that women who cry rape are only using it to get what they want the less they believe that a woman's actions should not be held against her when deciding rape blame. Likewise, the more women believe that a woman's actions should be held against her in deciding rape blame the more they believe that women use rape for manipulation.

Determining the Factor Structures of the Remaining Measures

Because no previous work has outlined the factor structure of the Sexual Experiences Survey, Attitudes Toward Women Scale-Short Form or Fear and Perception of Rape Scale, a principal components analysis with oblique rotation was conducted on each of the three scales.


### TABLE 9

**FACTOR LOADINGS OF THE SEXUAL EXPERIENCES SURVEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you ever:</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
<th>FACTOR 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. had intercourse when you both wanted to?</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. a man misinterpret the sexual intimacy you desired?</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. been a situation when the man became so sexually aroused that you felt you could not stop him even though you did want to have intercourse?</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. had sexual intercourse with a man even though you didn’t really want to because he threatened to end the relationship otherwise?</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. had sexual intercourse with a man because you felt pressured by his continual arguments?</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. been in a situation where a man obtained sexual intercourse by saying things he didn’t really mean?</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. been in a situation where a man used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to try to make you engage in kissing or petting?</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9—Continued.
8. been in a situation where a man tried to get sexual intercourse when you didn’t want to by threatening physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur? 

9. been in a situation where the man used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to try to get you to have intercourse but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur? 

10. had sex with a man when you didn’t want to because he threatened to use some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)? 

11. had sexual intercourse with a man because he used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)? 

12. where a man obtained sexual acts by using threats of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)? 

13. Have you ever been raped? 

Total Percentage of Variance

Factor 1 = Attempted Sexual Assault/Abuse; Factor 2 = Experience With Completed Sexual Assault/Abuse; Factor 3 = Verbal Sexual Coercion; Factor 4 = Experience With Man Misinterpreting Intimacy or Can’t Stop Self.
Sexual Experiences Survey. As shown in Table 9, a four-factor solution was obtained for the SES. Factor-Scale 1 was labelled "Attempted Sexual Assault/Abuse" and included three items which all had high positive loadings: Experience with A Man Using Physical Force to have Sex But it Did not Occur (1.01), Experience with a Man Who Used Threats of Physical Force to have Sex But it did Not Occur (.96), and Experience with a Man Who Attempted Physical Force to have Sex Play (.85). Factor-Scale 1 could be epitomized: A woman's experience with situations in which she is a victim of attempted rape. It accounted for 32.0% of the total variance.

Factor-Scale 2 was labelled "Experience With Completed Sexual Assault/Abuse" and included three items which had high negative loadings: Experience with a Situation in Which a Man Used Physical Force to Have Sex (-.96), Experience with a Situation in Which a Man Threatened to Use Physical Force to Have Sex (-.96), and Experience with Being Raped (-.79). Women who score high on this factor have less experience with actual sexual victimization. Women who score low on this factor-scale have more experience with sexual victimization. This factor-scale accounted for 15.2% of the total variance.

Factor-Scale 3 on the SES was titled "Verbal Sexual Coercion" and included three items with positive loadings on this factor: Experience with a Situation in Which a Man Threatened to End the Relationship to Obtain Sex (.91),
Experience with a Situation in Which the Man Used Verbal Pressure to Have Sex (.63), and Experience with a Situation in Which the Man Said Things He Didn't Mean to Have Sex (.43). Factor-Scale 3 accounted for 12.8% of the total variance. Women scoring high on this factor-scale have more experience being verbally coerced to have sex. Women scoring low of this factor-scale have less experience with verbal sexual coercion.

Factor-Scale 4, labelled "Experience With a Man Misinterpreting Intimacy or Can't Stop Self" included two items which had high negative loadings: Experience with a Situation in Which the Man Became So Aroused that He Couldn't Stop (-.87), Experience with a Situation in Which the Man Misinterpreted the Woman's Sexual Intimacy Level (-.80). This factor accounted for 8.3% of the total variance and could be epitomized: Women scoring high on this factor-scale have been in few situations in which intercourse occurs because they felt they could not stop the man or that he misinterpreted their desires. Likewise, women who score lower on this factor-scale have been in more situations in which a man misinterpreted sexual intimacy.

Factor-Scales 1 and 2 of the SES correlated negatively with each other ($r = -.41$). This suggests the more women have experience with attempted sexual assault/abuse, the more they have experience with completed sexual assault/abuse, and vice versa. The more women are able to fend off a would-be rapist, the more likely they are victims
of completed assault as well. There was also a moderate negative correlation between Factor-Scale 1 and Factor-Scale 4 of the SES ($r = -.33$). The more women have experience with attempted sexual assault/abuse the more they have experience in which a man misinterpreted the sexual intimacy they desired or became so aroused he could not stop himself, and vice versa.

Factor-Scale 2 of the SES also correlated with Factor-Scale 4 of the SES ($r = .25$). This suggests that the less experience women have with being a victim of sexual assault/abuse the less experience they have with situations in which they felt a man misinterpret their sexual intimacy desires or could not stop himself, and vice versa. Factor-Scale 3 and Factor-Scale 4 of the SES also correlated with each other ($r = -.29$). This suggests that the more a woman has experience with verbal coercion, the less she has been in situations where the man misinterpreted her sexual intimacy desires or could not stop himself, and vice versa.

Attitudes Toward Women Scale-Short Form. Table 10 shows the three-factor solution obtained by conducting a principal components analysis with oblique rotation on the AWS-Short Form. Factor-Scale 1 labelled "Task Differentiation Between Genders" accounted for 18.9% of the variance and included one item which with a positive loading and three items which loaded negatively on the factor: Men Should Have Intellectual Leadership of Community (.40), Promotion in Jobs Should be Based on Merit and Not on Sex (−
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-82</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10--Continued.
9. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage. -.46 -.19 -.24
10. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers. .09 .57 -.14
11. Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together. -.31 -.10 -.15
12. Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions among men. .10 .03 .63
13. A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places of to have quite the same freedom of action as a man. .10 -.01 .15
14. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters. .11 .33 -.02
15. It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and a man to darn socks. .15 .31 .07
16. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children. .06 .66 .11
17. Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage, even their fiancés. -.06 .03 -.27
18. The husband should not be favored by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income. -.31 .05 .45

Table 10--Continued.
19. Women should be concerned with their duties of childbearing and house tending, rather than the desires for professional and business career. 

20. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men. 

21. Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men. 

22. On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than are men. 

23. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted. 

24. Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in various trades. 

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

Percentage of Total Variance 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.16</th>
<th>-.11</th>
<th>-.22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 1 = Task Differentiation Between Genders; Factor 2 = Traditional Marriage Roles; Factor 3 = Economic/Social Equality.
Men Should Do Household Tasks Since Women are Now Active Outside the Home (-.52), and A Woman Should Also Be Free to Propose Marriage to a Man (-.46). This factor could be epitomized: The more women believe men should play the leadership roles, the more they believe that women should be delegated to less prestigious work. Likewise, the more women believe that women's tasks should be equal with men the less they endorse the belief that men should retain the leadership in the community.

Factor-Scale 2 accounted for 8.1% of the total variance and was titled "Traditional Marriage Roles." It included two items which had positive loadings: The Father Should Have Greater Authority Raising Children (.66) and Women Should Focus on Their Roles as Wives and Mothers (.57). It also included two items with negative loadings: The Obey Clause in Marriage is Insulting to Women (-.66) and Wives Should be Allowed the Same Grounds for Divorce as Husbands (-.48). This factor suggests that women who score higher on this factor believe more that they should be in traditional marriage roles and be afforded less rights and say in the marriage as husbands. Likewise, the more women believe that women should have equal voice in marriage the less they endorse the traditional roles for women in marriage.

