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INTRODUCTION

"It's better to commit rape than to masturbate."

Norman Mailer, 1962, p. 79.

"Rape is nothing more or less than a conscious process of intimidation by which all men keep all women in a state of fear."

Susan Brownmiller, 1975, p. 3.

"Of rape the Arapesh know nothing beyond the fact that it is the unpleasant custom of the Nugum people to the southeast of them."

Margaret Mead, 1935, p. 110.

"Nice girls don't get raped and bad girls shouldn't complain."

anon.

"...rape was an insurrectionary act. It delighted me..."


The phenomenon of rape arouses a multitude of opinions and feelings, arguments and controversies. One relatively undebatable comment is that the occurrence of reported rape is increasing at an alarming rate. Recent FBI Uniform Crime Reports (1978) show an increase of 11.1% in reported rapes in 1977 over 1976 (63,020 : 56,730) and a comparable increase of 10.2% in rate of rape per capita in 1977 over 1976 (29.1 per 100,000 : 26.4 per 100,000).

An often proposed explanation for this increase is that it is artifactual, a function of different reporting procedures, and not indicative of an actual increase in the occurrence of rape. Clark and
Lewis (1977) point out that there are in fact innovations and attitude changes which make women more willing to or forces them to report rapes more readily than in the past (United States Department of Justice, 1978). Such changes include the assigning of female officers and female support personnel in the police handling of the rape case, the mandatory reporting of rape cases by hospitals and clinics treating rape victims, the redefining of rape to include acts not traditionally considered to be rape (e.g., a husband forcibly having intercourse with his wife), and the disallowing of formerly acceptable questioning of the rape victim in court which is irrelevant to the case and often emotionally traumatic for the plaintiff.

Another artifact which might inflate the rate of reported rape is an altered consciousness of women which has them more likely reporting and identifying as rape their experiences of sexual coercion. For women who accept the myth that there is no such thing as rape it is difficult for them to realize that they have been raped. There is evidence, however, that what used to be dismissed by the woman as her provocative or submissive behavior (e.g., dressing or acting in a manner that suggested she was looking for it, "cock teasing", "losing control of the situation", "letting him go too far") is now being more often viewed as the male's forcible rape of the woman (Clark & Lewis, 1977). On the other hand, Russell (1975) claims that an actual increase in the occurrence of rape may exist and be attributable to a reaction to the Women's Movement. She opines that some men feel threatened by the liberation of women. Such men may express their anger and hostility toward women through the act of rape.
What tends to be overlooked in the dispute over whether or not rape is "actually" increasing is the apparent enormity of the phenomenon and its impact on our society, regardless of how or whether or not it is reported. Rape is claimed to be the most underreported major crime in our country (United States Department of Justice, 1978). It is estimated that from 2.2 to 10 times the number of reported rapes are actually occurring. The Federal Commission on Crimes of Violence puts the figure at approximately four times the reported rate, or about one-quarter million rapes per year. To my knowledge no one has added "deviant sexual assaults" (typically described as sodomy or fellatio) and attempted sexual assaults of all sorts to the estimated rapes in order to derive an estimate of the total forced sexual encounters experienced by women in our society. In this light, perhaps it is not difficult to understand the experience of Susan Griffin (1971) and assume that it applies to more women than we may have imagined:

I have never been free of the fear of rape. From a very early age I, like most women, have thought of rape as part of my natural environment—something to be feared and prayed against like fire or lightning. I have never asked why men raped; I simply thought that it was one of the mysteries of human nature. (p. 27)

How is it that a phenomenon which affects so many people directly or indirectly remains notoriously underreported? It is probably the same reason why rape has traditionally been a relatively uninvestigated experience (Geis, 1977). When rape has been reported or studied it tends to be met with denial, resistance, or snickering wisecracks (Schultz, 1975). Rape has assumed the status of a taboo subject. Consequently a "code of silence" has developed which seems to be effective at all levels of involvement—victims, law enforcers,
treatment personnel, judiciary, families and friends, offenders, and researchers.

Identifying rape as an unmentionable taboo certainly does not add to our understanding of the act. With the advent of the Women's Movement in the 1960's tautologies were no longer accepted as explanations of rape. Feminist writers began to attack the code of silence in an effort to alleviate the deleterious effects of ignoring and/or denying the reality of rape. The ignorance and stigma surrounding rape could be seen as contributing to the following problems: deterring the gathering of factual information; perpetuating the use of "myths" in discussing rape; inhibiting victims from seeking arrests and prosecution of offenders; deterring victims from seeking the support and treatment they require; inhibiting the development of appropriate, effective treatment; perpetuating the immediate and long range stigma and trauma attached to being sexually assaulted; inhibiting the proper rehabilitation and treatment of offenders; and perpetuating the general oppression of females in our society. The results of the feminists giving rape an identity, repulsive and heinous though it may be, has been a proliferation of papers and studies which are beginning to shed light on the phenomenon of rape and our attitudes toward it.

This study was designed to identify and elucidated some attitudes toward rape which are held by young, educated men and women. Specifically, the type and severity of an assault and the perceived resistance of a victim were investigated in an effort to determine which factors may contribute to or reduce the tendency of people to deal openly and assertively with the act of sexual assault.
Early behavioral science investigations of forcible rape were limited for the most part to psychiatric theorizing, with clinical experiences most often providing the data pool (Geis, 1977). A single rapist or a few victims (see for example, Wille, 1961) provided material for far-ranging speculations as to the unconscious motivations of offenders and victims. Bizarre cases and highly imaginative ideas were accorded prominent attention (see for example, Devereux, 1957).

The Women's Movement of the 1960's focused attention on rape, claiming that it was not an infrequent, unusual event, only an infrequently reported common experience. It was an act which was explained by fallacious societal myths; an act which epitomized the oppression of women in general and, in particular, the sexual oppression of women by men. Two statements by Griffin (1971) and Greer (1973) are generally recognized as most aptly representing the feminist view concerning rape. In their papers they describe the environment in which rape exists and appears to be thriving. It is a culture of paradoxes where males are taught to be sexually aggressive and to perceive women as possessions. At the same time they are expected to protect and defend women. Females, meanwhile, are taught to be passive and dependent on men, but are expected to violently resist unwelcome sexual assault (Becker & Abel, 1978). If she happens to be raped she will be blamed and treated as though she were somehow responsible for its occurrence.
As the archetypal antisocial crime rape is kept alive in the public conscience by sensational newspaper accounts of grisly sex murders—rape is the worst thing that can happen to a woman. Within this perspective, rape calls forth our greatest moral outrage and our greatest cry for vengeance. But coexisting with these attitudes are others in which rape is discussed with a knowing wink as a natural consequence of the sexual game in which man pursues woman. What is called rape, then, is thought to be only an unsophisticated seduction; at most it is a minor breach of our social standards. This contradiction in public attitudes is reflected in inconsistent treatment of rapists and victims. At the level of codified law and public pronouncements we repudiate rape as a serious offense. But at the level of actual practice, women have found little protection or justice in the system. Rape is characterized paradoxically as an "unthinkable", although "winkable", act.

Griffin and Greer attacked societal attitudes and myths regarding rape as being largely responsible for the strange phenomenon in rape cases of victim blameworthiness and victim stigmatization and derogation. It is not hard to see that in a society which maintains such myths as "Nice girls don't get raped." and "Women unconsciously desire to be raped." or "A woman who resists cannot be raped." that such a notion as blaming and derogating the victim of rape could exist.

These feminist authors most vehemently reject the myth that rape is an act of passion. They characterize rape as being an act of aggressive domination; a violent expression of power, hostility, anger, and contempt.

The importance of these two articles lay in their ability to
"raise consciousness" and to inspire further investigation of the issues they addressed. A number of feminist oriented (the adjective "feminist" might be replaced by "enlightened" in most cases) studies appeared which were distinctly different than the psychiatric case studies of before. Descriptive surveys and interviews became the preferred research tool and provided invaluable factual data regarding rape. The magnum opus of the feminist writings is Susan Brownmiller's Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape (1975) which, paraphrasing Brownmiller, gave rape its history so that its future may be denied. She presents an historical examination of the use of rape during wars, the evolution of rape laws, and the development of rape myths. She contends that the threat, use, and cultural acceptance of sexual force is a pervasive process of intimidation that affects all women whether or not they have been actual victims of sexual assault.

Enlightened surveys of rape victims include Russell's (1975) compilation of twenty-two case studies of actual rape experiences. It is designed to educate readers about rape from the victim's perspective and provides a feminist analysis of the cases and general theorizing regarding rape. Medea and Thompson (1974) present a rather polemical feminist outlook based on a survey of rape victims. They provide educational and practical information on the subject including suggestions on what a woman can do to prevent (at least reduce the probability) being raped.

Burgess and Holmstrom (1974) identify the "rape trauma syndrome" as being a two-stage reaction: an acute, disorganization phase followed by a long-term, reorganization phase. Burgess and Holmstrom entered
into rape research as a part of a program designed to offer crisis and long-term counseling to victims who came to the emergency room at the Boston City Hospital. In addition to the rape trauma syndrome they have begun to delineate different forms of rape, distinguishing between "blitz" rapes (sudden attacks) and "confidence" rapes (episodes in which the assailant works his way into the confidence of the victim prior to the attack).

The landmark sociological survey of rape was conducted by Menachim Amir (1971). The material presented in his book was based on an empirical study of 646 forcible rape cases recorded by the Philadelphia Police Department during 1958 and 1960. The author's focus was on the social characteristics and relationships of the victim and offender and on the circumstances of the rape itself. Significant relationships and patterns were sought and found among a large number of variables including race, age, marital status, and employment of victims and offenders, seasonal, temporal, and spatial aspects of the crime, the presence of alcohol, previous arrest record of victims and offenders, and particulars relating to modus operandi. In addition to its being recognized as the first systematic study in the area of research on rape, Amir's Patterns in Forcible Rape has been faulted on several counts. First, the text, tables, charts, and bibliography contain an unimaginable number of typographical and computational errors. Second, he fails to warn readers that police data must be handled with consummate caution, particularly police data which was gathered "pre-awareness" in the 1950's. Third, a criticism which is endemic to the field of study is that generalizations must be cautiously made when the sample pool re-
presents such a select percentage of the population actually involved (i.e., only reported victims and only convicted rapists). Amir proposed an explanation of rape based on the theory of a subculture of violence. He claimed that rape was being perpetrated by a unique segment of our society inordinately prone to violence and was being experienced by a parallel unique portion of society who encourage and contribute to the act being perpetrated against them. Feminists claim that such conclusions contribute to an "it's them not us" attitude toward rape which perpetuates the denial and/or myths which permeate our awareness of the rape experience (e.g., "rapists are all sex-crazed psychotics", "rape victims unconsciously desire to be violently assaulted"). Finally, perhaps the most controversial element in Amir's work is his adoption of Wolfgang's (1958) concept of victim-precipitation. Wolfgang had employed the term in his investigation of homicide in which he was able to report that on the basis of background material offenders were often indistinguishable from victims and that the lethal encounter was as often initiated by the victim as it was by the offender. Rape victims, however, rarely aggress against the offender prior to the rape encounter, and it is only through defining rape as a sexual event with real, covert, or presumed overtures on the part of both parties that Amir was able to make headway with the idea of victim-precipitation. "If the victim is not solely responsible for what becomes the unfortunate event, at least she is often a complementary factor...In a way the victim is always the cause of the crime" (Amir, 1971, p.323). It might have been better had he chosen another term, perhaps something such as "victim vulnerability" to rate the actions
and characteristics of the victim on a scale calibrated to the statistical likelihood that she might be raped. Hitchhiking, by such a standard, would be a highly vulnerable activity.

Weis and Borges (1973) point out that Amir's assumption that a rape victim may be responsible for what happened to her (an assumption that aptly represents societal attitudes regarding a rape incident, Klemmack & Klemmack, 1976) places a heavy burden of guilt and self-doubt on the victim, often making recovery from the psychic trauma of the event more difficult (see for example, Burgess & Holmstrom, 1974; Hilberman, 1976; Symonds, 1976). Weis and Borges (1973) contend that the concept of victim precipitation is "nothing more than the personification and embodiment of the rape mythology cleverly stated in academic-scientific terms" (p. 112).

Despite its apparent flaws Amir's work has provided the groundwork for most scientific investigations of rape since 1970. Two noteworthy surveys of comparable exhaustiveness but improved methodology and more enlightened analysis are the more recent works of Clark and Lewis (1977) and the United States Department of Justice (1978). Clark and Lewis present a sociological-descriptive survey of rape in Canada coupled with a feminist analysis of their results. The United States Department of Justice publication is the final research report of a project (nine separate publications) aimed at: (a) assembling, describing, and assessing current law enforcement practices and problems in responding to the crime of rape, and (b) developing operational/training manuals and other materials designed to improve police, prosecutor, and legislative response to forcible rape.
In addition to these two major surveys, two anthologies of studies concerned with rape could be seen as dealing with and expanding upon the material and ideas presented by Amir. *Rape Victimology* by Schultz (1975) and *Forcible Rape: The Crime, the Victim, and the Offender* by Chappell, Geis, and Geis (1977) each combine published articles, previously unpublished papers, and extensive bibliographies which probe the total phenomenon of rape with particular attention devoted to the victim.

