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ABSTRACT

Sexual assault has been referred to as a “silent epidemic” due to its high prevalence and low rate of reporting (Flintort, 2010). Although this is true for the United States as a whole, college campuses have been identified as one site of increased risk. One proposed rational for this silent epidemic is the cultural theory of rape. The cultural theory of rape, or “rape culture,” was coined in the 1970s and has been broadly defined as, “a pervasive ideology that effectively supports or excuses sexual assault” (Burt, 1980, p. 218).

Theorists have proposed various components, traditional gender roles, sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, and acceptance of general violence, which make up such a culture (Burt, 1980; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; 1995). Given the proposed cultural theory of rape, recent rape prevention efforts have aimed to alter rape culture. The bystander approach to rape prevention is one such program, which has been endorsed by the Center for Disease Control (2004) and American College Health Association (Carr & Ward, 2006). This program targets bystander intervention in an effort to decrease rape culture. The current study identified a well fitting model of rape culture, as well as relationships between this construct, rape myth acceptance, and bystander willingness to intervene. However, contrary to expectations, no relationship was identified between rape culture and bystander behavior. Implications of these findings on future rape prevention programming are discussed.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Social justice has a lengthy history within Counseling Psychology and has been identified as a core value of the field (Speight & Vera, 2008). The goal of social justice has been described as, “the full and equal participation of all groups in a society that is mutually shaped to meet their needs. Social justice includes a vision of a society that is equitable and all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure” (Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 2007, p.1). Feminist scholars have long proposed that the United States is not a “physically and psychologically safe and secure” society for women (Brownmiller, 1975). One proposed rational is the unequal distribution of power between the sexes. The field of Counseling Psychology has extensively discussed the implications of power and privilege on individuals’ wellbeing as well as community norms and structure (APA, 2007). One such community norm proposed as a result of gendered power and privilege is sexual assault.

The high rate of sexual assault among women in the United States is hypothesized as a result of a culture that excuses and condones violence against women. Due to this, the United States as a whole has often been referred to as a “rape culture.” Rape culture is a theoretical construct encompassing a number of rape supportive attitudes including: traditional gender roles, hostility towards women, and acceptance of violence (Burt, 1980; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; 1995). Given the projected role of culture in high
rates of violence against women, recent rape prevention efforts have embraced a social justice lens, and thus propose to target, and alter, this rape supportive culture. The bystander approach to rape prevention (Katz, 1994) is one such example. Bystander interventions propose to alter rape culture by empowering witnesses of inappropriate sexual behavior, including rape supportive attitudes, to safely intervene rather than stand by and ignore, or facilitate, such behaviors (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004; Coker, Cook-Craig, Williams, Fisher, Clear, Garcia, & Hegge, 2011).

Rape and Sexual Assault

Sexual assault has been referred to as a “silent epidemic” due to its high prevalence and low rate of reporting (Flintort, 2010). Although representative studies of rape and sexual assault nationally and internationally are rare, the existent research consistently demonstrates the common nature of these events (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Planty, Langton, Krebs, Berzofsky, & Smiley-McDonald, 2013; Watts & Zimmerman, 2002; World Health Organization, 2013). The World Health Organization (WHO) recently concluded an international examination of violence against women (WHO, 2013). Based on the report, the regions impacted most by intimate partner violence were South-East Asia (37.7% prevalence), Eastern Mediterranean (37% prevalence), and Africa (36.6%). When combining intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence, prevalence rates from highest to lowest by region were: Africa (45.6%), South-East Asia (40.2%), Eastern Mediterranean (36.4%, no non-partner sexual violence information was available for this region), Americas (36.1%), Western Pacific (27.9%), and Europe (27.2%). Further, when all high income countries were combined, a
rate of 32.7% prevalence was identified, demonstrating a worldwide epidemic, regardless of income or region.

Within the United States, although rates of violence against women, particularly rape and sexual assault, remain disturbingly high, a national downward trend has been observed between 1995 and 2005, and has since leveled off (Planty et al., 2013). Consistent with prior research (Koss, 1988), younger women, particularly between the ages of 12 to 34, reported the highest rates of rape and sexual assault. Furthermore, women of lower socioeconomic status and those residing in rural areas reported increased frequencies of rape and sexual assault. Within the aforementioned report, few consistent differences were identified between racial and ethnic groups in regards to experience of rape and sexual assault. This finding is consistent with prior research, demonstrating rape and sexual assault as common experiences across racial and ethnic lines (Dull & Giacopassi, 1987; Fischer, 1987; Giacopassi & Dull, 1986; Herman, 1984).