Factor-Scale 3 is labelled "Economic/Social Equality," and included three items which had positive loadings: "Economic and Social Freedom More Important than Femininity" (.68), "Women Should be Equal with Men in Business" (.63),
and "The Husband Should Not be Favored Over the Wife in Financial Matters" (.45). This factor-scale could be epitomized: Women share the same social and economic freedom as men. This factor accounted for 7.1% of the total variance.

There was a positive correlation between Factor-Scale 1 and Factor-Scale 2 of the AWS-Short Form ($r = .35$). The more women believe that men should play the leadership roles with women playing less prestigious roles, the more they believed that women should have less say in marriage and should be in traditional roles.

There was a negative correlation between Factor-Scale 2 and Factor-Scale 3 of the AWS-Short Form ($r = -.25$). This suggests that the more women believe that men should be the leaders in the community and have women engage in less prestigious tasks, the less they believe that women should share the same social and economic status as men. Likewise, the more women endorse equality for women in the social and economic spheres, the less they believe that men should be the leaders and women should play less prestigious roles.

Fear and Perception of Rape Scale. A principal components analysis of the FPRS yielded a three-factor solution. The first factor-scale, called "Fear of Rape," accounted for 20.7% of the total variance. It included four items which all had positive loadings: Fear of Rape After Dark (.81), Fear of Rape During Day (.79), Fear of Stranger Rape (.61), and Chances of Being Victim of Rape Attempt
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How often do you think a woman can avoid being raped if she really tries?</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When you are out alone after dark, how afraid are you of being raped?</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How likely, compared to the average woman, do you think you are to be raped?</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When you are out alone during the day, how afraid are you of being raped?</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How likely do you think you could avoid rape if confronted by the typical rape attempt?</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How afraid are you of being raped by a date?</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What percentage of rape victims do you think are raped by a stranger?</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What do you think the percentage of women are who become victims of rape during lifetime?</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What percentage of rape victims do you think are raped someone they knew (but not a date)?</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What percentage of rape victims do you think are raped by a date?</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. What percentage of women successfully fend off a rape attempt?  
   | .03 | .24 | .20 |

12. What percentage of rape victims do you think were raped after dark?  
   | .03 | - .05 | .12 |

13. How big of a problem do you think rape is?  
   | .27 | - .17 | -.08 |

14. How afraid are you of being raped by a stranger?  
   | .61 | - .13 | .16 |

15. What do you think the chances are that someone would try to rape you?  
   | .44 | - .43 | -.31 |

16. How much control do you think women have over rape?  
   | -.11 | -.83 | .23 |

17. How afraid are you of being raped by someone you know (but not a date)?  
   | .15 | -.15 | -.03 |

Percent of Variance  
| 20.7% | 12.4% | 9.1% |

Factor 1 = Fear of Rape; Factor 2 = Avoidability/Controllability Over Rape; Factor 3 = Rape Prevalence Knowledge.
(.44). This factor could be epitomized: Women’s fear of rape and perceived likelihood of being a victim of attempted rape.

The second factor "Avoidability/Controllability Over Rape" accounted for 12.4% of the total variance and included four items which all loaded negatively on this factor: Perceived Control Over Rape (-.83), Ability of a Woman to Fend Off a Rapist (-.76), Personal Perceived Likelihood of Fending Off a Rape Attempt (-.65), and Likelihood of Being Raped Compared to Other Women (-.46). This factor-scale could be epitomized: Women’s beliefs about their control over rape and ability to defend themselves. Women who are more likely to believe that they will be a victim of rape are more likely to believe that women control over rape and are able to defend themselves, and vice versa.

Factor-Scale 3 labelled "Rape Prevalence Knowledge" contained one item which had a high positive loading: "Perceived Percentage of Stranger Rape Victims" (.82). There were also two items which had negative loadings: Perceived Percentage of Acquaintance Rape Victims (-.49) and Perceived Percentage of Date Rape Victims (-.55). This factor-scale could be epitomized: The more women believe in high prevalence of stranger rape the less they believe in the high prevalence of acquaintance and date rape, and vice versa. This factor-scale accounted for 7.1% of the total variance.
Determining the Concurrent Validity of the Fear and Perception of Rape Scale

The concurrent validity of the Fear and Perception of Rape Scale was determined by (1) Examining its factor structure, (2) Determining its concurrent validity in which the factors of the FPRS were correlated with the factors of the other sexual coercion measures.

The factor structure of the FPRS was similar to the predicted factor structure. Fear, controllability over one's victimization, and knowledge of rape statistics appear to be the predominant empirical and theoretical factors.

To determine the concurrent validity of the FPRS, correlations between factor on this scale and factors on the other scales were conducted and are listed in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORRELATIONS COMPARING FPRS FACTORS WITH OTHER SEXUAL COERCION SCALE FACTORS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FPRS1</th>
<th>FPRS2</th>
<th>FPRS3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASB1</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB2</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA1</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA2</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA3</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA4</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12--Continued.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>SES1</th>
<th>SES2</th>
<th>SES3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES1</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES2</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES3</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES4</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS2</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS3</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

Note: ASB1 = Justification of Exploitation/Manipulation in Relationships; ASB2 = Justification of Male Dominance.
RMAl = Beliefs of Rape Claims and Women’s Wishes to Be Raped; RMA2 = Women’s Actions Asking for Rape; RMA3 = Women Use Rape as Manipulation; RMA4 = Women’s Actions Influence Rape Blame.
SES1 = Attempted Sexual Assault/Abuse; SES2 = Experience With Completed Sexual Assault/Abuse; SES3 = Verbal Sexual Coercion; SES4 = Experience With a Man Misinterpreting Intimacy or Can’t Stop Self.
AWS1 = Task Differentiation Between Genders; AWS2 = Traditional Marriage Roles; AWS3 = Economic/Social Equality.
FPRS1 = Fear of Rape; FPRS2 = Avoidability/Controllability Over Rape; FPRS3 = Rape Prevalence Knowledge.

Only endorsement of rape myth factors correlated negatively with factors of the FPRS suggesting that fear of rape and its correlates is associated with lower belief of rape myths as predicted. Because the FPRS factors did not correlate as predicted with the other sexual coercion factors, the FPRS factors will not be used in the second-order factor analysis to determine the over-arching construct of personal experience with sexual coercion.

Correlations Between First-Order Factor-Scales

Table 13 shows the correlations between first-order factor-scales. Of the 62 possible correlations between
TABLE 13

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FIRST ORDER FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ASB1</th>
<th>ASB2</th>
<th>RMA1</th>
<th>RMA2</th>
<th>RMA3</th>
<th>RMA4</th>
<th>SES1</th>
<th>SES2</th>
<th>SES3</th>
<th>SES4</th>
<th>AWS1</th>
<th>AWS2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASB2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA1</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA2</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA3</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA4</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES3</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES4</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS2</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS3</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13--Continued.
*p < .05, **p < .01

Note. ASB1 = Justification of Exploitation/Manipulation in Relationships; ASB2 = Justification of Male Dominance.
RMA1 = Disbeliefs of Rape Claims Because Most Women Want to be Raped; RMA2 = Women's Actions Asking for Rape; RMA3 = Women Use Rape as Manipulation; RMA4 = Women's Actions Influence Rape Blame.
SES1 = Attempted Sexual Assault/Abuse; SES2 = Completed Sexual Assault/Abuse; SES3 = Verbal Sexual Coercion; SES4 = Man Misinterprets Intimacy or Can't Stop Self.
AWS1 = Task Differentiation Between Genders; AWS2 = Traditional Marriage Roles; AWS3 = Economic/Social Equality.
factor-scales of different sexual coercion measures, there were 15 significant correlations. Factor-Scale 1 of the ASB, "Justification of Exploitation/Manipulation in Relationships," correlated positively with Factor-Scale 1 of the RMA "Beliefs of Rape Claims and Women's Wishes To Be Raped." This shows that the more women believe that relationships are based on manipulation or exploitation the less they believe in a woman's rape claim and more they think that all women secretly desire to be raped. Likewise, the less women endorse manipulation or exploitation in interpersonal relationships, the less they will believe that women want to be raped. They are also less likely to believe women's rape claims. Factor-Scale 2 of the RMA "Women's Action's Asking for Rape," correlated positively with Factor-Scale 3 of the RMA "Women Use Rape as Manipulation." The more women believe that rape victims "cry" rape to meet their own ends the more they will also believe that women ask for their victimization, and vice versa.