Psychologists, until recently, were conspicuously underrepresented among rape researchers. The seminal psychological study of rape was not even interested in rape per se, but rather attributions of responsibility. Jones and Aronson (1973) experimentally tested predictions derived from the "just world" hypothesis of Lerner (Lerner & Simmons, 1966). Lerner posits that people look for or fabricate causes for events which they witness, especially events with negative consequences. To attribute misfortune to chance is threatening to an observer in that he, too, is a potential victim of a similar chance misfortune. Instead he will believe in the concept of a just world, i.e., we live in a world where people get what they deserve and deserve what they get. The victim is seen as either characterologically deserving of the negative consequences of his fate, or somehow behaviorally responsible for their occurrence. The observer simultaneously denies any similarity to the victim's personality, behavior, or experience and thus protects himself from the anxiety of acknowledging himself as being a potential sufferer. Jones and Aronson specifically predicted that the more respectable a woman is perceived as being, the
more behaviorally responsible she will be held for her being raped. Mock crime scenes were presented to male and female undergraduates. The respectability of the victim was varied (married, virgin, or divorced) as was the degree of seriousness of the crime (rape or rape attempt). The results showed that the more socially respectable a woman, the more fault attributed to her as a victim of rape. No differences were obtained between male and female respondents.

That male-female differences were not obtained contradicts a standard belief concerning the insensitivity of males toward rape victims and an intuitive notion that females would be more empathetic and therefore less likely to blame a female victim of rape. Shaver (1970) refers to these proposed lessened attributions of responsibility as "defensive attributions". They would occur when an observer cannot deny a fate similarity or personality/behavioral similarity to the victim of misfortune. He recognizes his potential role as a victim and therefore assesses responsibility for the misfortune as he would want it to be assigned to him were he the victim. In other words, it is sometimes better to blame things on chance rather than derogate and blame the recipient of misfortune.

Subsequent studies of attributions of responsibility of rape victims have typically obtained male-female differences in responding with the females being more sympathetic towards the rape victim (Barnett & Field, 1977; Calhoun, Selby, & Waring, 1976; DeLara & Fulero, 1973; Field, 1978; Scroggs, 1976; Selby, Calhoun, & Brock, 1977; Smith, Keating, & Mitchell, 1976). Feldman-Summers and Lindner (1976) obtained male-female differences and also found that the less
respectable the victim, the more her responsibility for the rape, contrary to the findings of Jones and Aronson.

Conflicting results in the area of attribution of responsibility research have been attributed to two major methodological concerns. First, it has been suggested and empirically confirmed (Aderman, Brehm, & Katz, 1974) that Lerner's methodology (the results of which led to the predictions of Jones and Aronson) is empathy inhibiting and thereby more likely to produce blaming and derogation of the victim than other more neutral or empathy facilitating designs. One might expect and predict the occurrence of defensive attributions with such empathy facilitating designs. Secondly, as suggested by Shaver (1975) the term responsibility has many connotations. If research is to be readily interpretable the multidimensional quality of the target issue must be taken into consideration, ideally be clearly explicating the use of the term responsibility as intended by the researcher, or by providing the subject with the opportunity to respond to the various meanings of responsibility. For example, if a subject is asked "Was the victim responsible for the rape occurring?" will he respond in an associational context (e.g., Yes, she was in an area known for its high rate of rape.), a causal context (e.g., Yes, she shouldn't have had a drink with the guy at the party.), an intentional context (e.g., No, she didn't know that when she went to his apartment that he would rape her.), or a blameworthy context (e.g., No, she can't be blamed. It's ultimately the responsibility of the rapist and his fault.)? Unless the meaning of responsibility is controlled, what might be strong responses to separate items could average to meaningless responses to
a general item, or conflicting results may appear among different studies.

Male-female differences of perceptions of rape victims is an important, though not necessarily surprising, finding. More elucidating is that this line of research has begun to identify variables which can affect a respondent's perception of a rape incident (e.g., victim behavior, victim characteristics, situational circumstances, rapist characteristics, and interactions of the above). The consistent finding is that if a victim is perceived as having precipitated, encouraged, or given consent to the sexual assault then a rape technically has not occurred. Such a conclusion is hardly unexpected. It represents our legal and popular understanding of circumstances which discount the charge of rape (Bohmer, 1974; Wood, 1973). What was especially enlightening, however, was the type of evidence required to convince subjects that consent or encouragement had taken place. Their perceptions could be affected by variables such as "victim's personality/character" (Feldman-Summers & Lindner, 1976; Jones & Aronson, 1973; Kalven & Zeisel, 1966; Selby, Calhoun, & Brock, 1977), "socio-economic status of victim" (Calhoun, Selby, & Waring, 1976; Fulero & DeLara, 1976; Smith, Keating, Hester, & Mitchell, 1976), "the dress of the victim" (Calhoun, Selby, & Waring, 1976; Scroggs, 1976), "assertive, liberated behavior of the victim" (Calhoun, Selby, & Waring), even "resistance of sexual advances" (e.g., Of course she initially resisted. She did not want to be known as an easy make. She was really saying yes when she said no.) (Kanin, 1969; Schultz & DeSavage, 1975). Bohmer (1974), Kalven and Zeisel (1966), and Wood
(1973) present a number of court cases and studies of jury and judicial decision making processes to elucidate the common practice of holding rape victims blameworthy and somehow responsible for the sexual assault. The common element encountered in all of these articles is this tendency to blame the victim (Ryan, 1974). These studies lend empirical support to the feminists' contention that our society has attitudes toward rape which add the insult of stigma, derogation, blame, and guilt of the victim to the actual physical and emotional trauma of the rape itself.

The present study was designed to explore those attitudes toward rape which relate to a person's perception of a rape victim. Specifically, it dealt with the following perceptions: (a) similarity to victim, (b) victim personality characteristics, (c) victim responsibility/culpability, (d) trauma of the event, and (e) victim post-rape behavior. These areas of interest were intuitively developed as representing the various possible factors which contribute to and reflect attitudes toward a rape victim. A factor analytic study by Field (1978) supports the contention that an attitude toward a rape victim would include the above factors. Only those perceptions of the victim were included in this study. Other rape relevant variables such as rapist characteristics were not investigated.

As in other studies cited above, male-female differences in perceiving and responding to a rape incident were investigated. In addition to studying gender differences, the subjects' responses were analyzed as a function of their acknowledged potential fate similarity with the victim. Shaver (1975) identified situational possibility as
being instrumental in eliciting defensive attributions. Rather than assume that all women would respond in a homogeneous fashion indicating empathy for the female victim, subjects' responses to the potential fate similarity item "What happened to J.S. (the victim) could happen to me." were correlated with their other responses to determine the effect of their perceived potential fate similarity on their attitudes toward the rape victim.

It has been suggested that any type of victim tends to face a certain amount of stigma and derogation Lerner, 1971; Symonds, 1975). Rape, however, appears to constitute a situation which is unique in the intensity with which the victim is blamed and derogated. To test this assumption both rape victims and robbery victims were used as stimuli (see for example, Feldman-Summers & Lindner, 1976; Scroggs, 1976).

Unlike other studies which manipulated victim characteristics and/or pre-rape victim behavior (Feldman-Summers & Lindner, 1976; Jones & Aronson, 1973 -- victim respectability; Smith, et.al., 1976 -- victim socio-economic status and acquaintance with rapist; Scroggs, 1976 -- victim actions and dress; Calhoun, et.al., 1976 -- victim acquaintance with rapist, victim risk-taking behavior) a seemingly neutral, innocent victim was presented across treatments in the present study. During-assault behavior, however, was manipulated by presenting the stimulus victims as actively resisting or not the attack upon them. Victim resistance is generally acknowledged as necessary, although not sufficient, evidence that a rape has actually occurred. A societal belief maintains that "A woman who does not resist has not
been raped.". As implied in legal nosology, "forcible rape" requires that the offender overpower a resisting victim. Rape, thus, is viewed differently than other crimes in that if the victim does not resist she will be held somehow responsible for the event, thereby excusing the offender. A robbery victim is not held responsible for the robbery if he does not resist. This seemingly biased treatment of rape victims is apparently the result of the notion that sexual violation is the ultimate horror that a woman can experience and it will be resisted with all possible strength and effort regardless of the consequences unless, of course, she actually desires to be raped. A new perspective on the rape resistance issue has emerged as a consequence of rape victims and offenders actually being interviewed (Burgess & Holmstrom, 1974; Cohn, 1975; Groth, Burgess, & Holmstrom, 1977; Hilberman, 1976; Russell, 1976; Symonds, 1976). There appears to be an almost unanimous description among victims of being frightened for their lives or fearful of being tortured and/or permanently hurt or disfigured. This fear seems to supercede concerns of being sexually violated. A common remark is "I was sure he would hurt me even more or even kill me if I fought. I figured that maybe if I did not resist I would at least come out of it alive". Symonds (1976) refers to this reaction as representing a "traumatic psychological infantilism". This reaction is characterized by truly immediate shock and disbelief. As a realization of the situation sets in a fright bordering on panic develops. This is especially evident when the victim believes his life to be in imminent danger. In crimes of prolonged contact such as kidnapping or rape this feeling of impending peril is deliberately produced by the
offender. The fright finally leads to a heightened distortion of perceptive thinking and judgment. All behavior is directed at self-preservation. Most learned behavior seems to evaporate and the victim responds with the adaptive and innate patterns of early childhood (e.g., helplessness, compliance, cooperation). Rape victims make submitting signs in order to inhibit the rapist's aggressive action. This is similar to an animal, who faced with overwhelming violence from other animals of the same species, exposes the most vulnerable parts of its body to the aggressors.

Terrorization is the common denominator of all violent crime. It is employed by the criminal to insure the immediate compliance of the victim. Conklin (1972) interviewed robbery victims and found that only one in ten responded to the robbery with active resistance. The others felt a paralyzing fear, were disabled, went blank, and complied. Yet, no one would raise the question of whether the robbery victim wanted to be robbed or not. Nor would it be suggested that the non-resistance would be grounds for excusing the offender and bringing blame and derogation to the victim. Society seems to expect different behavior from victims of rape than victims of robbery and views each according to these expectations.

The finding that the rape act is experienced by the victim as a violent, aggressive assault on her "entire person" (Bard & Ellison, 1974) confronts several societal myths. It is commonly believed that rape is a crime from which a woman may actually derive some pleasure and that rape is a sexually motivated and experienced crime. Instead, this finding supports recent research in which rapists are described
as being motivated primarily (Cohen, Garofalo, Boucher, & Seghorn, 1971) or totally (Groth, et.al., 1977) by a need for power or out of anger and hostility. Rapists have been differentiated from "normal" males by their aggressive and violent impulsivity as determined by psychological testing (Amir, 1971) and by their psychopathic qualities, particularly lack of empathy (Becker & Abel, 1978). It seems as though forced sexual intercourse is more likely the means of acting out for these violent, hostile-aggressive individuals rather than the goal of sex-starved, sexually stimulated individuals.

Interviews with rapists (Cohen, et.al., 1971; Groth, et.al., 1977; Russell, 1975) support the victim's report of the rape incident. Rapists admit to having used violence or threats of violence to the victim or her family. Their interpretation of the victim's compliance is, however, that she "really wanted it", rather than that she was acting to protect herself from further harm. At the same time, rapists confirm the victim's experience of the dynamics of the rape act by stating that indeed they enjoyed humiliating and degrading the victim, that they threatened and used physical and mental abuse and torture, and that they have even killed victims who resisted them.

The victim is thusly presented with a dilemma. Should she resist and thereby risk even greater harm to herself? On the other hand, resistance could result in the rape attempt being aborted, particularly if immediately initiated (Symonds, 1977). If she does not resist she will probably be perceived by others and even herself as having consented or offered encouragement to the rapist. In the present study the issue of resistance was explored by having the stimulus victims
resisting or not resisting in a situation where the offender threatens increased violence if the victim resists. Thus, should differential perceptions and attitudes toward rape victims exist as a function of their resisting or submitting, such differences would be elicited by the experimental treatments.