Contrary to the common belief that rape only occurs “at night, in an ally, by a stranger, with a weapon”, in the United States, the majority of rape and sexual assaults occur close to or within the victim’s home (55%) by someone known to the victim (78%) (Planty et al., 2013). Furthermore, many sexual assaults do not involve the use of a weapon, other than the perpetrator’s power. In regards to perpetrators, most offenders were under the age of 30, with 34% between the ages of 18 and 29. Forty percent of victims believe their assailant(s) used drugs and/or alcohol during their offense. Additionally, White men have committed the majority of sexual assaults in the United States (82%) (Planty et al., 2013).
Consistent with the aforementioned silent epidemic, researchers continue to find that rape and sexual assaults are one of the most underreported crimes in the United States (Planty et al., 2013). For the year 2010, a 35% reporting rate was determined by the national crime and victimization survey (NCVS). “Other” was the most frequently cited reason for not reporting, closing followed by fear of reprisal. This demonstrates the importance of expanding explorations of reasons for not reporting, including culturally bound beliefs and attitudes (Planty et al., 2013). Furthermore, although reporting is one obstacle to overcome in the realm of rape and sexual assault, another barrier occurs at the police station. When reports are filed, the police only record 86% of the time, and merely 48% of those accused are questioned. Additionally, evidence is collected in merely 19% of cases reported. Finally, approximately 31% of those accused of rape were arrested between the years of 2005-2010 and only 12% of reported and unreported sexual assaults resulted in arrests (Planty et al., 2013).

Although this silent epidemic is true nationally and internationally, as demonstrated above, researchers have identified a number of microcosms within the United States, which appear to be particularly at risk for this phenomenon. One microcosm that has been of particular interest, and thus the target of various prevention efforts, is college campuses. Other highlighted areas include the prison complex and the military (Messerschmidt, 2001; Turchik & Wilson, 2010).

*Rape On College Campuses*

The Ms. Magazine project (Koss, 1988) on campus sexual assault sought to establish a national, representative picture of rape and sexual assault on college campuses across the United States. This project was conducted in 1988, with a follow-up study
conducted by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) in 1996 (Fischer, Cullen, & Turner, 2000), indicating the necessity for an updated exploration into this epidemic. In light of this limitation, results of these projects demonstrated strikingly high numbers of sexual assault on college campuses, albeit vast differences in prevalence. Results of the Ms. Magazine project (Koss, 1988) found 53.7% of college women reporting experiences of sexual assault and 25.1% of college men endorsing personal engagement in sexually aggressive acts. These rates are similar to more recent research exploring rape and sexual assault with restricted college samples (Abbey, Ross, McDuffie, & McAuslan, 1996; Johnson & Johnson, 2013; Vrana & Lauterbach, 1994). However, a victimization rate of 27.7% was found within the NIJ representative sample. Although vast differences in rates were established, both studies found considerably low rates of reporting, with only 2% of experiences that met legal definition of rape reported to school officials or the police within the Ms. Magazine sample and 0-4% reported within the NIJ sample. These rates are substantially less than the already low reporting rates of the general population at 31% (Planty et al., 2013).

Several reasons have been proposed for this “silent epidemic” on college campuses. One reason is the demographic makeup of many college students. The majority of college students fall within the age range of 18 to 24. As previously highlighted, this age range encompasses the bulk of victims and perpetrators of rape and sexual assault. In fact, 47% of convicted rapists are under the age of 24 (Koss, 1988).

The social expectation of substance use is another commonly cited reason for increased rates of sexual assault on college campuses. In a review of the literature on substance use on college campuses, Prendergast (1994) concluded that 90% of college
students engage in substance use and 20 to 40% of those students are at high risk of
developing substance related problems due to their excessive and dangerous use.
Research has demonstrated a strong relationship between substance use and sexual
assault. In a national sample of college students, 55% of sexual assault victims endorsed
substance use at the time of their sexual assault, where 74% of perpetrators reported
substance use (Koss, 1988).