Factor-Scale 2 of the ASB, "Justification of Male Dominance," also correlated positively with Factor-Scales 1, 2, and 3 of the RMA, indicating greater endorsement of male dominance was associated with greater belief in rape myths. There was a negative correlation between Factor-Scale 1 of the ASB, "Justification of Manipulation/Exploitation in Relationships," and Factor-Scale 4 of the RMA, "A Woman's Actions Influence Rape Blame."
This suggests that the more women believe in the justification of manipulation and exploitation in relationships as well as an justification of male dominance, the more they would endorse rape myths. Also, victim blame as measured by Factor-Scale 4 of the RMA was associated with higher justification of manipulation/exploitation in relationships and more endorsement of male dominance.

Factor-Scale 4 of the SES, "Experience With a Man Misinterpreting Intimacy or Can't Stop Self," was positively correlated with Factor-Scale 2 of the SES, "Experience With Completed Sexual Assault/Abuse." The less women have experience in situations in which a man "went too far" by misinterpreting sexual intimacy the less they have been in situations in which they were actually sexually victimized. Factor-Scale 4 of the SES, "Experience With a Man Misinterpreting Intimacy or Can't Stop Self," also negatively correlated with Factor-Scale 1 of the SES, "Attempted Sexual Assault/Abuse." That is, the more the woman has had experience with completed sexual assault or abuse, the more likely she has also been in situations in which sexual intimacy has been misinterpreted by the man or he went too far.

Regarding the factors of the AWS- Short Form, beliefs in the "Gender Differentiation Between Tasks" (Factor-Scale 1) was associated with more disbelief of rape claims (Factor-Scale 1 of the RMA--"Belief in Rape Claims and Women's Wishes to Be Raped"). "Gender Differentiation
Between Tasks" was also positively associated with an endorsement of rape myths which state that women ask to be raped (Factor-Scale 2 of the RMA--"Women Actions Asking for Rape) and endorsement of the belief that women are manipulating and should be punished by being raped (Factor-Scale 3 of the RMA--"Women Use Rape as Manipulation"). The more women believe that tasks should be differentiated by genders with men taking more prestigious leadership roles the more women endorse rape myths. Belief in "Gender Differentiation Between Tasks" was negatively correlated with Factor-Scale 4 of the RMA "A Woman’s Actions Influence Rape Blame." This suggests that belief in male leadership roles is associated with blaming the rape victim more.

Factor-Scale 2 of the AWS-Short Form ("Traditional Marriage Roles") was positively associated with endorsement of manipulation and exploitation in relationships (Factor-Scale 1 of the ASB--"Justification of Manipulation/Exploitation in Relationships"). "Traditional Marriage Roles" was also positively associated with an endorsement of the belief that women ask to be raped (Factor-Scale 2 of the RMA--Women’s Actions Asking for Rape) and endorsement of the superiority of men’s tasks (Factor-Scale 1 of the AWS-Short Form--"Gender Differentiation Between Tasks"). This suggests that the more women believe in traditional marriage roles, the more they are believe that all male-female relationships should be based on manipulation or exploitations. Also, they tend to blame
women more for their sexual victimization. Traditional marriage roles which often place the husband at a greater status over the wife are also associated with the belief that men's roles in society should be more prestigious, with the women relegated to more traditional gender-typed tasks such as doing housework.

Factor-Scale 3 of the AWS- Short Form, "Economic/Social Equality," correlated only with the second factor-scale of the AWS- Short Form "Traditional Marriage Roles." There was a negative correlation between these two factor-scales. This suggests that the more women believe in traditional marriage roles the less they endorse economic and social equality for women. Likewise, the less women believe in traditional marriage roles, the more they believe in economic and social equality for women.

Determining the Second-Order Factor-Scale Structure

Because the FPRS factors did not demonstrate sufficient concurrent validity, these were not included in the final factor analysis to determine the higher order factor-scales which make up the Personal Experience with Sexual Coercion Construct. Table 14 shows the factor loadings of each of the first-order factor-scales onto the second-order factor structure. A two-factor model was generated using a principal components analysis with oblique rotation of the first-order factor-scales.
### TABLE 14
FACTORS OF THE PERSONAL EXPERIENCE WITH SEXUAL COERCION CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASB1</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB2</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA1</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA2</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA3</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA4</td>
<td>-.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES1</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES2</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES3</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES4</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS1</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS2</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS3</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Total Variance 26.6% 13.9%

**Note.** Factor 1 = Attitudes Toward Sexual Coercion; Factor 2 = Experience with Sexual Coercion. ASB1 = Justification of Exploitation/Manipulation in Relationships; ASB2 = Justification of Male Dominance. RMA1 = Beliefs of Rape Claims and Women’s Wishes to Be Raped; RMA2 = Women’s Actions Asking for Rape; RMA3 = Women Use Rape as Manipulation; RMA4 = Women’s Actions Influence Rape Blame. SES1 = Attempted Sexual Assault/Abuse; SES2 = Experience with Sexual Assault/Abuse. Table 14--Continued.
Factor-Scale 1 of the personal experience with sexual coercion construct, which accounts for 26.6% of the total variance, is labelled "Attitudes Toward Sexual Coercion". It includes four first-order factor-scales which loaded positively on this factor: Factor-Scale 1 of the ASB ("Justification of Adversarial Sexual Beliefs") (.71), Factor-Scale 1 of the RMA ("Beliefs of Rape Claims and Women's Wishes to Be Raped"), (.72), Factor-Scale 2 of the RMA ("Women's Actions Asking for Rape") (.64), Factor-Scale 3 of the RMA ("Women Use Rape as Manipulation") (.79). It also included one first-order scale which loaded negatively: Factor-Scale 4 of the RMA ("Women's Actions Influence Rape Blame") (-.64). This second-order factor-scale can be epitomized: The more women disbelieve rape claims, the more they endorse exploitation and manipulation in relationships, and the more they believe that women wish to be raped and their actions ask for it. Likewise, the more women believe rape claims the less they believe that women want to be raped, their actions ask for it or that exploitation and manipulation are acceptable in relationships.

The second factor-scale labelled "Experience with Sexual Coercion" includes two first-order factor-scale scales which loaded positively: Factor-Scale 2 ("Experience with Completed Sexual Assault/Abuse") (.73), and Factor-
Scale 4 of the SES ("Experience With a Man Misinterpreting Intimacy or Can't Stop Self") (.49). It also includes one negatively loaded first-order factor-scale: Factor-Scale 1 of the SES ("Attempted Sexual Assault/Abuse") (-.84). This second-order factor-scale may be epitomized: The less women have experience with attempted rape and/or completed rape the less likely they are to have experience in situations where a man has misinterpreted the sexual intimacy they desired. Likewise, the more they have had been in situations in which they were a victim of attempted rape, the more likely they have been in sexual coercive situations and in situations in which a man misinterpreted the sexual intimacy they desired. It accounts for 13.9% of the total variance.