The resistance variable was combined with a severity if consequences variable. The subjects read reports of either completed or merely attempted crimes. It was not clearly stated that resistance had resulted in an abortive attempt. It might have been simply good luck. In some cases unsuccessful resistance ended in a completed crime anyways. Attribution of responsibility research has provided mixed results regarding severity of consequences. In some instances the more severe the consequences, the more harshly is blame levied and derogation aroused toward the victim (Walster, 1966). In other instances the more severe the consequences the more sympathetic are the attributors (Chaikin & Darley, 1973). In rape research the severity defined as attempted or completed rape has yielded no differences (Jones & Aronson, 1973). Regarding rape, a commonly held belief is that if penetration and ejaculation does not occur the victim has little to be upset about. The severity of consequences variable was included in the present study to determine whether or not the victim of attempted rape is perceived as having been traumatized as feminists and Symonds (1977) suggest. Also would she suffer the same stigma and derogation as the completed rape victim? Furthermore, how would the severity of consequences interact with the resistance (or lack of it) to affect the subjects' perceptions of the victim?
Hypotheses  The intent of this study was to investigate the effects of the gender of respondent, the type of assault, the resistance of the victim, and the severity of the consequences on a respondent's perceptions of a victim, particularly as the perceptions related to post-rape stigmatization and derogation of a rape victim. Based on the research literature and commonly held beliefs concerning rape and victimization, the following hypotheses were derived and tested:

1. Rape victims are subjected to more stigmatization and derogation as compared to robbery victims.

2. Females respond more sympathetically than males to the female victim of assault.

3. Females who acknowledge a potential fate similarity with the victim will be more sympathetic towards the victim as compared to those who deny a potential fate similarity.

4. Assault resisters are viewed more favorably as compared to assault submitters.

5. Victims of completed assaults are perceived as being more traumatized by the experience than are victims of attempted assaults.
METHOD

Subjects

One hundred sixty three members of the Introductory Psychology subject pool at Loyola University of Chicago volunteered to participate in the study, for which they each received class credit. From these subjects one hundred sixty usable protocols were obtained (eighty males, eighty females). Subjects ranged in age from 17 to 25 years of age and averaged 19.2. Gender was the only demographic variable used to differentiate subjects.

Design Overview

A 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design with two levels of gender of respondent (Male-Female), two levels of nature of assault (Rape-Robbery) two levels of victim resistance (Resist-Submit), and two levels of severity of assault (Completed-Attempted) was employed. Permutations of the levels of the latter three variables established the essential stimulus information from which purported victimization reports were developed. These reports served as the stimuli to which the experimental subjects responded via dependent measure Likert scales. Ten males and ten females were randomly assigned to each of the eight treatment (i.e., assault report) conditions.

Stimulus Material

Every assault report began with a self-description of the victim's activities which read as follows:
I was studying in the library that evening. I was going to have a late dinner with some people from one of my classes. At 7:30 I left the library and started walking to the restaurant which was a couple of blocks away. It was a cool evening and turning dark. The street lights were coming on. I was wearing my usual clothes—jeans, blouse, tennis shoes, and a light jacket—and carrying a book and my purse.

This description was intended to present a neutral, non-provocative stimulus. It was devised and pretested using the help of associates and undergraduates with this intention in mind. The other stimulus materials and dependent measures were likewise developed and pretested.

The report continued to describe an assault incident. A Rape-Completed-Resist report continued as follows (see Appendix A for complete copies of stimulus materials):

It happened as I was walking past a large apartment building. I was grabbed from behind by a guy. He had his arm around my neck and was choking me. He was strong and bigger than me. He told me to be quiet and do what he said or else I'd get hurt real bad. He said he was going to rape me. I was afraid he would kill me or something, but I yelled and made alot of noise and struggled with him and hit him and kicked him. He forced me through the gangway and pushed me to the ground, tore at my clothes, and raped me. He finished and ran away down the alley just as some people were coming down their backstairs to the yard. I didn't recognize the guy.

In the Attempt conditions the section "and raped me. He finished" was deleted and replaced with "but stopped". In the Submit conditions the phrase "but I yelled and made alot of noise and struggled with him and hit him and kicked him" was deleted and replaced with "I did what he said."

A Robbery-Completed-Resist report continued the initial self-description as follows:

It happened as I was walking past a large apartment building. I was grabbed from behind by a guy. He had his arm around my neck and was choking me. He was strong and bigger than me. He told me
to be quiet and do what he said or else I'd get hurt real bad. He said he was going to rob me. I was afraid he would kill me or something, but I yelled and made a lot of noise and struggled with him and hit him and kicked him. He forced me through the gangway, pushed me to the ground, and hit me in the head with something. He grabbed my purse and took out my wallet. I had just cashed a paycheck and had all my credit cards in my wallet. He took the wallet and ran away down the alley just as some people were coming down their backstairs to the yard. I didn't recognize the guy. I went to an emergency room where I received medical attention for where he hit me and then was released.

In the Attempt conditions the section "He took the wallet" was deleted and replaced with "He dropped everything, though,". In the Submit conditions the phrase "but I yelled and made a lot of noise and struggled with him and hit him and kicked him." was deleted and replaced with "I did what he said."

The reports for robbery and rape assaults were equated for severity using Sellin and Wolfgang's (1964) index of seriousness of elements of crimes which involves such things as type of crime, type of injury to victim, and amount of theft. For the completed rape situation the equation for severity of the crime is computed as follows: 10 (victim of forcible sexual intercourse). For the robbery assault the equation is computed as follows: 4 (victim treated and discharged) + 4 (intimidation of person in connection with theft by weapon) + 2 (value of property stolen = $10-$250) = 10.

Dependent Measures

Forty-three items which were related to the victim reports were presented in Likert Scale fashion. The subjects responded to the items with agreement-disagreement ranging on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). These items represent attitudes toward rape victims, particularly those attitudes which contribute to and reflect
stigmatization of rape victims. The items were derived intuitively and have been corroborated in a factor analytic study by Field (1978) as representing those dimensions of attitudes toward rape which deal specifically with victim derogation and stigmatization (see Appendix B for Dependent Measures).

The subjects were requested to provide short explanations of their responses to each item in order to ascertain whether or not the item was interpreted and responded to as intended by the experimenter and also to provide a richer understanding of the thought and feeling involved in the subjects' responses.

Procedure

Members of the Introductory Psychology subject pool volunteered to participate in an experiment for which they would receive one class credit. They arrived at scheduled times and received a "packet" with the instruction to "Follow the instructions in the packet". The packet contained the following:

(1) an introduction-instruction sheet;
(2) an explanation-example of Likert Scale responses;
(3) an assault report;
(4) a dependent measure list;
(5) a personal information sheet (see Appendix C for packet items).

The assignment of eighty males and eighty females to treatment conditions was randomly determined, maintaining the factorial design.

The introduction sheet informed the subjects that they were participating in a study dealing with criminal assault. They were reminded of the fact that their responses remained anonymous and that
they were under no obligation to continue the experiment and could discontinue without forfeiting their class credit should they so desire. They were instructed to work through the packet one page at a time in the order the pages appeared.

The Likert Scale instruction sheet provided descriptions of Likert Scales and an example of how they are used to respond to items.

The assault reports and dependent measures appeared as described above.

The personal information sheet requested the subjects to identify their gender and age, identify any problems or difficulties they had with the study, assess their ability to understand and respond to the study honestly, acknowledge their experiences with rape and rape victims, and comment on the study.

The personal information sheet informed the subjects that they should approach the experimenter with any questions they had concerning the experiment, and should they wish to receive information or counseling on issues dealt with in the experiment, telephone numbers of the Loyola Rape Prevention Committee and the Loyola Counseling Center were provided. The subjects were thanked for their cooperation.
RESULTS

The subjects' responses to the dependent measures were analyzed in a 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 gender of respondent (Male-Female) by type of assault (Rape-Robbery) by severity of assault (Completed-Attempted) by resistance of victim (Resist-Submit) analysis of variance which was prepared by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Brent, 1975). Correlations were likewise prepared by SPSS. As referred to above, the dependent measures were grouped as being representative of different dimensions of an attitude toward a rape victim. The results are presented whenever appropriate in the following groupings of dependent measures: (a) similarity/empathy with the victim; (b) victim characteristics; (c) victim responsibility/culpability; (d) victim trauma; and (e) victim post-assault behavior.

Similarity/empathy with the Victim

The items in this conceptual grouping tended to support the hypotheses that females respond more sympathetically than males to the female victim of assault, that assault resisters are viewed more favorably than assault submitters, and that rape victims are more stigmatized than robbery victims.

I am similar to JS personality wise. This item received mild agreement overall ($\bar{X} = 3.73$, SD = 1.34). It obtained a significant gender main effect, $F(1, 144) = 9.30$, $p < .003$, in the expected direction (Male: $\bar{X} = 3.42$, SD = 1.39; Female: $\bar{X} = 4.04$, SD = 1.24). A resis-
tance main effect, $F(1, 144) = 3.72, \ p < .056$, approached significance, with the subjects tending to feel more similar personality wise to resisting victims (Resist: $\bar{X} = 3.92, SD = 1.19$; Submit: $\bar{X} = 3.54, SD = 1.45$). A significant assault by resistance interaction was obtained, $F(1, 144) = 7.16, \ p < .008$, with subjects perceiving the submitting victim of rape as significantly least similar and the resisting rape victim as most similar (see Tables 1 and 2). Resistance did not significantly affect perceptions of similarity to the robbery victim.

These findings support the notion that a rape victim who submitted to the assault will be viewed as being different from those who "judge" her. It might be inferred that she would be viewed less favorably and that people prefer to think of themselves as resisters. That females felt more similar to the female victim is partially attributable to their apparent identification with the victimization role. The "similar personality wise" variable correlates significantly with both "I have been in fear of being assaulted more than once in my life", $r(158) = .166, \ p < .04$, and "What happened to JS could happen to me", $r(158) = .29, \ p < .001$, each of which was more highly agreed to by females than by males.

What happened to JS could happen to anyone. This variable yielded overall moderate agreement ($\bar{X} = 5.23, SD = 1.32$). It obtained a significant gender main effect, $F(1, 144) = 4.48, \ p < .037$, with females feeling that the assault could happen to anyone ($\bar{X} = 5.45, SD = 1.24$) more so than males ($\bar{X} = 5.01, SD = 1.35$) (see Table 3). This would suggest a more sympathetic attitude among females, but it should be noted that all responses were highly in agreement with the state-
Table 1

Significant Results for "I Am Similar to JS Personality Wise"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resist</td>
<td>Submit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means are significantly different from this mean, $p < .05$, Newman-Keuls statistic (Winer, 1971)

Note: Results are mean responses of agreement with statement ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).
Table 2
Significant F Statistics for
"I Am Similar to JS Personality Wise" *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault x Resistance</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only a compressed F table of significant F statistics will be presented for this variable and others.
Table 3

Significant F Statistics for "What Happened to JS Could Happen to Anyone"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ment.

I have been in fear of being assaulted. A significant gender main effect on this item, $F(1, 144) = 24.70$, $p < .001$, showed females to have been more in fear ($\bar{x} = 4.11, \text{SD} = 1.72$) of being assaulted than males ($\bar{x} = 2.85, \text{SD} = 2.05$). A significant assault main effect, $F(1, 144) = 49.52$, $p < .001$, showed subjects have been more in fear of being robbed ($\bar{x} = 4.37, \text{SD} = 1.64$) than raped ($\bar{x} = 2.58, \text{SD} = 1.92$). A significant gender by assault interaction, $F(1, 144) = 19.18$, $p < .001$, showed both males and females felt equally in fear of being robbed (see Tables 4 and 5). Males, however, were highly significantly not in fear of being raped, while females claimed to be slightly less, although not significantly, in fear of being raped than robbed.

What happened to JS could happen to me. This variable obtained a significant gender main effect, $F(1, 144) = 111.75$, $p < .001$, with females claiming that they could be victims of an assault more readily ($\bar{x} = 5.30, \text{SD} = 1.01$) than males ($\bar{x} = 3.16, \text{SD} = 2.00$). A significant assault main effect, $F(1, 144) = 54.12$, $p < .001$, showed subjects more likely to believe that they could be a victim of a robbery ($\bar{x} = 4.97, \text{SD} = 1.24$) than a rape ($\bar{x} = 3.48, \text{SD} = 2.16$). A significant gender by assault interaction, $F(1, 144) = 37.46$, $p < .001$, found females felt that robbery is slightly, although not significantly, more likely to happen to them than rape. Males claimed that rape is less likely at a highly significant level to happen to them than robbery (see Tables 6 and 7).

These results suggest that women tend to be more empathetic to a female victim of any assault and significantly better able to empa-
Table 4

Significant Results for
"I Have Been in Fear of Being Assaulted"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{x} )</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean significantly different from others, \( p < .01 \),

Newman-Keuls statistic
Table 5

Significant F Statistics for
"I Have Been in Fear of Being Assaulted"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>63.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.76</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>127.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127.81</td>
<td>49.52</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Assault</td>
<td>49.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.51</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Significant Results for
"What Happened to JS Could Happen to Me"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th></th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>1.80*</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean is significantly different than others, $p < .01$,

Newman-Keuls statistic
Table 7

Significant F Statistics for
"What Happened to JS Could Happen to Me"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>182.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>182.76</td>
<td>111.75</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>88.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88.51</td>
<td>54.12</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Assault</td>
<td>61.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61.26</td>
<td>37.46</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thize with a victim of rape than would a male. There is evidence to suggest that this empathy is attributable to a shared female identification with a victimization role in society. A test of the hypothesis that such empathy is a function of and positively correlated with the apparent sense of potential fate similarity held by females was performed by correlating the item "What happened to JS could happen to me" with the other variables of the study. Table 8 presents the significant results of this test.