Comparison of First and Second-order Factors by Developmental Level

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine if developmental group differences existed for any of the first or second-order factor-scales. Factor-scale scores were first obtained by unit weighting, then mean factor scores were compared across groups. Table 15 shows the means for each group on both first and second-order factors and corresponding $F$ value for each analysis. There were no differences between groups with regard to factors of the ASB, Hotellings's $T^2 = .060, F (4, 216) = 1.60$, n.s., nor on the factors of the RMA, Hotellings's $T^2 = .106, F (8, 212) = 1.42$, n.s. Nor were there any
**TABLE 15**

COMPARISON OF FIRST- AND SECOND-ORDER FACTOR-SCALES BY DEVELOPMENTAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Level</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F(2,110)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASB1</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>- .25</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB2</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA1</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA2</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA3</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA4</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES1</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES2</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES3</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15--Continued.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SES4</th>
<th>AWS1</th>
<th>AWS2</th>
<th>AWS3</th>
<th>FPRS1</th>
<th>FPRS2</th>
<th>FPRS3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.32*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

Note. ASB1 = Justification of Exploitation/Manipulation in Relationships; ASB2 = Justification of Male Dominance.
RMA1 = Beliefs of Rape Claims and Women’s Wishes to Be Raped; RMA2 = Women’s Actions Asking for Rape; RMA3 = Women Use Rape as Manipulation; RMA4 = A Woman’s Actions Should Not Be Held Against Her in Deciding Rape Blame.
SES1 = Attempted Sexual Assault/Abuse; SES2 = Experience with Completed Sexual Assault/Abuse; SES3 = Verbal Sexual Coercion; SES4 = Experience with a Man Misinterpreting Intimacy or Can’t Stop Self.
AWS1 = Task Differentiation Between Genders; AWS2 = Traditional Marriage Roles; AWS3 = Economic/Social Equality.
FPRS1 = Fear of Rape; FPRS2 = Avoidability/Controllability Over Rape; FPRS3 = Rape Prevalence Knowledge.
significant multivariate differences between groups on the
first-order factor-scales of the SES, Hotellings's $T^2 = .058$, $F (8, 212) = .77$, n.s., or the AWS-Short Form,
Hotellings's $T^2 = .040$, $F (6, 214) = .71$, n.s.

As shown in Table 14, there were no also multivariate
differences between groups on either of the two second-order
factors, "Attitudes Toward Sexual Coercion," or "Experience
With Sexual Coercion," Hotelling's $T^2 = .028$, $F (6, 214) = .502$, n.s. Thus, the hypothesis that women who differ with
regard to ethic of care moral development levels will also
differ in their views of and experience with sexual coercion
was not supported.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION

The present study investigated two main areas of research in women's issues: sexual aggression against women and women's moral development. First, it sought to define the construct underlying women's attitudes and experience with various forms of sexual coercion. This was done by first determining if women's attitudes toward sexual coercion are organized in the same manner as men. Second, the first and second-order factor structures underlying some of the major sexual coercion instruments used to assess attitudes and experience with sexual coercion were examined.

The present study also examined the Ethic of Care Stage Theory constructed by Gilligan (1982) and further refined by Attanucci (1984). This was done by testing the hypothesis that women who are at various moral developmental levels, (Instrumental, Self-Sacrifice, and Authentic-Care) would not only conceptualize non-coercive relationships differently, but also have differing views of and experience with coercive sexual relationships.

Differences in the Factor Structure Between Men and Women

Both the factor structures of the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale and Adversarial Sexual Beliefs scale differed between
women in the present study and men in the Briere, Malamuth, and Check (1985) sample. Previous studies have shown that men believe significantly more in rape myths than women (Margolin, Miller, and Moran, 1989). However, the present study shows that women's beliefs about adversarial sexual relationships and rape myths may also be organized differently than men.

As shown in Table 4, women may distinguish adversarial sexual beliefs, such as acceptance of manipulation and exploitation in relationships, from endorsement of male dominance in their beliefs about sexual relationships. The two items endorsing male dominance (i.e., A Man Must Show a Woman Who’s Boss and A Woman Will Only Respect a Man who Lays down the Law to Her) actually loaded highly on a separate second factor, not the first factor. In contrast, for men in the Briere, Malamuth, and Check (1985) study, the items which reflected male dominance also correlated highly with the adversarial sexual beliefs items and both on the same factor. This suggests that males, but not females, may equate exploitation and manipulation in relationships as part of an over-arching endorsement of male dominance.

The model provided by Briere, Malamuth, and Check (1985) for the RMA also did not fit well with the present study's data. Visual inspection of factor differences in tables 6 and 7 show that both males and females organized similarly in that belief of rape claims are organized together for both. Both had factors primarily made up of
rape claim items. However, in the all-female sample, belief rape claims varied as to whether or not women knew the victim. Just because women reported that they would believe their best friend's rape claims, this did not necessarily mean that they would believe rape claims of strangers. In contrast, for men, beliefs in one's best friend also loaded positively with the other rape claim items on Factor-Scale 1 of the RMA. For men, either one believes all or most rape claims, either from an acquaintance or stranger, or one does not believe any rape claim. The difference between the two genders on this factor may be accounted for by a differential experience with rape victims. Rape is a vastly unreported crime and because of the shame and humiliation, women may be unlikely to tell anyone of their victimization, especially males. Therefore, for men rape claims may be influenced more by dominant cultural ideology and less by personally knowing someone who has been raped. Since dominant cultural ideology influences general rape myths, it will influence how men look at any victim. Women are likely to have been in more situations in which a friend confided in them about their victimization or in which they were victimized. With a wider range of experiences such as these, they are more likely to be able to make differentiations between "true" victims and those whose rape claims are false.

Also, as shown in Table 7, women's belief of rape claims was associated with beliefs about women's wishes to
be raped, which was not evident in the male sample. For men, the belief that women wanted to be raped was associated with a belief that women’s actions cause their own victimization. Additionally, visual inspection of Factor 2 of the RMA factor structure in the all-male sample show that men may associate a female’s willingness to have sex with a belief that women deserve to be raped and should be punished. This was not true for the all-female sample who associated a willingness to have sex as part of women’s actions causing their own victimization.

Differences in the organization of women and men’s beliefs about coercive sexuality have implications for how both genders view dating and sexuality in general. "Mixed messages," which are often the purported causes of male sexual aggression (such as the man interprets a woman’s nonverbal behavior of inviting him up to her room as willingness to have sex), may be a byproduct of the differential belief structures of men and women. For instance, it appears that for males, if a female indicates through her actions that she wants sex, rape is seen as justified. This association does not appear to be as strong for females, and since a female may not be making this connection, she may inadvertently enter into a coercive sexual situation.

Correlations Between First-Order Factor-Scales

A number of significant correlations between first-order factor-scales suggest ways in which women organize
their views of sexual assault. Rape myths as measured by the factors of the RMA and justification of exploitation and manipulation in relationships as measured by the factors of the ASB tended to be positively associated with each other. Those who found that manipulation and exploitation were justified were less likely to believe rape claims, and more likely to see women's actions as causing their own victimization, and vice versa. They are also more likely to believe that women may "cry" rape to get what they want such as getting back at a man or protecting their reputation when they are pregnant out of wedlock.

This positive association between rape myths and belief in adversarial sexual relationships is not surprising given the socialization of women into the heterosexual game playing pointed out by Muehlenhard and Hollabaugh (1988) when they described the concept of "token resistance." Women are socialized to believe that to appear as "good" and not loose, they must be initially resistant to a man's advances but then give into his pressure. This allows a woman to obtain sex without having to appear too eager. It also points to the use of manipulation and deceit to meet female sexual needs. A woman cannot openly voice her desires but must play a game to make a man think he is obtaining sex by force. According to this notion, the concept of rape itself cannot exist since all women who say no really mean yes. Therefore, any woman who claims to be raped must be lying or just not played the "game" well
enough; she should have known that her actions implied she was willing to have sex.

From a women's moral developmental level standpoint, it appears that this way of getting women's needs met through covert methods rather than assertive ones seems closely aligned with the Self-Sacrifice perspective. Women must not voice their own needs but be submissive to others' needs in relationships. Therefore, it would have been logical to predict that self-sacrificing women would be significantly more likely to endorse the factors of the ASB and RMA than women from the other two developmental levels. This hypothesis was not supported. One reason for this may be the subtle difference between Self-Sacrifice as defined by Gilligan and this sexual game playing in which women must use manipulation and "token resistance" to meet their sexual needs. Specifically, Self-sacrificing women place the needs and wants of others before themselves, completely subjugating their own desires. However, the sexual game playing defined by the factors of the ASB and rape myths imply that women actually are seeking to fulfill their own sexual needs. But because of sexual socialization, they must appear to be completely subjugating themselves to the man's advances. What would be defined as rape or taking sex by force is really wanted by women. It gains them the sexual gratification they desire while protecting their reputation. Clearly, then, the sexual game playing which
covertly meets women’s needs is different than Gilligan’s Self-Sacrifice role.

Justification of male dominance (Factor-Scale 2 of the ASB) was also positively associated with endorsement of rape myths as defined by Factor-Scales 1 and 3 of the RMA. Women must meet their needs, especially sexual needs, through manipulation and deceit. Therefore, women cannot be assertive but overtly submissive to still appear as good women. Men may use aggressive means to obtain sexual gratification for both sexes. Male dominance once again allows women to obtain sex without appearing loose.

With regard to actual experience with sexual coercion and victimization, correlations between factors on the Sexual Experiences Survey indicate that the more women have been in more situations in which they have been sexually victimized the more they have been in situations in which they prevented being victimized. This shows an overall experience with more situations in which sexual coercion is likely to occur. This finding would also suggest that women who have a greater number of coercive sexual experiences would also be more sexually active, more often placing themselves in situations in which sex is likely to take place, coercive or otherwise. However, as Table 9 indicates, item 1, which assesses women’s sexual activity experiences did not load on any of the four SES factors and did not appear to be related to either attempted or completed sexual assault or abuse. While sexual activity
level has been associated with higher rates of sexual victimization in adolescents (Aegton, 1983), this was not shown in the present study of college-age women.

As shown in Table 13, there appears to be little association between one's experience with sexual victimization or coercion and rape attitudes. There were no significant correlations between factors of the ASB, RMA and SES. This concurs with Koss and Dinero's (1989) findings that rape attitudes failed to predict sexual victimization. In their study of 14 predictor variables hypothesized to affect victimization rates, only early childhood sexual victimization predicted later victimization. In addition, there were no significant correlations between factors of the SES and AWS-Short Form. Koss (1985) found that belief in traditional sex-roles was not associated with sexual victimization rates. Likewise, this study seems to question the feminist analysis of rape that women's socialization into the traditional feminine sex-role promotes sexual victimization (e.g., Rose, 1977). Granted, the feminist argument centers around actions women take which are submissive and invite sexual aggression rather than just beliefs about women's roles in society. However, it is interesting to note one's beliefs about women's roles does not seem to make one more vulnerable to sexual aggression or coercion.

Factor-Scale 3 and 4 of the SES both dealt with sexual coercion that does not involve threats or force and would
probably not be defined as rape. The positive correlation between Factor-Scale 3, "Verbal Sexual Coercion," and "Experience With a Man Misinterpreting Intimacy or Can't Stop Self" indicates that the more women are situations in which verbal coercion is used the less they are to be in situations where the intercourse occurred because the man merely misinterpreted the woman's desires. It appears that little verbal interaction may occur when the man misinterprets a woman's desires or she feels he cannot stop himself because he is so aroused. It may be that he does not have to resort to verbal pressure because she continues to allow the sexual acts because she figures he will obtain sex anyway. This appears to be a mistake on the woman's part; her lack of verbal dissent is actually viewed by the man as willingness. However, it is important to note that perhaps the woman figures she cannot stop the male anyway so that perhaps she figures if she voiced her dissent he would move on to more intense verbal and/or physical coercion to obtain sexual intercourse.

Factor-Scale 1 of the SES, "Attempted Assault/Abuse," correlated negatively with Factor-Scale 4 of the SES, "Experience With a Man Misinterpreting Intimacy or Can't Stop Self." This suggests that the more women have experience with attempted assault the more they have been situations in which the man went too far or misinterpreted their desired intimacy, and vice versa. This finding is interesting in that one would assume that a woman who is
able to keep an unwanted sexual act from occurring by her words or actions would be more able to be assertive when she perceives a man has misinterpreted her desire for sexual intimacy. However, it may be that women interpret men’s actions described in items comprising Factor-Scale 1 and men’s actions described items comprising Factor-Scale 4 very differently. That is, Factor-Scale 1 "Attempted Sexual Assault/Abuse" includes items which clearly describe a man’s actions as being coercive. Either he has used physical force or threatened to use physical force to try to get the woman to have intercourse. However, items which make up Factor-Scale 4 "Experience With a Man Misinterpreting Intimacy or Can’t Stop Self" describe a man’s actions as a result of his misinterpretation or over-arousal and do not imply his direct coercion. This may mean that while women clearly interpret a man’s actions in items which make up "Attempted Sexual Assault/Abuse" as coercive and probably rape, women may not interpret a man’s actions in items making up the "Experience With a Man Misinterpreting Intimacy or Can’t Stop Self" factor-scale as rape. Therefore, women may be much more likely to stop a man when they can clearly see that his actions constitute sexual coercion and sexual assault rather than when his intentions are more ambiguous. So that is why women may have both high experiences with fending off a would-be rapist (scoring higher on the factor-scale "Attempted Sexual Assault/Abuse") and also having more experience in which they participated
in sexual acts because the man misinterpreted the sexual intimacy they desired or couldn't stop himself (scoring lower on the factor-scale "Experience With a Man Misinterpreting Intimacy or Can't Stop Self.")

However, there was a positive relationship between actual sexual victimization and experience with situations in which a man misinterpreted sexual intimacy. This suggests that women who have been victimized may believe that a man will use force or threats when they perceive him as "going too far" so they do not try to stop him. This may be because they fear getting injured (because they may have in the past) or have recognized that their past actions did little to stop the victimization once a man became aroused.

Beliefs in traditional roles of women as defined by the factors of the AWS-Short Form correlated with factors on both the ASB and RMA. Generally, women who held more traditional views of women also endorsed rape myths more blaming the victim and holding her accountable for her victimization. For instance, both beliefs in the "Task Differentiation Between Genders" (Factor-Scale 1 of the AWS-Short Form) and "Traditional Marriage Roles" (Factor-Scale 2 of the AWS-Short Form) were positively associated with disbelief of rape claims (Factor-Scale 2 of the RMA). The positive relationship between belief in traditional roles for women and endorsement of rape myths supports the feminist contention that while female socialization may not
lead to greater victimization, it causes women to be more accepting of rape in general.

Factor-Scale 1 of the AWS-Short Form ("Task Differentiation Between Genders") and Factor-Scale 2 of the ASB ("Justification of Male Dominance") correlated positively with each other. Greater endorsement of the belief that men should play the leadership roles while women should be given less prestigious tasks is associated with greater endorsement in the belief that men should dominate interpersonal relationships.

Factor-Scale 2 of the AWS-Short Form ("Traditional Marriage Roles") also correlated with Factor-Scale 2 of the ASB (Justification of Male Dominance"). The more women endorse traditional marriage roles for women the more they also believe in male dominance in other interpersonal relationships, and vice versa.

Not surprisingly, women who are more likely to believe in traditional marriage roles are also less likely to ascribe equality for women in other social and economic spheres. There was a negative correlation between Factor-Scale 3 of the AWS-Short Form ("Economic/Social Equality") and Factor-Scale 2 ("Traditional Marriage Roles.") This suggests that women who have traditional views of females hold those beliefs both about one’s own relationship with one’s spouse and for women in general.