These results indicate that the more likely a person feels an assault could befall them the more they feel similar personality wise to the victim; the more they feel it could happen to anyone; the more a victim is seen as disclosing the assault to parents, friends, and boyfriends. One might infer that the victim is being seen as a victim of chance who should not feel ashamed to nor threatened by disclosing her status as a victim. Furthermore, the more a person feels that they could be an assault victim the less they feel that the victim could prevent the assault, the less she would be ashamed, the less she would derive pleasure from the assault, and the less she would be traumatized due to the stigma of being victimized. Again one witnesses an empathetic reaction to the victim with apparent defensively self-protective, almost "pollyana-like" overtones (e.g., the victim would experience less trauma after the assault). These results support the hypothesis that empathy and consequent lenient attributions of responsibility and less derogation would come from subjects who feel a potential fate similarity with the victim.
Table 8

Significant Correlations of Item "What Happened to JS Could Happen to Me" with Items Related to Victim Stigma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>r(158)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similar personality</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could happen to anyone</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>&lt;.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS is respectable</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>&lt;.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS would tell parents</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS would tell friends</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>&lt;.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS would tell boyfriend</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>&lt;.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS could prevent assault</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>&lt;.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS would derive pleasure</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>&lt;.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS would be ashamed</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>&lt;.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS would experience trauma following the assault</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>&lt;.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Victim Characteristics

The items in this conceptual grouping provided mixed results on the hypotheses being tested. As an unexpected main effect rape victims were viewed more favorably than robbery victims. The gender variable interacting with the assault variable, however, evoked responses as were predicted, i.e., females viewed the rape victim more favorably. In interaction with the severity variable the gender variable produced the unexpected results of males derogating the victims of attempted assaults more than they did the victims of completed assaults.

**JS is the kind of person who gets into harmful situations.** This item received an overall moderate disagreement ($\bar{X} = 2.22$, $SD = 1.34$). A significant assault main effect was obtained, $F(1, 144) = 6.59$, $p < .01$, with robbery victims being perceived more ($\bar{X} = 2.48$, $SD = 1.34$) than rape victims ($\bar{X} = 1.96$, $SD = 1.28$) as being somehow characterologically responsible for their plight. An assault by severity interaction reached significance, $F(1, 144) = 4.84$, $p < .029$, with victims of completed assaults equally perceived, but attempted rape victims were seen at a significant level as not the kind of person who gets into such situations as compared to attempted robbery victims who were perceived most as the kind of person who gets into such situations. A gender by severity interaction reached significance, $F(1, 144) = 4.32$, $p < .04$. Males found victims of attempted assaults as most characterologically responsible at a significant level as compared to the perceptions of females of victims of attempted assaults (see Tables 9 and 10).

**JS is a careful person.** This item produced overall mild disa-
Table 9

Significant Results for "JS Is the Kind of Person Who Gets into Harmful Situations"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th></th>
<th>Attempted</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.77*</td>
<td>2.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th></th>
<th>Attempted</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.65*</td>
<td>1.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means significantly different from each other, $p < .05$, Newman-Keuls statistic
Table 10

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Is the Kind of Person Who Gets into Harmful Situations"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault x Severity</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Severity</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
agreement (\(\bar{x} = 2.83, \text{SD} = 1.27\)) and obtained a significant gender by severity interaction, \(F(1, 144) = 5.28, p < .023\), with females perceiving all victims as slightly not careful (see Tables 11 and 12). As in the previous item, males appeared to be sympathetic towards victims of completed assaults, claiming them to be significantly more careful than victims of attempted assaults.

**JS impresses people favorably.** The victim was perceived as slightly favorably impressing in general (\(\bar{x} = 3.78, \text{SD} = 1.26\)). A significant gender by assault interaction, \(F(1, 144) = 6.71, p < .01\), had females perceiving the rape victim as being more impressive than the robbery victim (see Tables 13 and 14). This trend was reversed for males, with rape victims perceived as less impressive than robbery victims. These findings support the defensive attribution belief that females might have a better opinion of rape victims, whereas males would be less inclined to empathize with and have a high opinion of the rape victim. The males appear to be endorsing the commonly held belief that a rape victim deserves denigration.

**JS is a likeable person.** The victim was perceived across all treatments as being equally, moderately likeable (\(\bar{x} = 4.51, \text{SD} = 0.84\)). Lerner's just world research typically finds victims to be perceived as less likeable. They appear to be victims of stigma as well as the actual misfortune. This stigmatization was not elicited by this item.

**JS is a respectable person.** The victim was, likewise, perceived across all treatments as equally, moderately respectable (\(\bar{x} = 4.89, \text{SD} = 1.00\)), with a trend, \(F(1, 144) = 3.89, p < .051\), towards males rating the rape victim as less respectable than robbery victims
Table 11

Significant Results for Item
"JS Is a Careful Person"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Attempted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{x} )</td>
<td>3.27*</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means different from each other, \( p < .05 \), Newman-Keuls statistic
Table 12

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Is a Careful Person"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Severity</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Significant Results for
"JS Impresses People Favorably"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 14

Significant F Statistics for

"JS Impresses People Favorably"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Assault</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(see Tables 15 and 16). Again the males were more prone to derogate the rape victim.

*JS is a less desirable person as a result of the assault.* This variable received overall moderate disagreement ($\bar{X} = 1.74, SD = 1.32$). A significant assault main effect, $F(1, 144) = 4.23, p<.04$, showed rape victims as less devalued in comparison with robbery victims (see Tables 17 and 18).
Table 15

Significant Results for "JS Is a Respectable Person"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robbery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

Significant F Statistics for "JS Is a Respectable Person"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Assault</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

Significant Results for

"JS Is a Less Desirable Person as a Result of the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Is a Less Desirable Person as a Result of the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The items in this conceptual grouping generally supported the hypotheses that rape victims would be held more responsible than robbery victims for their misfortune and that females would be more sympathetic towards the victim of assault. The interaction effects were as expected with females particularly more sympathetic towards rape victims as compared to males.

The hypothesis that resisting victims would be viewed more favorably received mixed results depending upon which interpretation of the multidimensional concept of responsibility the subjects were responding to (e.g., resisters were paradoxically perceived as both "more encouraging" the assault while simultaneously being "less deserving" of their fate).

The dependent measures are presented under headings which represent the various major dimensions of responsibility dealt with in this study.

Victim causality. The following items were included to determine the perceived contribution of the victim's actions to the occurrence of the assault. The statement "JS should have acted differently prior to the assault" produced a general mild disagreement (\( \bar{X} = 2.92, \ SD = 1.70 \)). A significant assault by severity interaction, \( F(1, 144) = 5.34, \ p < .02 \), which yielded mild disagreement that the attempted assault victim should have acted differently, while it was significantly more agreed that the rape victims should have acted differently as compared to the robbery victims (see Tables 19 and 20). This supports the stereotypic assumption that the rape victim did something in her
Table 19

Significant Results for
"JS Should Have Acted Differently Prior to the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th></th>
<th>Attempted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>3.37*</td>
<td>2.30*</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means are significantly different from each other, \( p < .05 \), Newman-Keuls statistic
Table 20

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Should Have Acted Differently Prior to the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault x Severity</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
power to control which contributed to the assault.

The item "JS should have acted differently during the assault" received overall mild disagreement ($\bar{X} = 2.95$, $SD = 1.60$). A significant assault by resistance interaction, $F(1, 144) = 3.94$, $p < .049$, was obtained with resistance affecting the responses to assault differentially. The submitting rape victim was seen as "should have acted differently" more so than the resisting rape victim (see Tables 21 and 22). This was expected based on the notion that a victim of a sexual assault is expected to resist the attack. Unexpected was the resisting robbery victim seen most as "should have acted differently during the assault", while the submitting robbery victim was seen less so. This might be explained by the belief that persons who resist a robbery attempt when threatened with violence should they resist are foolishly putting themselves in danger of personal harm. These results support the suggestion that rape and robbery victims are expected to act differently from each other, supposedly because they are being presented with different situations. In spite of evidence to the contrary (e.g., victims of terrorization of any sort respond similarly; rape victims are responding to avoid further harm rather than to preserve chastity) rape victims are still singularly burdened with the responsibility of resisting at all costs the terrorization perpetrated against them.

The variable "JS did something to encourage the assault" received general moderate disagreement ($\bar{X} = 1.98$, $SD = 1.38$), while it obtained a significant resistance main effect, $F(1, 144) = 4.48$, $p < .036$. Resisters were seen as more encouraging of the assault than
Table 21

Significant Results for

"JS Should Have Acted Differently During the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th></th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resist</td>
<td>Submit</td>
<td>Resist</td>
<td>Submit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Should Have Acted Differently During the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault x Resistance</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
submitters (see Tables 23 and 24).

The variables "JS could have done more to prevent the assault" and "JS should have done more to prevent the assault" each obtained a significant resistance main effect in the expected direction, $F(1, 144) = 4.70, p < .032$ (Resist: $\bar{X} = 3.34, SD = 1.42$; Submit: $\bar{X} = 3.90, SD = 1.53$), and $F(1, 144) = 4.51, p < .035$ (Resist: $\bar{X} = 3.20, SD = 1.29$; Submit: $\bar{X} = 3.75, SD = 1.37$), respectively (see Tables 25 and 26). As predicted by societal beliefs, the submitting victim was perceived as not doing enough to prevent the assault.

Victim foreseeability. The item "JS could have foreseen the assault" produced no significant differences and a general mild disagreement that the victim could have foreseen her fate ($\bar{X} = 2.70, SD = 1.64$). On the other hand, the variable "JS could have avoided the assault" obtained more agreement overall ($\bar{X} = 3.30, SD = 1.64$) and a significant assault by resistance interaction, $F(1, 144) = 4.61, p < .033$, with the resisting robbery victim being seen as least able to avoid the assault (see Tables 27 and 28). The resisting rape victim joined the submitting assault victims in being perceived as being more able to avoid the assault. Even if she does resist, the rape victim is still held responsible for not avoiding the attack. It appears as though "avoid" was being interpreted more as "escape", as verified by subjects' comments.

Victim blameworthiness. Despite the above results the subjects responded in unanimous agreement that the victimization was "due to chance" ($\bar{X} = 4.62, SD = 1.32$). The item "JS is an innocent victim" received overall moderate agreement ($\bar{X} = 5.09, SD = 1.53$). A sig-
Table 23
Significant Results for
"JS Did Something to Encourage the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resist</th>
<th>Submit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\overline{x}$</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24

Significant F Statistics for "JS Did Something to Encourage the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resistance</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Could Have Done More to Prevent the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resistance</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26

Significant F Statistics for "JS Should Have Done More to Prevent the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resistance</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27

Significant Results for "JS Could Have Avoided the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th></th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resist</td>
<td>Submit</td>
<td>Resist</td>
<td>Submit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Could Have Avoided the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault x Resistance</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significant severity main effect was obtained, $F(1, 144) = 11.89, \ p < .001$, with victims of completed assaults seen as more innocent ($\bar{X} = 5.47, \ SD = 1.32$) than victims of attempted assaults ($\bar{X} = 4.70, \ SD = 1.68$). This appears to be a show of sympathy, definitely not a derogation, of the victim of more severe misfortune. A significant gender by severity interaction was obtained, $F(1, 144) = 5.97, \ p < .016$, with males attributing significantly less innocence to the victim of an attempted assault (see Tables 29 and 30). It is as though the males accepted the notion that a victim is deserving of suffering, and if she does not experience the suffering directly through the assault, she should experience it by being held somehow guilty of complicity.

A significant gender by resistance interaction was also obtained, $F(1, 144) = 4.94, \ p < .028$, with females sympathizing more with submitting victims than resisting victims and significantly more with submitting victims as compared to males.

The males appeared to be generally less sympathetic toward victims except the resisting victim, especially the resisting rape victim. They seemed to view her resistance as evidence of her innocence. Women, on the other hand, generally were more sympathetic toward the victim, except the resisting rape victim whom they viewed as being least innocent. Here the females appeared to be endorsing the just world belief of "she was not innocent, she deserves what she got".

The variable "JS is to blame for the assault" received overall moderate disagreement ($\bar{X} = 1.73, \ SD = 1.08$). An assault by severity interaction produced significant results, $F(1, 144) = 4.63, \ p < .033$, with rape victims being blamed more than rape attempt victims. This
Table 29

Significant Results for
"JS Is an Innocent Victim"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Attempted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean is different from the others, $p < .05$, Newman-Keuls statistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resist</th>
<th>Submit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means are different from each other, $p < .05$, Newman-Keuls statistic
Table 30

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Is an Innocent Victim"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Severity</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Resistance</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
finding was reversed for robbery victims and robbery attempt victims (see Tables 31 and 32). The robbery assault victim suffered either the robbery assault itself or the blame for the aborted attempt. The rape victims suffered both the assault and the blame, precisely the thesis of feminists and most research to date. A significant severity by resistance interaction was also obtained, \( F(1, 144) = 5.99, \ p < .016 \). Victims of completed assaults who resisted were more blamed in comparison with victims who did not resist, while resistance made little difference between victims of attempted assaults. This might suggest that even though women are expected to resist, especially rape assaults, to do so is out-of-role behavior (i.e., not passive, not submissive). They may be, therefore, derogated or blamed for not "keeping in their place". A significant three way interaction, assault by severity by resistance, \( F(1, 144) = 4.63, \ p < .033 \), helps elucidate the issue. Robbery victims regardless of resistance experienced either the completed assault with lesser blame or the attempted assault with greater blame. They are apparently perceived as experiencing one negative consequence or the other. With rape victims, however, a more complex dynamic emerges. A resisting rape attempt victim received significantly lesser blame along with the submitting victim of a completed rape in comparison with the resisting victim of a completed rape. It was as if subjects were saying "If you get raped you'll be blamed if you did not resist". One might infer that the resisting rape victim is doubly stigmatized: once for being a victim, once again for being an ineffective resister (or for out-of-role behavior) which ended in victimization anyway.
Table 31
Significant Results for
"JS Is To Blame for the Assault"

**Completed** | **Attempted**
---|---
**Rape** | **Robbery** | **Rape** | **Robbery**
**X** | 1.85 | 1.57 | 1.52 | 1.97
**SD** | 1.21 | 0.78 | 1.14 | 1.15

**Completed** | **Attempted**
---|---
**Resist** | **Submit** | **Resist** | **Submit**
**X** | 2.02* | 1.40* | 1.65 | 1.85
**SD** | 1.19 | 0.67 | 1.05 | 1.23

**Completed** | **Attempted**
---|---
**Rape** | **Robbery** | **Rape** | **Robbery**
**Resist** | **Submit** | **Resist** | **Submit** | **Resist** | **Submit** | **Resist** | **Submit**
**X** | 2.40* | 1.30* | 1.65 | 1.50 | 1.30* | 1.75 | 2.00 | 1.85
**SD** | 1.42 | 0.57 | 0.81 | 0.76 | 0.73 | 1.33 | 1.21 | 1.13

* Means are different from each other, $p < .05$, Newman-Keuls statistic.
Table 32
Significant F Statistics for
"JS Is To Blame for the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault x Severity</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance x Severity</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault x Severity x Resistance</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variable "JS deserves what she experienced" produced strong disagreement overall ($\bar{X} = 1.32$, SD = 0.71). A significant gender by assault by resistance interaction, $F(1, 144) = 5.03$, $p < .030$, was obtained (see Tables 33 and 34). Females saw the robbery victims as equally undeserving of their fate but saw rape victims differently as a function of their resistance. Resisting rape victims were perceived as most deserving of their fate while non-resisting rape victims were perceived as least deserving. Males saw submitting victims as equally undeserving across treatments. They perceived resisting victims differently as a function of the type of assault. Resisting rape victims were viewed as least deserving while resisting robbery victims were seen as most deserving.
Table 33

Significant Results for
"JS Deserves What She Experienced"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th></th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resist</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.60*</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.10*</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means are different from each other, p < .05, Newman-Keuls statistic.
Table 34

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Deserves What She Experienced"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Assault x Resistance</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Victim Trauma

The items in this conceptual grouping supported the hypotheses that females would be more empathetic with a female victim of assault and that rape victims would be perceived differently than robbery victims. In regards to the victim's experiencing the attack as pleasurable or desirous the interaction of gender and assault variables found males especially being less empathetic and more differentiating between rape and robbery victims.

**JS was traumatized by the actual assault.** This item resulted in an overall mild agreement ($\overline{X} = 3.79$, $SD = 1.41$). A significant gender main effect, $F(1, 144) = 6.66$, $p < .01$, had females feeling that the victim was more traumatized ($\overline{X} = 4.10$, $SD = 1.22$) than did males ($\overline{X} = 3.50$, $SD = 1.55$). An assault main effect also achieved significance, $F(1, 144) = 12.24$, $p < .001$, with the rape victim perceived as being more traumatized by the assault ($\overline{X} = 4.20$, $SD = 0.95$) than the robbery victim ($\overline{X} = 3.40$, $SD = 1.62$) (see Table 35).

**JS will be traumatized by the way she will be treated.** This variable resulted in an overall slight tendency towards disagreement ($\overline{X} = 3.36$, $SD = 1.43$). A significant assault main effect was obtained, $F(1, 144) = 27.60$, $p < .001$, with rape victims seen as experiencing trauma beyond the actual assault more ($\overline{X} = 3.90$, $SD = 1.08$) than robbery victims ($\overline{X} = 2.82$, $SD = 1.62$). A significant gender by assault interaction was obtained, $F(1, 144) = 4.84$, $p < .029$, in which males and females equally perceived rape victims as experiencing more trauma after the assault than robbery victims, but males saw robbery victims as experiencing significantly less trauma than other treatments (see
Table 35

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Was Traumatized by the Actual Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 36 and 37).

JS desired to be victimized. This item yielded general disagreement ($\bar{X} = 1.66$, SD = 1.08). Nevertheless, a significant gender by assault interaction was obtained, $F(1, 144) = 10.98$, $p < .02$, with females perceiving the rape victim as significantly less desiring her fate as compared to the robbery victim and the males' perception of the rape victim (see Tables 38 and 39).

JS derived pleasure from being victimized. This item received general disagreement ($\bar{X} = 1.65$, SD = 1.13). A significant gender main effect, $F(1, 144) = 4.07$, $p < .05$, had males rating the victim of assault as deriving more pleasure ($\bar{X} = 1.82$, SD = 1.21) than did the females ($\bar{X} = 1.47$, SD = 1.01). A significant gender by assault interaction, $F(1, 144) = 11.96$, $p < .001$, found males perceived the rape victim as deriving significantly more pleasure from the assault as compared to robbery victims and females' perceptions of rape victims (see Tables 40 and 41).
Table 36

Significant Results for
"JS Wil Be Traumatized by the Way She Will Be Treated"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>3.95*</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.32*</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means are different from each other, \( p < .05 \), Newman-Keuls statistic.
Table 37

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Will Be Traumatized by the Way She Will Be Treated"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>46.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.23</td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Assault</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 38

Significant Results for
"JS Desired To Be Victimized"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th></th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>1.90*</td>
<td>1.32**</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.97**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Means are different from each other, $p < .05$, Newman-Keuls statistic.
Table 39

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Desired To Be Victimized"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Assault</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 40

Significant Results for
"JS Derived Pleasure from Being Victimized"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>2.22**</td>
<td>1.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means different from each other, \( p<.05 \), Newman-Keuls statistic.

** Means different from each other, \( p<.05 \), Newman-Keuls statistic.
Table 41

Significant F Statistics for

"JS Derived Pleasure from Being Victimized"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Assault</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post-Assault Victim Behavior

The items included in this section dealt with the post-assault behavior of the victim. They represent behaviors which might be affected were a victim stigmatized as a result of her being assaulted. These dependent measures appeared in pairs. They were first presented as a "would" statement then as a "should" statement. It was hypothesized that differences in responses would arise as a result of changing the statement, with the "would" statements more readily reflecting the stigma attached to the victim. A separate analysis of this hypothesis appears later. Taken separately, the dependent variables specifically supported the hypothesis that rape victims are more stigmatized in comparison to robbery victims.

JS would react to men differently as a result of the assault. This item received mild agreement overall ($\bar{X} = 4.00$, SD = 1.34). A significant assault main effect, $F(1, 144) = 13.46$, $p < .001$, had rape victims seen as more likely reacting differently to men ($\bar{X} = 4.40$, SD = 1.02) as compared to robbery victims ($\bar{X} = 3.60$, SD = 1.43) (see Table 42). Subjects' comments to this item show that by react differently they meant "be less trusting, more cautious".

JS should react to men differently as a result of the assault. This variable received an overall moderate disagreement ($\bar{X} = 2.40$, SD = 1.43). A significant assault by severity interaction was obtained, $F(1, 144) = 4.55$, $p < .035$, which had rape victims perceived as most compelled to react differently towards men (see Tables 43 and 44). The subjects generally did not want to see victims react differently to men. It was as though they were endorsing the notion that an assault
Table 42

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Would React to Men Differently as a Result of the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 43

Significant Results for
"JS Should React to Men Differently as a Result of the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Attempted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 44

Significant F Statistics for

"JS Should React to Men Differently as a Result of the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault x Severity</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
offender is an unique individual and that a person's reaction to him should not generalize to all males.

**JS would want to seek revenge.** This item received mild disagreement overall ($\bar{X} = 3.04$, SD = 1.40). A significant assault main effect was obtained, $F(1, 144) = 7.48$, $p < .007$, with rape victims seen as more likely to want to seek revenge as compared to robbery victims ($\bar{X} = 3.34$, SD = 1.08; $\bar{X} = 2.75$, SD = 1.64) (see Tables 45 and 46). A severity main effect approached significance, $F(1, 144) = 3.69$, $p < .057$, showing a tendency for victims of assaults to be more likely seen as wanting to seek revenge ($\bar{X} = 3.25$, SD = 1.23) as compared to victims of attempted assaults ($\bar{X} = 2.84$, SD = 1.52).

**JS should want to seek revenge.** This variable received an overall mild disagreement ($\bar{X} = 2.94$, SD = 1.70). A significant assault main effect, $F(1, 144) = 12.20$, $p < .001$, had rape victims perceived as they should want to seek revenge more so ($\bar{X} = 3.40$, SD = 1.38) than robbery victims ($\bar{X} = 2.48$, SD = 1.90) (see Table 47).

These results suggest that rape victims are seen as having more reason to want to seek revenge relative to robbery victims, but are still perceived as being not particularly vengeful. Comments to these variables portrayed the victim as powerless to avenge their fate or as "wanting to put the whole thing out of her mind" or as "not righting the wrong done her by being vengeful". These comments correspond to commonly held beliefs concerning the recourse left to the victim of rape—"What can you do? Why bother? It's over and done with, forget it." It is such beliefs which perpetuate beyond the rape the frustration and sense of powerlessness which were experienced by the rape victim during the assault.
Table 45

Significant Results for
"JS Would Want To Seek Revenge"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assault</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Attempted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 46

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Would Want To Seek Revenge"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 47

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Should Want To Seek Revenge"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>33.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.31</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It has been asserted that the victim of a rape tends to blame herself and feel guilty for the rape occurring. The following items dealt directly with this issue.

**JS would feel guilty following the assault.** This statement received an overall mild disagreement ($\bar{X} = 2.86$, $SD = 1.42$). A significant assault main effect was obtained, $F(1, 144) = 9.60$, $p < .002$, with rape victims seen as feeling more guilty ($\bar{X} = 3.20$, $SD = 1.20$) than robbery victims ($\bar{X} = 2.52$, $SD = 1.57$) (see Table 48).

**JS should feel guilty following the assault.** This item received moderate disagreement overall ($\bar{X} = 1.69$, $SD = 1.21$). A significant gender by assault by severity interaction, $F(1, 144) = 5.50$, $p < .020$, had females viewing the victims similarly as to whether she should feel guilty. Males saw the rape attempt victim as being significantly less guilty as compared to robbery attempt and completed rape victims (see Tables 49 and 50).

Looking at these two variables it appeared as though the subjects believed the victim would endorse the commonly held belief that the victim of a rape is somehow guilty for what happened, however, they fairly strongly felt that this should not be so. Females especially felt all victims should be free of self-guilt, while males tended to perpetuate a double standard, i.e., they typically assigned guilt to a relatively unsuffering victim (assault attempt) and not to suffering victims, except for the rape victims who were seen as suffering both the assault and the onus of self guilt.

**JS would feel ashamed following the assault.** This item re-
Table 48

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Would Feel Guilty Following the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 49

Significant Results for
"JS Should Feel Guilty Following the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th></th>
<th>Attempted</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.40*</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.25**</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means are different from each other, \( p < .05 \), Newman-Keuls statistic.

** Means are different from each other, \( p < .05 \), Newman-Keuls statistic.
Table 50

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Should Feel Guilty Following the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Assault x Severity</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ceived an overall mild agreement ($X = 3.63, SD = 1.34$). A signifi-
cant assault main effect, $F(1, 144) = 31.12, p < .001$, had rape vic-
tims perceived as more likely to feel ashamed ($X = 4.29, SD = 1.23$)
than robbery victims ($X = 2.96, SD = 1.37$) (see Table 5).

**JS should feel ashamed following the assault.** This item yielded
moderate disagreement overall ($X = 1.74, SD = 1.18$). A significant
assault by severity interaction, $F(1, 144) = 4.34, p < .039$, had rape
victims seem most as "should feel ashamed" (see Tables 52 and 53).

The subjects again appeared to endorse the societal belief by
feeling that the victim would feel ashamed for the rape occurring, but
felt this should not be so (although with the same prejudiced trend,
i.e., that rape victims were still perceived as relatively more "should
feel ashamed").

The following items dealt with the issue of the subject making
the assault known to others. It was hypothesized that the victim
would disclose the experience less readily than she should due to the
stigma attached to having been victimized, particularly raped.