The Personal Experience with Sexual Coercion Construct
Table 14 shows that for the most part, second-order factors corresponded to the original scales. First-order factor-scales measuring sexual coercion attitudes were grouped together on Factor 1 of the Personal Experience with Sexual Coercion Construct and factors measuring personal experience with sexual coercion were grouped on Factor 2. However, Factor-Scale 2 of the ASB ("Justification of Male Dominance") did not load on Factor-Scale 1 of the Personal Experience with Sexual Coercion Construct. This suggests that women may believe in adversarial sexual beliefs and endorse rape myths but not necessarily believe in the ideology of male dominance. First-order factor-scale correlations show positive correlations between Factor-Scale 2 of the ASB and Factor-Scale 1 and 3 of the RMA. This suggests that rape myth adherence is associated with a belief in male dominance. However, it appears that belief in male dominance is not as influential in women's overall beliefs which may condone rape. According to Schwendinger and Schwendinger (1983) and others (Brownmiller, 1975), rape is merely an extension of the gender inequality that exists in our society. Male dominance is directly tied to the endorsement of rape and must be considered as a causal factor when positing a socioeconomic etiology of rape. Yet it appears that, at least in this study, women's views of rape are not as tied to a belief in general male dominance. Comparison of the Adversarial Beliefs scale factor structure between men and women also showed that men seem more likely
to link a belief in male dominance to acceptance of rape myths. If this is correct, that men rather than women may link a belief in male dominance to acceptance of rape and victim blame, then the feminist analysis linking gender inequality and acceptance of rape may be more true for men than women.

The factors on the personal experience with sexual coercion construct could be divided between first-order factor-scales assessing rape attitudes (the ASB and RMA) and first-order factor-scales assessing experience (the SES). This suggests that the original sexual coercion measures accurately describe the structure of women’s experience with sexual coercion. Therefore, a second-order factor analysis provides little new information about the organization of women’s views and experience of sexual assault.

Explanations for Lack of Differences Between Developmental Level Groups on First- and Second-Order Factor-Scales

The failure to find differences between groups may be accounted for by many factors. The following is a brief outline of the reasons. Each will be discussed in more detail in the remainder of the discussion section.

First, the present study’s design may not have been statistically powerful enough to detect small effect sizes. Secondly, the present scoring system designed to place women into one of the three developmental levels may not accurately reflect Gilligan’s stages. This is because: (1)
developmental level may not truly measure developmental level, and (2) Because of social desirability, the interview used to determine developmental level may actually underestimate women's Instrumental levels and overestimate the number of women who are Self-Sacrifice or Authentic-Care, (3) The current coding system generates a global developmental score which may fail to accurately measure Ethic of Care developmental level for women when dealing with romantic heterosexual relationships.

Lack of differences may also be explained by examining the theoretical underpinnings of Gilligan's stage theory itself. A continuous rather than discrete model may better explain women views of self in relationships. Also, women's roles in relationships may be more fluid than Gilligan originally proposed. Women may make decisions using a variety of different moral developmental levels rather than just one.

Another reason for lack of differences in views of rape between the groups in the current sample is that the present sample may not be representative of the population with regard to experience with sexual coercion.

In addition to methodological flaws which might account for null findings, lack of differences between women of varying moral developmental levels on views of and experience with sexual coercion may be because women's moral developmental level has little to do with attitudes and experience with sexual coercion. Rather, cultural and
societal beliefs may influence women's experience with and views of sexual coercion to a much greater extent than women's individual ways of relating in relationships.

**Design sensitivity.** The inequality of the number of women in each of the three developmental level groups may have decreased the sensitivity of the study so if there were group differences they were not likely to be detected. Because of the small number of subjects and unequal N, the present design could only detect large differences between groups. This is especially problematic given the small effect sizes (.2 of a Standard Deviation) found between groups. Low numbers of subjects per cell may be attributed to the difficulty in obtaining Instrumental subjects. As this is the first study which attempted to collect data from women who are at the Instrumental level, the number of subjects required to obtain sufficient number of Instrumental women needed to detect small group differences could only be projected. As it turns out, the number of subjects needed was an underestimation. Rather than making up 33% of the population as predicted by Oliff (1990), Instrumental women may actually make up less than 20% of the college female population.

**Social desirability.** Another possibility for the lack of group mean differences between factors is that because of social desirability, the Self-Descriptive interviews may not accurately measure a woman's moral development level. Women may have been more likely to endorse self-sacrificing and
Authentic-Care statements because such statements are more socially desirable for women. For instance, because it coincides with the traditional role of women, interviewees often endorsed doing everything for others without expecting much in return. This sense of caring and giving would be seen as socially desirable. Likewise, when referring to the romantic significant-other, women often mentioned the equality in their relationship, stressing that they were not too demanding nor too passive. However, when endorsing the Instrumental developmental level, women would have to endorse such statements as "I am the one who always gets her way," or "I tend to be pretty selfish at times." These statements do not appear to be as socially desirable. Therefore, this face-to-face interview technique may actually underestimate the number of Instrumental women in the college population. Creating a pencil and paper measure which assesses women’s role in relationships may decrease this social desirability effect and give a truer picture of women’s developmental level.

Scoring system to determine developmental level. It is also notable that according to the existing scoring system, developmental level was scored for all segments of the transcript, not just those referring to one’s relationship with the romantic significant-other. This procedure is consistent with both Attanucci’s interview probe questions (1984) and the Oliff and Russell (1990) scoring system. However, this procedure meant that women’s relationships
with peers, friends, and family members also entered into the calculation of the their Ethic of Care moral developmental level. My impressions as a interviewer were that women may envision themselves in three different spheres of relationships: non-romantic peers and friends, family members, and with the romantically-involved significant-other. Future research might determine if women endorse a particular developmental level in one sphere of her relationships while endorsing another developmental level when in another sphere of her relationships.

The existence of an interaction between relationship sphere and moral developmental level could not be formally tested because there was not an equal number of questions about family, friends, and romantic significant-other included in the interview. However, the belief that women may use different moral developmental levels depending on their current relationship is consistent with Attanucci’s (1988) findings that women conceptualized their roles differently depending whether they were referring to friends, family, or romantic significant-other. If one were to score only those items which assessed one’s relationship with the romantic significant-other, there might have been differences with regard to views of and experience with coercive sexual relationships.

Problems with the Gilligan stage theory. Another explanation for this lack of significant differences between groups is that Gilligan’s stage theory is discrete but
should include the transition stages originally proposed by Gilligan (1982). This would make the stages of her theory: Instrumental, Instrumental/Self-Sacrifice, Self-Sacrifice, Self-Sacrifice/Authentic-Care, and finally Authentic-Care. Kohlberg (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987) includes many people who are between his justice moral development stages (i.e., Stage 3/4), recognizing the continuity of moral development levels rather than their exclusiveness.

However, this does not explain why women may endorse all three developmental levels. In other words, women’s actions in relationships may be an interplay of all three roles: wanting what was good for the woman, wanting to play the traditional self-sacrificing role, and knowing that what is best for her relationships is an equal give and take between partners. Women who may be in primarily one stage may still make choices from each of three levels. Rather than starting at Instrumental and moving up to Authentic-Care, women may use all three levels depending on the situation.

In the present study there was also no significant correlation between age and moral developmental level. According to the developmental stage theory model, moral developmental level should be positively correlated with age. It should be noted, however, that there was only a 10 year age range in the current sample with the majority of subjects between 18 and 20 years. It may be that for women, the age block of 18-20 years is a time when they are in a
transition stage. They may be trying out a variety of roles before they discover the problems with being both too self-centered and too selfless and progress to the Authentic-Care stage in their later college years. Using a more diversified sample with respect to age would test this hypothesis.

Lack of representativeness of the current sample with regard to sexual coercion experience. Another possible reason for lack of differences between group means of factors making up the sexual coercion construct was the possibility that the study's sample had very a low rate of experience with sexual victimization compared to the general female population.