**JS would go to a crisis center.** This item received an overall
mild disagreement ($X = 3.10, SD = 1.21$). A significant assault main
effect was obtained, $F(1, 144) = 8.83, p < .003$, with rape victims seen
as more likely to go to a crisis center ($X = 3.29, SD = 1.08$) as com-
pared to robbery victims ($X = 2.80, SD = 1.28$) (see Table 5).

**JS should go to a crisis center.** This item received an overall
mild agreement ($X = 4.28, SD = 1.50$). A significant assault main ef-
fact was obtained, $F(1, 144) = 24.96, p < .001$, with rape victims seen
more as "should go" ($X = 4.80, SD = 0.97$) as compared to robbery vic-
Table 51

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Would Feel Ashamed Following the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>70.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70.23</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 52

Significant Results for

"JS Should Feel Ashamed Following the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Attempted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 53

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Should Feel Ashamed Following the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault x Severity</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 54

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Would Go To a Crisis Center"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tims ($\bar{X} = 3.68$, SD = 1.79). The subjects felt that the victim would benefit from crisis treatment and when the realities of the situation were removed ("would" became "should") this belief was allowed to exhibit itself separate from the obstacles and reservations of reality as indicated by subjects' comments, e.g., "she should, but probably wouldn't because she'd be embarrassed, or because she wouldn't be believed"; "she definitely needs to be treated, but maybe won't because she feels funny about not fighting the guy". These responses support the common belief that a rape victim is more traumatized and in need of crisis counseling, but unwilling to seek it due to the stigma attached to being rape victimized (see Table 55).

*JS would report the assault to the police.* This variable received an overall moderate agreement ($\bar{X} = 4.51$, SD = 1.55). A significant assault main effect was obtained, $F(1, 144) = 13.63$, $p < .001$. Robbery victims were seen as more likely reporting to police ($\bar{X} = 4.95$, SD = 1.51) as compared to rape victims ($\bar{X} = 4.07$, SD = 1.62). These results support the stereotypic and realistic belief regarding a rape victim's reluctance to report her experience. A significant severity by resistance interaction was obtained, $F(1, 144) = 5.39$, $p < .020$, which showed severity to affect the subjects' perceptions of submitting victims differentially. Submitting victims of completed assaults were viewed as most likely reporting to the police, while submitting victims of attempted assaults were seen as least likely to report (see Tables 56 and 57). Comments on the item found victims of attempted assaults perceived as "not bothering to report because she didn't bother to resist the assault. Anyways, she got off lucky, why push the issue?"
Table 55

Significant F Statistics for

"JS Should Go To a Crisis Center"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>48.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.40</td>
<td>24.96</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 56

Significant Results for

"JS Would Report the Assault to the Police"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th></th>
<th>Attempted</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resist</td>
<td>Submit</td>
<td>Resist</td>
<td>Submit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 57

Significant F Statistics for

"JS Would Report the Assault to the Police"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>30.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.63</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity x Resistance</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JS should report the assault to the police. This statement produced an overall strong agreement ($\bar{X} = 5.79, \text{SD} = 0.65$) which showed no significant differences across treatments.

Once again, when relieved of reality considerations the victim was seen as "should disclose the attack". In this instance not only for her own welfare but also for the benefit of society and particularly potential victims as was suggested by the subjects' comments. Reality considerations, e.g., "she couldn't identify the guy", "she'd have a hard time with the police", "she'd want to just forget it", which are attributable to the stigma which accompanies sexual assault contributed to the perceptions of the victim's reluctance to report the assault to the police.

JS would tell her parents about the assault. This variable yielded an overall mild agreement ($\bar{X} = 4.36, \text{SD} = 1.46$). A significant assault main effect, $F(1, 144) = 18.12, \ p < .001$, had rape victims seen as less likely to tell parents ($\bar{X} = 3.90, \text{SD} = 1.53$) as compared to robbery victims ($\bar{X} = 4.81, \text{SD} = 1.40$). A significant gender by assault by severity interaction, $F(1, 144) = 4.66, \ p < .033$, showed males perceiving the victim of a completed rape as being significantly less likely to tell her parents (see Tables 58 and 59). Females saw the victim more equally across treatments to tell her parents with a tendency for rape victims to less likely tell.

JS should tell her parents about the assault. This item received an overall moderate agreement ($\bar{X} = 5.24, \text{SD} = 1.04$). A significant assault main effect was obtained, $F(1, 144) = 4.29, \ p < .040$, with rape victims seen as less compelled to tell parents ($\bar{X} = 5.07,$
Table 58

Significant Results for
"JS Would Tell Her Parents about the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th></th>
<th>Attempted</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>3.20*</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean different from others, p < .01, Newman-Keuls statistic.
Table 59

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Would Tell Her Parents about the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>33.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.31</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Assault x</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SD = 0.89) as compared to robbery victims (\( \bar{X} = 5.40, SD = 1.08 \)) (see Table 60).

**JS would tell her friends about the assault.** This statement received overall mild agreement (\( \bar{X} = 4.18, SD = 1.42 \)). A significant assault main effect, \( F(1, 144) = 50.12, \ p < .001 \), showed rape victims to be less likely to tell friends (\( \bar{X} = 3.47, SD = 1.40 \)) as compared to robbery victims (\( \bar{X} = 4.89, SD = 1.45 \)) (see Table 61).

**JS should tell her friends about the assault.** This item received an overall mild agreement (\( \bar{X} = 4.21, SD = 1.66 \)). A significant assault main effect was obtained, \( F(1, 144) = 20.12, \ p < .001 \), which showed the rape victim to be seen as less compelled to tell her friends (\( \bar{X} = 3.64, SD = 1.72 \)) as compared to robbery victim (\( \bar{X} = 4.77, SD = 1.60 \)) (see Table 62). The subjects felt equally that the victim would and should tell friends. As with other variables, the rape victim was seen as relatively less likely to disclose her experience. Comments to these items showed that her hesitance would probably be due to the stigma attached to being raped.

**JS would tell her boyfriend about the assault.** This variable produced an overall moderate agreement (\( \bar{X} = 4.26, SD = 1.53 \)). A significant assault main effect was obtained, \( F(1, 144) = 17.95, \ p < .001 \), which had rape victims seen as less likely to tell her boyfriend (\( \bar{X} = 3.76, SD = 1.47 \)) as compared to robbery victims (\( \bar{X} = 4.75, SD = 1.73 \)) (see Table 63).

**JS should tell her boyfriend about the assault.** This item received moderate agreement overall (\( \bar{X} = 4.99, SD = 1.29 \)) with no sig-
Table 60

Significant F Statistics for "JS Should Tell Her Parents about the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 61

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Would Tell Her Friends about the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>79.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79.81</td>
<td>50.12</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 62

Significant F Statistics for
"JS Should Tell Her Friends about the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>51.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.76</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 63

Significant F Statistics for

"JS Would Tell Her Boyfriend about the Assault"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>39.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.01</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significant differences across treatments.
Additional Analyses

As described above, certain variables were presented in both a "would" and a "should" version (e.g., "JS would report the assault to the police" and "JS should report the assault to the police"). It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between a subject's perception of how the victim would react and how she should react. Specifically, responses to how the victim would react would reveal the phenomenon of post-rape stigmatization (i.e., The rape condition would reveal more discrepancy between how the subject felt the victim should act compared to how she would act. The difference is allegedly due to the blame and derogation of the victim associated with the act of sexual assault.). An analysis was performed to determine the significance of the differences. Difference scores (mean scores to the should item minus the mean scores to the would item) were computed and served as the dependent variable in an analysis of variance. In seven of eight variables tested a significant assault main effect was obtained as predicted, i.e., the rape condition showed greater disparity between how the victim was perceived in regards to the would-should items and this difference was in the direction indicating that the victim experienced a post-rape stigmatization.

The item "JS would-should report the assault to the police" obtained a significant assault main effect, $F(1, 144) = 11.87, \ p < .001$, with the rape condition eliciting a greater difference ($\bar{X} = 1.69$) than the robbery treatment ($\bar{X} = 0.88$) between the "should" and the "would" versions of the item. The direction of the difference was that the rape victim would be significantly less likely to report to the po-
lice compared to the feeling that she should report to the police.

The item "JS would-should feel guilty following the assault" obtained a significant assault main effect, $F(1, 144) = 8.67$, $p < .003$, with the rape treatment eliciting a greater difference ($\bar{X} = 1.55$) than the robbery treatment ($\bar{X} = 0.81$). The direction of the difference was that the rape victim would feel more guilty than she should.

The item "JS would-should feel ashamed following the assault" obtained a significant assault main effect, $F(1, 144) = 16.75$, $p < .001$ with the rape treatment eliciting a greater difference ($\bar{X} = 2.45$) than the robbery treatment ($\bar{X} = 1.32$). The direction of the difference was that the victim would feel more ashamed than she should.

The item "JS would-should react differently to men following the assault" obtained a significant assault main effect, $F(1, 144) = 7.61$, $p < .007$, with the rape treatment eliciting a greater difference ($\bar{X} = 1.92$) than the robbery treatment ($\bar{X} = 1.22$). The direction of the difference was that the victim would react to men more differently than she should.

The item "JS would-should go to a crisis center" obtained a significant assault main effect, $F(1, 144) = 5.07$, $p < .026$, with the rape treatment eliciting a greater difference score ($\bar{X} = 1.51$) than the robbery treatment ($\bar{X} = 0.99$). The direction of the difference was that the victim would go to a crisis center less than she should.

The item "JS would-should tell her parents of the assault" obtained a significant assault main effect, $F(1, 144) = 7.66$, $p < .006$, with the rape treatment eliciting a greater difference score ($\bar{X} = 1.19$) than the robbery treatment ($\bar{X} = 0.59$). The direction of the differ-
ence was that the victim would tell her parents less than she should.

The item "JS would-should tell her boyfriend" obtained a significant assault main effect, \( F(1, 144) = 7.18, \ p < .008 \), with the rape treatment eliciting a greater difference score (\( \bar{X} = 1.05 \)) than the robbery treatment (\( \bar{X} = 0.45 \)). The direction of the difference was that the victim would tell her boyfriend less than she should.
The purpose of this study was to assess the effects of gender of respondent, nature of assault, severity of assault, and resistance of victim on a subject's perceptions of assault victims. In particular, perceptions or attitudes toward rape victims were investigated regarding an alleged post-rape stigmatization of rape victims. Post-rape stigmatization referred to the phenomena of a rape victim being derogated and blamed as a result of her being victimized. It has been suggested that such behavior has the effect of traumatizing the victim beyond the temporal limits of the crime itself, making her hesitant to act in any way to seek help, justice, retribution, or support and increasing her feelings of self-blame, guilt, and doubt.

The hypothesis that rape victims would be subjected to more stigma than robbery assault victims and that females would be more sympathetic than males were supported. As a main effect the rape victim was especially perceived as being less likely to disclose her experience to officials and significant others. Respondents' comments pointed out that this could be attributed to the rape victim's sense of guilt and shame and also to the assumed futility of attempting to receive comfort or retribution by the telling of her victimization.

The assault variable most often appeared interacting with the gender variable. The most frequent result was that the males viewed the rape victim in a more derogatory-blaming manner or minimized the
trauma of the event more than did females. This was most readily ex-
plained in terms of Shaver's (1973) defensive attribution model (i.e.,
a person who perceived a potential fate similarity and acknowledged a
personality similarity tended to be more lenient and sympathetic.
Therefore, the females were more sympathetic than males.). Conspicu-
ously absent were personality derogations. Rape victims were occas-
ionally viewed as more blameworthy as a result of unintentional neg-
ligence or lack of vigilance (e.g., She should have known better than
to go out unescorted.).

Males displayed their most salient lack of empathy compared to
females in response to whether the rape victim actually desired or
derived pleasure from the assault. Males appeared to be less able to
view rape as an act of violence, aggression, and humiliation. In
their comments they continued to endorse the notion of rape being
primarily a sexual encounter.

It must be noted that the differences in results which were ob-
tained were of a relative nature and in general the victims were not
markedly derogated. The absence of more salient negative perceptions
of the victims, as is predicted by victimology literature, might be
attributable to the stimulus which was designed to present a relative-
ly neutral, blameless person.

If one would ignore for a moment comparisons between treatments
it becomes apparent that victims, even rape victims, tended to be
viewed generally in a neutral to sympathetic light. This is not un-
like other reports in the literature which, however, stressed solely
the relative differences between respondents' perceptions of different
assault victims or the differences between male and female respondents. The consistent finding of relative sympathy toward the victim which is apparent in the research literature might be attributable to the bias and homogeneity of the sampling of the typical psychological experiment using college students as subjects (i.e., college students as a group may endorse more "enlightened" views regarding rape than other populations). Studies have shown that variables such as "attitudes toward women", race, occupation, marital status (Feild, 1978); religious orientation (Joe, McGee, & Dazey, 1977); cross-sectional age differences (Scroggs, 1976); and same-age cross-generational differences (Schultz, & DeSavage, 1975) in the respondents can affect attitudes toward rape. It seems plausible that college students might be more prone to respond in a generally more enlightened manner regarding rape; more enlightened, at least, than what one would expect based on the assertions of feminists and victimologists.

Another explanation for the differences between the results of this study and those results which might be expected based on feminist literature may possibly be found in the lack of involvement or identification of the subjects with the rape incident stimulus (less than 10% of the respondents claimed to have been directly or indirectly involved as a victim of rape). At the same time the subjects were responding in an apparently serious, conscientious manner to the study, although admittedly their responses carried no immediate impact beyond the study. Consequently the subjects seemed to be not as emotionally aroused, nor were they responding flippantly, nor were they faced with the gravity of making binding legal decisions. Such an atypical in-
volvement with a rape incident may have resulted in responses unlike those witnessed in more naturally occurring situations (e.g., juries, police and support personnel, victim reports, casual conversations). One must be warned to consider cautiously the results of rape research which uses reports of purported assaults and relatively disinterested subjects. The full emotional component of attitudes may not be sufficiently aroused, resulting in responses differing from those observed in persons directly involved in rape incidents. I offer as an example the comment of a friend who, although extremely liberated, enlightened, knowledgable regarding rape, and sensitive to the suffering of others, stated that he does not know how he would respond if his wife were raped. He suspects that he would not be understanding of her trauma and would respond in what he identified as an irrational and negative fashion.

A final possible explanation for the relative sympathy towards rape victims witnessed in this study is the increased media coverage, especially television dramatizations, of the past year regarding rape. More people are being put in contact with the trauma of sexual assault and are perhaps better able to empathize with the victim whereas in the past they were more able to deny or ignore the possibility of their being affected by sexual assault.

The hypothesis that assault resisters would be viewed more favorably than submitters was generally supported. Resisting victims were seen as more similar to respondents, less encouraging the assault upon themselves, more attempting to prevent the assault, and more likely to seek crisis center help. Such impressions indicate that a
victim will be less stigmatized if she resisted the assault.

More complex effects of resistance were observed in relation to several items. Females felt a submitting rape victim was more innocent. Their comments portrayed the submitting rape victim as totally helpless, paralyzed by fear, and not accountable for their actions or the assault.

A different dynamic emerged in regards to victim blameworthiness. A resisting victim of completed rape received the most blame. This might be explained as a "punishment" for ineffective resistance.

Regarding whether the victim deserves what she experienced, females rated the resisting rape victim as most deserving while males rated her as least deserving. In this instance the males appeared to be equating submission with encouragement. One female's comment might help explain the increased derogation of the resisting victim by females. This subject portrayed the victim as being rather brazen to be out alone at night ("asking for it") and could not imagine fighting back as the victim did. The victim was being perceived as acting "out-of-role" for a woman and might therefore have been derogated.

The prediction that victims of attempted assaults would be perceived as being less traumatized and stigmatized by the experience received mixed results. To the statements directly concerning trauma during and following the assault, severity (i.e., completed versus attempted assault) did not affect the subjects' responses. To "JS should have acted different prior to the assault", however, victims of completed rapes were rated higher. Males perceived completed rape victims most as "should feel guilty", all subjects saw
be considered ideal circumstances. In general the subjects felt that the victim should not be stigmatized, but felt that she would be. They felt that the victim should not be self-blaming, but felt that she would be. These findings lend support to the notion of post-rape stigmatization.

The results of this exploratory investigation of attitudes toward rape victims point out a number of issues to be considered in future research. Allowing for the multi-dimensionality of the concept of responsibility appears to be essential should one want to maintain a replicability and comparability between studies. Similarly, there appears to be no one attitude toward rape and rape victims, but rather a composite of many sometimes seemingly paradoxical attitudes and perceptions. It might be helpful to arrive at some sort of a profile of a subject's attributions of responsibility and attitudes toward a rape victim which would take into account the many factors involved in such judgments.

It seems obvious that more studies need to be performed using various subject populations. Except for one attitude survey (Feild, 1978) all published experiments regarding rape involve college students responding to purported reports of rape. Experimental studies using victimized and non-victim subjects, various demographics as treatment variables, and if possible test-retest attitude surveys (e.g., test before personal involvement with a rape assault, retest after personal involvement) would provide valuable information which would be generalizable beyond the population of college students.

It was shown that females respond differently to rape victims
the victim of completed rape more as "should feel ashamed", and com-
pleted rape victims were held more blameworthy than attempted rape
victims. On the other hand, males viewed victims of completed rapes
as less characterologically responsible (i.e., "kind of person who
gets into such situations"), more careful, and more innocent compared
to attempted rape victims.

As noted in other instances it seemed as though the subjects
were more hesitant to derogate the personality characteristics of
completed rape victims, whereas the actions and subsequent feelings of
completed rape victims were perceived in such a manner as to suggest
derogation and blame. Males were more prone to attitudinal/perceptual
shifts based on the circumstances of the assault.

The concept of post-rape stigmatization was generally supported
in this study. Rape victims tended to be perceived as relatively more
behaviorally responsible for the assault and more suffering of nega-
tive consequences as a function of being sexually assaulted. These
results were particularly evident among male respondents. Males
tended to be more labile in their perceptions of rape victims--more
influenced by circumstances surrounding the incident. Females were
generally more sympathetic and lenient in judging victims, regardless
of circumstances. This reaction of females is suggestive of an em-
pathy attributable to a potential fate similarity of females (i.e.,
that of being violently assaulted). This appears to be a potential
fate similarity perceived by the subjects in that less than 2% of
the female subjects claimed to actually having been sexually assaulted.
They nevertheless admitted to being in fear of assault and acknow-
ledged that the experience of the victim could happen to them more so than did males.

Several procedures used in this study have helped shed light on what could otherwise appear to be contradictory and confusing results. Recognizing and allowing for the multi-dimensionality of attitudes toward rape and in particular the multi-dimensionality of the concept of responsibility was of prime importance in interpreting the results. Had only one of the following items been included, how would the results have been interpreted? "JS could have done more to prevent what happened" received a mean score of agreement of 3.62, while "JS is an innocent victim" received a mean score of agreement of 5.09. Given the assortment of responses dealing with the various interpretations of responsibility, patterns of responses allowed explanations of seemingly incongruous results. For example, the victim JS was innocent, i.e., a random victim who did not offer encouragement, but she could have been more careful, e.g., she could have had an escort when going out at night.

The inclusion of subject comments to items in the data collection was a paramount aid in interpretation of the results. Their candid observations, qualifications, and explanations of their responses provided clues to the rationale of their responses and made the process of interpretation more closely allied to the data--less a function of intellectual guesswork.

The inclusion of would-should versions of some items allowed subjects to apparently differentiate between their responses to what might be considered to be reality and their responses to what might
than do males, primarily as a function of their potential fate similarity and increased empathy with the victim. One would assume that increased empathy (as well as certain personality traits or cognitive orientations) would allow a person to be more sensitively responsive to a rape victim's suffering. Studies have shown rapists to be less likely to commit the act the more they view the victim as a person instead of as an object or a symbol (Becker & Abel, 1978; Brodsky, 1976; Russell, 1975). It appears as though an education program aimed at making persons aware of the realities of rape (debunking societal myths), perhaps similar to the current sensitive television dramatizations, would result in more enlightened, sensitive reactions to the rape incident. It would require more than a mere dissemination of rape facts (c.f., Feild, 1978). A person's total attitudinal system need be aroused to facilitate attitude change. Unless our society's attitudes toward rape change countless thousands of women will continue to be directly traumatized due to the rape assault itself and by the stigma which follows. All women appear to be somehow affected by the fear of sexual assault and all men and women are probably affected by the paradoxical "unthinkable-winkable" attitudes toward rape held by our society. Continued attention and investigation rather than denial or minimization of the problem is required to fully understand the phenomenon and to lessen the suffering experienced by all due to the act of sexual assault.
SUMMARY

An experiment was conducted to investigate the effects of gender of respondent, nature of assault, severity of assault, and resistance of victim on respondents' perceptions of assault victims. Attention was focused on the subjects' perceptions of rape victims, especially as these perceptions related to blame and derogation. Utilizing methodological improvements suggested by Feild (1978) and Shaver (1973) regarding the multi-dimensional quality of the concepts of "attitudes toward rape" and "responsibility" respectively, the defensive attribution model of Shaver (1973) was tested against the just world hypothesis of Lerner (1966).

One hundred sixty undergraduates from Loyola University of Chicago read purported self reports of assault victims and responded to items dealing with the victim's personality and behavioral characteristics, the victim's facilitation of the assault, the victim's reaction to the assault, and the subject's empathy with the victim. A 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design was devised in which male-female subjects commented on victims who resisted-submitted to completed-attempted rape-robbery assaults. Predictions of lessened attributions of responsibility and lessened derogation by fate similar subjects were confirmed. Hypotheses predicting the stigmatization of rape victims were supported. Mixed results were obtained concerning the effect of the severity of the assault and the effect of the victim's resistance on
how the victim was perceived.

The victim of rape was generally perceived in a relatively sympa­thetic manner. That stigmatization which did exist manifested it­self primarily as holding the victim somehow behaviorally responsible for the assault and as perceiving the victim as experiencing shame and guilt as a function of being sexually assaulted. The victim was seen as being hesitant to report the incident to officials or significant others due to the fear of experiencing further trauma and castigation from those meant to give support and comfort.

Suggestions for future research included the continuance of the methodological improvements utilized in this study and the necessity of using various subject populations. The issue of attitude change and the enhancement of empathy for the victim of sexual assaults were discussed.
REFERENCES


Calhoun, L. G., Selby, J. W., & Waring, L. J. Social perception of
the victim's causal role in rape: An exploratory examination of

Chaikin, A., & Darley, J. Victim or perpetrator?: Defensive attribu-
tion of responsibility and the need for order and justice.

Chappell, D., Geis, R., & Geis, G. *Forcible rape: The crime, the vic-

Clark, L., & Lewis, D. *Rape: The price of coercive sexuality*. The


Cohen, M. L., Garofalo, R. B., & Seghorn, T. The psychology of rapists.

Cohn, B. N. Succumbing to rape. In L. G. Schultz (Ed.), *Rape victim-

Conklin, J. E. *Robbery and the criminal justice system*. Philadelphia:
Lippincott, 1972.

Devereux, G. The awarding of the penis as compensation for rape: A
demonstration of the clinical relevance of the psychoanalytical
study of cultural data. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*,
1957, 38, 398-401.


Field, H. S. Attitudes toward rape: A comparative analysis of police,
rapists, crisis counselors, and citizens. *Journal of Personality

Feldman-Summers, S., & Lindner, K. Perceptions of victims and defend-
ants in criminal assault cases. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 1976, 2, 135-150.


Greer, G. Seduction is a four-letter word. *Playboy*, 1973, 20, 80-82.


Selby, J. W., Calhoun, L. G., & Brock, T. A. Sex differences in the


Weis, K., & Borges, S. S. Victimology and rape: The case of the legi-


APPENDIX A
Sample Rape-Completed-Resist Report

The following is a victim's report of a sexual assault. Read it carefully, then respond to the statements which follow.

The victim (JS) is a 20 year old female college student of average height, weight, and looks.

"I was studying in the library that evening. I was going to have a late dinner with some people from one of my classes. At 7:30 I left the library and started walking to the restaurant which was a couple of blocks away. It was a cool evening and turning dark. The street lights were coming on. I was wearing my usual clothes--jeans, blouse, tennis shoes, and a light jacket--and carrying a book and my purse. It happened as I was walking past a large apartment building. I was grabbed from behind by a guy. He had his arm around my neck and was choking me. He was strong and bigger than me. He told me to be quiet and do what he said or else I'd get hurt real bad. He said he was going to rape me. I was afraid he would kill me or something, but I yelled and made alot of noise and struggled with him and hit him and kicked him. He forced me through the gangway and pushed me to the ground, tore at my clothes, and raped me. He finished and ran away down the alley just as some people were coming down their backstairs to the yard. I didn't recognize the guy."
Sample Rape-Completed-Submit Report

The following is a victim's report of a sexual assault. Read it carefully, then respond to the statements which follow.

The victim (JS) is a 20 year old female college student of average height, weight, and looks.

"I was studying in the library that evening. I was going to have a late dinner with some people from one of my classes. At 7:30 I left the library and started walking to the restaurant which was a couple of blocks away. It was a cool evening and turning dark. The street lights were coming on. I was wearing my usual clothes--jeans, blouse, tennis shoes, and a light jacket--and carrying a book and my purse. It happened as I was walking past a large apartment building. I was grabbed from behind by a guy. He had his arm around my neck and was choking me. He was strong and bigger than me. He told me to be quiet and do what he said or else I'd get hurt real bad. He said he was going to rape me. I did what he said. I was afraid he would kill me or something. He forced me through the gangway and pushed me to the ground, tore at my clothes, and raped me. He finished and ran away down the alley just as some people were coming down their backstairs to the yard. I didn't recognize the guy."
Sample Rape-Attempt-Submit Report

The following is a victim's report of a sexual assault. Read it carefully, then respond to the statements which follow.