With regard to experience with sexual victimization, the present study's sample was compared with responses of national sample of higher education female students (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). The national study of 3187 college women showed that 25% of the respondents indicated experience with verbal coercion (as defined by answering yes to item 5 in which the woman has sex because she is overwhelmed by a man's continual arguments) compared to 12.4% of the present sample. The national sample and present study's sample had equal rates of women who have experienced attempted rape (as defined as threat or use of physical force to obtain intercourse but it did not occur). Both were 15.0% of the total sample surveyed. However, while 15.4% of the national sample had been raped, only 8.8%
of the present study's sample were sexual assault survivors. The present study's sample appears to be much lower than the national rate. Koss and her colleagues actually found that in religiously-affiliated institutions only 7% of the women surveyed had been rape victims. The national study was also based on juniors or seniors (Mean age = 21.3 years), compared with 84.9% of the present study's sample who were freshmen or sophomores and whose mean age was 18.9 years. However, the low rate of experience with sexual aggression compared to the national sample may show that the present sample was not representative with regard to experience, which may partially account for lack of group mean differences.

Women's moral developmental levels may not affect views or experience with sexual coercion. Another explanation for the findings is that while Gilligan's stage theory may be true and attempts to measure developmental levels may be accurate, women's view of non-coercive relationships may, in fact, not affect their views of or experience with sexual coercion. The present study suggests little relationship between views and experiences of sexual coercion and women's moral developmental levels. True, Oliff (1990) found differences between Self-Sacrifice and Authentic-Care women in ways they viewed themselves and the man when given hypothetical situations of sexual bids with varying levels of coerciveness. Yet she, too, did not find that women's attitudes toward rape as measured by total scale scores of
the ASB, RMA, or SES differed among women who were Self-Sacrifice and Authentic-Care. Therefore, both Oliff’s research and the present study support the belief that overall attitudes toward sexual assault are not related to moral developmental level.

The sociocultural etiology of rape, which is now widely argued, shows that acceptance of rape in our society is a natural extension of the dominant ideology of male domination (Lottes, 1988). Just as young children learn social inequality between genders is natural, justification of coercive sexuality is also acceptable. Women as well as men are socialized to accept sexual violence against women and blame the victim (Lottes, 1988). Therefore, individual ways of relating, or changes in developmental level, may do little to affect attitudes which condone rape, internalized via the socialization process for women. While a woman may make individual decisions regarding herself and her relationships, her attitudes may be still governed by the dominant cultural ideology which promotes sexual aggression.

The present study’s results also suggest changing women’s attitudes about rape does not necessarily mean that they will relate differently in their relationships. If this is true, then this raises questions about the efficacy of rape education programs. Even though one may have different attitudes toward sexual assault after participating in prevention programs designed to dispel rape myths and provide accurate information about sexual assault,
one's behavior with significant romantic others (such as being more assertive rather than self-sacrificing) may not be affected. This is especially problematic given the fact that the majority of sexual coercive incidents happen between acquaintances and dates, that is, with the romantic significant-other.

Conclusions

The present study's results indicate the need to reexamine both the theoretical underpinnings of Gilligan's Ethic of Care theory and method of assessing women's moral developmental level. Future work should assess whether Gilligan's stages are not discrete but continuous or that women's ways of relating depend on which type of relationship they are in. Women may be constantly making decisions from all three perspectives. A scoring system in which each segment is scored on all three developmental levels may better assess whether Gilligan's stages are continuous or discrete.

The scoring system created by Oliff and Russell (1990) may have been useful in differentiating Self-sacrificing versus Authentic-Care women. However, because of social desirability, the face-to-face interview format may have actually underestimated the number of Instrumental women in the population. Generation of a written version of the self-descriptive interview may reduce the likelihood of social desirability. Secondly, a recalculation of the current formula for determining developmental level which
reflects not only primary developmental level but also takes into account women's endorsement of the other developmental levels should be attempted. Finally, breaking segments into three relationship spheres: family, peers, and romantic significant-others may provide information about moral developmental levels for all three spheres. This would determine if women's moral development levels do not affect their views and experience with sexual coercion, as suggested by the current data. Focusing only on women's ways of relating with their romantic significant-other may show that, in fact, views of coercive sexuality are governed by ways of relating in non-coercive interpersonal relationships.
APPENDICES
Dear Participant:

Thank you for participating in this study. This research consists of two parts. In Part 1 you will be asked various questions about your perception of general aspects of your relationships and how you see yourself. Your responses in this part (and only this part) will be tape-recorded. There will be no way to match your name with your interview since there will only be a number attached to your interview tape and your consent form will be kept separate from it. In addition, the relationship interviews will be transcribed and the tape contents erased. In other words, everything you say will be completely confidential.

You are free to quit this study at any time before Part 2 of the study without penalty or loss of course credit. If you have any questions or concerns about this study you will be given debriefing materials with the researcher's phone number on it for further information.

Once again, remember that you may quit this study at any time and thank for your help in this research.

Sincerely,

Marylouise Jones
Researcher

I have read the above letter and understand the nature of Part 1 of this study. I also note that I may terminate my service as a subject at any time without penalty and that my responses are kept completely confidential. Finally, I am aware that I will be offered information concerning the topics covered in the study at the end of the experiment.

Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________
CONSENT FORM - PART 2

Dear Participant:

Thank you for participating in Part 2 of this study. In Part 2 you will fill out a questionnaire assessing your attitudes about various subjects such as violent crimes including sexual assault. In the second part of this study there will be no identifying information on the research questionnaire you fill out concerning violent crimes. This will be done by separating your consent form from your other research materials.

Since some material covered in Part 2 of this research is very sensitive, you are free to quit this study at any time without penalty or loss of course credit. Also, at the end of this study you will be offered debriefing materials concerning the topics covered in this study. You are free to take these materials. Finally, you are free to ask any questions you might have about this research at the end of the study, and the researcher’s telephone number is listed on the last page of the information and debriefing sheet in case you have any further questions or concerns.

Once again, remember that you may quit this study at any time and thank for your help in this research.

Sincerely,

Marylouise Jones
Researcher

I have read the above letter and understand the nature of Part 2 of this study. I also note that I may terminate my service as a subject at any time without penalty and that my responses are kept completely confidential. Finally, I am aware that I will be offered information concerning the topics covered in the study at the end of the experiment.

Signature ______________________ Date ______________________
We would like to find out a little about your family and background. Please fill out the following items.

1. Please indicate your year in school:
   - Freshman
   - Sophomore
   - Junior
   - Senior
   - 5th year-

2. Please list your age:

3. Please list your major:

4. Please circle your ethnicity:
   - Caucasian
   - African-American
   - Asian-American
   - Pacific-Islander
   - Native American
   - Hispanic
   - Other:

5. Please indicate your religious affiliation:

6. Please indicate the highest education level reached by your mother by marking the appropriate item:
   - ___ High school or less
   - ___ Some college
___ College graduate
___ Two years of graduate school (Master's or equivalent)
___ Graduate degree (Law, Ph.D., etc.)

7. Please indicate the highest education level reached by your father by marking the appropriate item:
___ High school or less
___ Some college
___ College graduate
___ Two years of graduate school (Master's or equivalent)
___ Graduate degree (Law, Ph.D., etc.)

8. Please indicate your mother's occupation by marking the appropriate item:
___ Unskilled laborer
___ Homemaker
___ Clerical
___ Skilled, managerial
___ Professional
___ Self-Employed
___ Retired
9. Please indicate your father’s occupation by marking the appropriate item:

___ Unskilled laborer
___ Homemaker
___ Clerical
___ Skilled, managerial
___ Professional
___ Self-Employed
___ Retired

10. Please list the number of siblings you have: _______

11. Please indicate your birth order:

___ Oldest
___ Middle
___ Youngest
___ Not applicable

12. We would like to ask you a few questions about your relationships. How long have you been in a romantic relationship with your boyfriend or spouse?

___ less than 3 months
___ less than 6 months
___ 6 months to 1 year
___ greater than 1 but less than 2 years
13. How satisfied are you in this relationships?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Not satisfied Completely
at all    satisfied

14. How many romantic relationships (including the present one) have you had since high school? 

15. How many other close friendships do you have at the present time? 

16. We would like to ask you a few questions about your religious and/or belief system. How religious would you say you are?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Not at all Extremely
religious宗教

17. How often do you participate in religious practices?

Daily
More than once a week
once a week
once a month
less than once a month

18. How spiritual would you say you are?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Extremely
spiritual spiritual

19. What is the marital status of your parents?

20. In the relationship interview you discussed your relationship with your:

_____ Boyfriend
_____ Husband
APPENDIX 3
FEAR AND PERCEPTION OF RAPE SCALE

The following questions deal with a particular type of crime--rape. We are interested in people’s perceptions of rape. Please circle the correct number on the scale.