The victim is a 20 year old female college student of average height, weight, and looks.

"I was studying in the library that evening. I was going to have a late dinner with some people from one of my classes. At 7:30 I left the library and started walking to the restaurant which was a couple of blocks away. It was a cool evening and turning dark. The street lights were coming on. I was wearing my usual clothes—jeans, blouse, tennis shoes, and a light jacket—and carrying a book and my purse. It happened as I was walking past a large apartment building. I was grabbed from behind by a guy. He had his arm around my neck and was choking me. He was strong and bigger than me. He told me to do what he said and be quiet or else I'd get hurt real bad. He said he was going to rape me. I did what he said. I was afraid he would kill me or something. He forced me through the gangway and pushed me to the ground, tore at my clothes, but stopped and ran away down the alley just as some people were coming down their backstairs to the yard. I didn't recognize the guy.
The following is a victim's report of a sexual assault. Read it carefully, then respond to the statements which follow.

The victim (JS) is a 20 year old female college student of average height, weight, and looks.

"I was studying in the library that evening. I was going to have a late dinner with some people from one of my classes. At 7:30 I left the library and started walking to the restaurant which was a couple of blocks away. It was a cool evening and turning dark. The street lights were coming on. I was wearing my usual clothes--jeans, blouse, tennis shoes, and a light jacket--and carrying a book and my purse. It happened as I was walking past a large apartment building. I was grabbed from behind by a guy. He had his arm around my neck and was choking me. He was strong and bigger than me. He told me to be quiet and do what he said or else I'd get hurt real bad. He said he was going to rape me. I was afraid he was going to kill me or something, but I yelled and made a lot of noise and struggled with him and hit him and kicked him. He forced me through the gangway and pushed me to the ground, tore at my clothes, but stopped and ran away down the alley just as some people were coming down their backstairs to the yard. I didn't recognize the guy."
Sample Robbery-Attempt-Resist Report

The following is a victim's report of a robbery assault. Read it carefully, then respond to the statements which follow.

The victim (JS) is a 20 year old female college student of average height, weight, and looks.

"I was studying in the library that evening. I was going to have a late dinner with some people from one of my classes. At 7:30 I left the library and started walking to the restaurant which was a couple of blocks away. It was a cool evening and turning dark. The street lights were coming on. I was wearing my usual clothes--jeans, blouse, tennis shoes, and a light jacket--and carrying a book and my purse. It happened as I was walking past a large apartment building. I was grabbed from behind by a guy. He had his arm around my neck and was choking me. He was strong and bigger than me. He told me to be quiet and do what he said or else I'd get hurt real bad. He said he was going to rob me. I was afraid he would kill me or something, but I yelled and made a lot of noise and struggled with him and hit him and kicked him. He forced me through the gangway, pushed me to the ground, and hit me in the head with something. He grabbed my purse and took out my wallet. I had just cashed a paycheck and had all my credit cards in my wallet. He dropped everything, though, and ran away down the alley just as some people were coming down their backstairs to the yard. I didn't recognize the guy. I went to an emergency room where I received medical attention for where he hit me and then was released."
The following is a victim's report of a robbery assault. Read it carefully, then respond to the statements which follow.

The victim (JS) is a 20 year old female college student of average height, weight, and looks.

"I was studying that evening in the library. I was going to have a late dinner with some people from one of my classes. At 7:30 I left the library and started walking to the restaurant which was a couple of blocks away. It was a cool evening and turning dark. The street lights were coming on. I was wearing my usual clothes--jeans, blouse, tennis shoes, and a light jacket--and carrying a book and my purse. It happened as I was walking past a large apartment building. I was grabbed from behind by a guy. He had his arm around my neck and was choking me. He was strong and bigger than me. He told me to be quiet and do what he said or else I'd get hurt real bad. He said he was going to rob me. I was afraid he was going to kill me or something, but I yelled and made alot of noise and struggled with him and hit him and kicked him. He forced me through the gangway, pushed me to the ground, and hit me in the head with something. He grabbed my purse and took out my wallet. I had just cashed a paycheck and had all my credit cards in my wallet. He took the wallet and ran away down the alley just as some people were coming down their backstairs to the yard. I didn't recognize the guy. I went to an emergency room where I received medical attention for where he hit me and then was released."
Sample Robbery-Attempt-Submit Report

The following is a victim's report of a robbery assault. Read it carefully, then respond to the statements which follow.

The victim (JS) is a 20 year old female college student of average height, weight, and looks.

"I was studying in the library that evening. I was going to have a late dinner with some people from one of my classes. At 7:30 I left the library and started walking to the restaurant which was a couple of blocks away. It was a cool evening and turning dark. The street lights were coming on. I was wearing my usual clothes--jeans, blouse, tennis shoes, and a light jacket--carrying a book and my purse. It happened as I was walking past a large apartment building. I was grabbed from behind by a guy. He had his arm around my neck and was choking me. He was strong and bigger than me. He told me to be quiet and do what he said or else I'd get hurt real bad. He said he was going to rob me. I did what he said. I was afraid he was going to kill me or something. He grabbed my purse and took out my wallet. I had just cashed a paycheck and had all my credit cards in my wallet. He dropped everything, though, and ran away down the alley just as some people were coming down their backstairs to the yard. I didn't recognize the guy. I went to an emergency room where I received medical attention for where he hit me and then was released".
The following is a victim's report of a robbery assault. Read it carefully, then respond to the statements which follow.

The victim (JS) is a 20 year old female college student of average height, weight, and looks.

"I was studying in the library that evening. I was going to have a late dinner with some people from one of my classes. At 7:30 I left the library and started walking to the restaurant which was a couple of blocks away. It was a cool evening and turning dark. The street lights were coming on. I was wearing my usual clothes--jeans, blouse, tennis shoes, and a light jacket--and carrying a book and my purse. It happened as I was walking past a large apartment building. I was grabbed from behind by a guy. He had his arm around my neck and was choking me. He was strong and bigger than me. He told me to be quiet and do what he said or else I'd get hurt real bad. He said he was going to rob me. I did what he said. I was afraid he would kill me or something. He grabbed my purse and took out my wallet. I had just cashed a paycheck and had all my credit cards in my wallet. He took the wallet and ran away down the alley just as some people were coming down their backstairs to the yard. I didn't recognize the guy. I went to an emergency room where I received medical attention for where he hit me and then was released."
APPENDIX B
Sample Rape Questionnaire

To the left of each statement place the number from 1 to 6 which matches your agreement/disagreement. Briefly explain or comment on your responses in the spaces provided. Complete each item.

1. I am similar to the victim (JS) personality wise.
2. JS should have acted differently prior to the sexual assault.
3. What happened to JS could happen to anyone.
4. At least once in my life I have been in fear of being raped.
5. JS should have reacted differently to being sexually assaulted.
6. JS could have foreseen the sexual assault.
7. JS could not have avoided the sexual assault.
8. JS did something to encourage the sexual assault.
9. JS is an innocent victim.
10. JS is the kind of person who gets into such situations.
11. JS is a careful person.
12. JS is to blame for the sexual assault.
13. JS being the victim of a sexual assault was due to chance.
14. JS could have done more to prevent the completion of the rape.
15. JS should have done more to prevent the completion of the rape.
16. JS unconsciously desired to be raped.
17. JS derived some pleasure out of being sexually assaulted.
18. JS impresses people favorably.
19. JS is a likeable person.
20. JS deserves what she experienced.
__21. JS is a less desirable person as a result of the sexual assault.
__22. JS is a respectable person.
__23. JS would report the sexual assault to the police.
__24. JS should report the assault to the police.
__25. JS would feel guilty/blameworthy for the sexual assault.
__26. JS should feel guilty/blameworthy for the sexual assault.
__27. JS would feel ashamed following the sexual assault.
__28. JS should feel ashamed following the sexual assault.
__29. JS would want to seek revenge following the sexual assault.
__30. JS should want to seek revenge following the sexual assault.
__31. JS would suffer extreme emotional trauma as a result of how she would be treated following the sexual assault.
__32. JS would suffer extreme emotional trauma as a result of the sexual assault itself.
__33. JS would react to men differently following the sexual assault.
__34. JS should react to men differently following the sexual assault.
__35. JS would go to a rape crisis center or a similar support service.
__36. JS should go to a rape crisis center or similar support service.
__37. JS would tell her parents about the sexual assault.
__38. JS should tell her parents about the sexual assault.
__39. JS would tell her friends about the sexual assault.
__40. JS should tell her friends about the sexual assault.
__41. JS would tell her boyfriend about the sexual assault.
__42. JS should tell her boyfriend about the sexual assault.
__43. What happened to JS could happen to me.
Sample Robbery Questionnaire

To the left of each statement place the number from 1 to 6 which matches your agreement/disagreement. Briefly explain or comment on your responses in the space provided. Complete each item.

__ 1. I am similar to the victim (JS) personality wise.
__ 2. JS should have acted differently prior to the robbery-assault.
__ 3. What happened to JS could happen to anyone.
__ 4. At least once in my life I have been in fear of being robbed.
__ 5. JS should have reacted differently to being robbed.
__ 6. JS could have foreseen the robbery.
__ 7. JS could not have avoided the robbery.
__ 8. JS did something to encourage the robbery.
__ 9. JS is an innocent victim.
__10. JS is the kind of person who gets into such situations.
__11. JS is a careful person.
__12. JS is to blame for the robbery.
__13. JS being the victim of a robbery was due to chance.
__14. JS could have done more to prevent the completion of the robbery.
__15. JS should have done more to prevent the completion of the robbery.
__16. JS unconsciously desired to be robbed.
__17. JS derived some pleasure out of being robbed.
__18. JS impresses people favorably.
__19. JS deserves what she experienced.
__20. JS is a likeable person.
__21. JS is a less desirable person as a result of the robbery.
22. JS is a respectable person.

23. JS would report the robbery to the police.

24. JS should report the robbery to the police.

25. JS would feel guilty/blameworthy for the robbery.

26. JS should feel guilty/blameworthy for the robbery.

27. JS would feel ashamed following the robbery.

28. JS should feel ashamed following the robbery.

29. JS would want to seek revenge following the robbery.

30. JS should want to seek revenge following the robbery.

31. JS would suffer extreme emotional trauma as a result of how she would be treated following the robbery.

32. JS would suffer extreme emotional trauma as a result of the robbery itself.

33. JS would react to men differently following the robbery.

34. JS should react to men differently following the robbery.

35. JS would go to a crisis center or similar support service.

36. JS should go to a crisis center or a similar support service.

37. JS would tell her parents about the robbery.

38. JS should tell her parents about the robbery.

39. JS would tell her friends about the robbery.

40. JS should tell her friends about the robbery.

41. JS would tell her boyfriend about the robbery.

42. JS should tell her boyfriend about the robbery.

43. What happened to JS could happen to me.
You have volunteered to participate in a study dealing with criminal acts.

Read the page of instructions and the account of a crime then respond to the list of statements and questions as directed.

Do not write your name on any of these sheets.

Should you at any time not wish to continue you are under no obligation to do so. You will not forfeit your class credit by not completing the study.

Start with the first sheet and work through the pages in the order in which they appear.

Thank you for your cooperation.
Sample Likert Scale Instruction Sheet

On the following pages, to the left of each statement place the number from 1 to 6 which matches the amount of your agreement. For instance, imagine your agreement ranging on a scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6) with moderate and mild levels of agreement and disagreement in between.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>mildly disagree</th>
<th>mildly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your responses to the following statements might be:

1. The CTA should not increase its bus fares.
2. The CTA needs more route supervisors.
3. The CTA does not need to increase its security measures.
4. The CTA should use double-decker buses.

The first example statement received strong agreement (6), the second received mild disagreement (3), the third received strong disagreement (1), and the fourth statement received moderate agreement (5).

Use this page as a guide if necessary while responding to the following statements. Answer carefully and quickly. Where requested provide brief, clear statements.
Sample Personal Information Sheet

1. Age __
2. Male ____ Female ____
3. Did you understand and know how to respond to the statements of this study? yes ___ no ___
4. Do you feel it is important to educate people regarding the facts and realities of rape? yes ___ no ___
5. Would you participate in a rape study program? 
6. Did you experience particular difficulty with any part of this study? yes ___ no ___
7. If yes, which part? (explain)
8. Have you been able to respond honestly to all parts of this study? yes ___ no ___
9. If no, would you please comment?

The following questions relate to your own personal experiences with rape and as such may be of an extremely sensitive nature. While we hope you can provide us with as much information as possible, feel free to omit responses to any or all questions 10 through 13.

10. Has someone close to you been the victim of a rape attempt? yes ___ no ___
11. Has someone close to you been the victim of rape? yes ___ no ___
12. Have you been the victim of a rape attempt? yes ___ no ___
13. Have you been the victim of rape? yes ___ no ___

Use the back of this sheet to comment on the study.

Should you wish further information regarding rape or if you feel distress as a result of your participation in this study notify the person administering the study or contact the Loyola Rape Prevention Program (x 431) or the Loyola Student Counseling Center (x 431).

Thank you for your cooperation.
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