1. How big of a problem do you think rape is?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   No problem  A really big problem
   at all

2. How afraid are you of being raped by a stranger?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Not at all  Extremely afraid
   afraid

3. What do you think the chances are that someone would try to rape you?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Very low  Very high

4. How much control do you think women have over rape?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Complete No control
   control

5. How afraid are you of being raped by someone you know (but not a date)?
6. How often do you think a woman can avoid being raped if she really tries?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not at all
afraid

Extremely
afraid

7. When you are out alone after dark, how afraid are you of being raped?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not at all
afraid

Extremely
afraid

8. How likely, compared to the average woman, do you think you are to be raped?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Much less
likely

Much more
likely

9. When you are out alone during the day, how afraid are you of being raped?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not at all
afraid

Extremely
afraid

10. How likely do you think you could avoid rape if confronted by the typical rape attempt?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>11. How afraid are you of being raped by a date?</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. What percentage of rape victims do you think are raped by a stranger? Please write in the percentage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. What do you think the percentage of women are who become victims of rape during their lifetime?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What percentage of rape victims do you think are raped someone they knew (but not a date)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. What percentage of rape victims do you think are raped by a date?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. What percentage of women successfully fend off a rape attempt?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. What percentage of rape victims do you think were raped after dark?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-Perception Questions
How would you describe yourself to yourself? (If you had to describe yourself in a way that you would know it was really you what would you say?)
How would you describe yourself in the past?
What are the differences between how you were then and the way you are now?
What do you think contributed to the changes?

Relationships Questions
*How would you describe your boyfriend?
In what ways are you similar to your boyfriend?
In what ways are you different?
How are the differences, if any, between your concerns and your boyfriend's concerns handled? (In many relationships one person is more demanding while the other is more accommodating, or sometimes both parties try to stick up for their own needs, or they try to do what they think the other wants. How would you describe your relationship?)

Standardized Probes for Interview
Tell me more.
Anything else?
Can you give me an example?
Talk about you.
Talk about your life.
How so?
How do you handle this?
How do you feel about that?

APPENDIX 5

RULES FOR SEGMENTING INTERVIEWS

A "/" indicates a division between segments.

1. Segment filler words in the beginning or the end of a segment but not in the middle. Example: "Um,/the rain in Spain falls mainly on the plain,/you know."—3 segments, "My boyfriend, you know, cheats on me."—Only 1 segment.

2. When the second part of the sentence describes the first part of the sentence, make only one segment. Example: "I'm studious, I work real hard at my studies."—Only 1 segment.

3. When there are two independent parts to a sentence make 2 segments. Example: "When someone is sick I just want to take care of them, /I want to love them even when they aren't my friend."—2 segments.

4. If the sentence contains two parts but the second begins with a "if", "so", "then", "but", "because", (making the second part a dependent clause), make 1 segment. Example: "I went to lunch because I was hungry."—1 segment.

5. If two parts of the sentence are separated by an "and", or "or" and one is dependent clause, make 1 segment. Example: "We just sat down and talked."—1 segment.

6. If two parts of the sentence are separated by an "and" and both are independent clauses, make 2 segments. Example: "We went to the store/ and my boyfriend bought a magazine."—2 segments.
7. Lists of items require a separate segment for each item. Example: "My boyfriend is big,/ tall,/ and caring."--3 segments.

8. Two or more filler words in a sequence should be divided into only 1 segment. Example: "You know, ah, well, ah/ we began to discuss it."--2 segments.

9. Anything that the subject says is a segment, even if it is only clarifying the interviewer’s words. Example:
   
   I: How do you interact with others?
   S: /What?/
   I: How do you see each yourself as a friend?
   --1 segment.

10. When there is a quotation within the sentence, keep it segmented together with introduction. Example: "And my boyfriend said, 'Why don’t you mind your own business.'"--1 segment.

11. However, segment within quotations. Example: "And my boyfriend said, 'Why don’t you mind your own business./ You’re a big busybody.'"--2 segments.
APPENDIX 6

SAMPLE CODING SHEET

Key: Categories
IN=Instrumental
SS=Self-Sacrifice
AC=Authentic-Care
UC=Unrelated-to-Concept

Confidence Ratings (CR)
1 = Little Confidence
2 = Somewhat Confident
3 = Very Confident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN/SS/AC/UC</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7
RAW SCORE SUMMARY SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Very(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorse/Criticize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Self-Sacrifice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Very(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorse/Criticize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Authentic-Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Very(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorse/Criticize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total # of Sentences Reflecting Developmental Category: _____

Subject #:________
APPENDIX 8
FORMULAS TO DETERMINE DEVELOPMENTAL LEVEL

Codes:
IN = Instrumental Sentences
SS = Self-Sacrifice Sentences
AC = Authentic-Care Sentences
E = Sum of sentences
degree = degree to which person endorses or criticizes a perspective
x = Multiply
- = Criticize (-AC=criticize Authentic-Care perspective)
+ = Endorse (+AC=endorse Authentic-Care perspective)

1. For Instrumental Developmental Level:
IN = E(+IN x degree) + \[1/4 x E(-SS x degree) + 1/4 x E(-AC x degree)\] ⩾ \#AC + \#SS + \#IN

2x \[E(-IN x degree) + \frac{1}{4} x E(+SS x degree) + \frac{1}{4} x E(+AC x degree)\] = \#AC + \#SS + \#IN

2. For Self-Sacrifice Developmental Level:
SS = E(+SS x degree) + \[1/4 x E(-AC x degree) + 1/4 x E(-IN x degree)\] ⩾ \#AC + \#SS + \#IN

2 x \[E(-SS x degree) + \frac{1}{4} x E(+AC x degree) + \frac{1}{4} x E(+IN x degree)\] = \#AC + \#SS + \#IN

3. For Authentic-Care Developmental Level:
AC = E(+AC x degree) + \[1/4 x E(-IN x degree) + 1/4 x E(-SS x degree)\] ⩾ \#AC + \#SS + \#IN

2 x \[E(-AC x degree) + \frac{1}{4} x E(+IN x degree) + \frac{1}{4} x E(+SS x degree)\] = \#AC + \#SS + \#IN
Dear Participant:

Thank you for your participation in this research. In this study we explored the characteristics of relationships and views of sexually coercive situations. Please remember that your results are completely confidential. Your name will never be connected to your interview or computer data file. Because this is an ongoing study with other subjects yet to be tested, we hope that you will keep the details of this study in confidence.

Some of the topics covered in this study, such as sexual assault, may have raised questions or concerns. There are many resources available to you both on and off campus if you have any concerns about sexual assault. Any concerns you may have about possible risks at Loyola may be directed to Loyola Security and Safety at 508-2394 or for an Emergency at 44911. The Loyola Counseling Center (508-2740) is available to provide counseling services to students who may have concerns about sexual assault. Other resources in Chicago include Rape Victim Advocates (312)733-6954 for questions or counseling, and a 24-hour "crisis line" number is available from Edgewater Uptown Community Mental Health Center (312)769-0205. If you have any further questions or concerns about this study or need further information about resources in Chicago dealing with sexual assault, please
contact Marylou Jones (312) 271-2872 at any time upon the conclusion of this study.

Finally, we would like to give you some resources and information about sexual assault. Please take the pamphlets provided, and thank you once again for your participation in this study.

Accompanying this debriefing form are the following materials published by the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault:

Sexual Assault: What Do I Need to Know? A Guide to Services
How Can I Help?: A Guide for Friends and Family
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