A Cultural Theory of Rape

Feminist scholars have hypothesized that reasons for this “silent epidemic” go far
beyond demographics and alcohol use to an overall cultural theory of rape (Brownmiller,
1975; Buchwald, Fletcher, & Roth, 2005; Herman, 1984). The cultural theory of rape, or
rape culture, originated in the 1970s during the rise of second wave feminism. Since its
advent, many scholars have referred to the United States, and several other environments,
as rape cultures. Although this construct has been cited frequently, limited effort has been
made to verify this theory empirically.

The majority of scholarship on rape culture has been theoretical in nature. Theorists have broadly defined rape culture as “a pervasive ideology that effectively
supports or excuses sexual assault” (Burt, 1980, p. 218). Martha Burt (1980) presented
the most comprehensive model of this ideology in an effort to quantify the construct of
rape myth acceptance. In this model, sex role stereotyping, adversarial sexual beliefs, and
acceptance of interpersonal violence were hypothesized to make up a rape supportive
culture, or rape culture. In 1995, Lonsway and Fitzgerald expanded on Burt’s model of
rape culture to include sexism and hostility towards women. They also expanded the
construct of acceptance of interpersonal violence to include a more broad definition of violence.

Sex role stereotyping, is an outdated term synonymous with traditional gender roles. The term traditional gender roles replaced sex role stereotyping in current research due to the distinction between sex and gender (Johnson & Repta, 2012). Sex is defined as “a biological construct that encapsulates the anatomical, physiological, genetic, and hormonal variation that exist in species” (p. 19). On the other hand, gender is typically viewed as a “multidimensional, context-specific factor that changes according to time and place” (p. 18). Therefore, because Burt (1980) discussed sex role stereotyping as assumed roles, responsibilities, and interests of men and women based on cultural norms and expectations, a more accurate title is traditional gender roles. Thus, for the remainder of the document, the construct defined above will be referred to as traditional gender roles. Traditional gender roles include that men are dominant and women are submissive; men are aggressive and women are passive; men are strong and women are fragile; men are sexual and women are pure. Traditional gender roles have been linked to sexual objectification of women. In these ways, individuals who adhere to traditional gender roles are more likely to see women as sexual objects, whose sole purpose is the pleasure of men. Herman (1984) argued that rape is a “logical outcome” based on the roles to which men and women subscribe.

Sexism is another factor closely linked to both traditional gender roles and in turn rape culture (Burt, 1980; Guy, 2006; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999). Sexism may be defined as discrimination against individuals based on their biological sex. Individuals are often discriminated against when they do not fit what
is expected of them (e.g., by violating the assumption of traditional gender roles). For example, if a woman is aggressive she may experience discrimination, whereas, if a man is passive he may experience similar discrimination. Our society encourages adherence to gender roles in order to avoid negative consequences and increase positive feedback (Guy, 2006). Further, at the core of sexism is the belief that men are superior to women. This again encourages the notion that women are merely objects for men’s pleasure, and therefore, normalizes rape. Guy (2006) stated, “[…] sexual violence is the inevitable result of sexism” (p. 5).

Also linked to rape culture is the belief that all “sexual relationships are fundamentally exploitative” (Burt, 1980, p. 218). Burt (1980) refers to this belief as adversarial sexual beliefs. Adversarial sexual beliefs include the notions that women are sly and manipulative and men are only after sex. It is proposed that individuals who accept these beliefs are more likely to excuse or rationalize rape, especially in incidences of date rape. One rationale for rape based on adversarial sexual beliefs is, women know going into dates that men expect sex; therefore, if a woman did not want to have sex she should not have agreed to a date.

Linked to adversarial sexual beliefs is the idea that women are all inherently ill willed. Women are seen as deceitful, coercive beings, which leads some to assume that women will do anything to get ahead and are therefore not to be trusted. Holding this negative view towards women is proposed to justify and legitimate violence against women and thus, perpetuate a rape culture. Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) refer to this concept as hostility towards women.
Finally, the belief that violence is justified and in certain circumstances desired leads to a culture that accepts and encourages violence (Burt, 1980; Herman, 1984; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; Payne et al., 1999). Herman (1984) argued that the United States is a nation with an underlying theme of violence. The rates of violence in the United States further solidify this point. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, 4,935,983 individuals were victims of violent crimes in 2010.

Due to the cultural value placed on men and the denigration of women, violence against women is particularly accepted in the United States (Chang et al., 2006; RAINN, 2013). Further, Burt (1980) argued that a strong association between sex and violence has been created in this culture. For example, the media often portrays rough sexual encounters as stimulating. Therefore, the notion that women want and enjoy rough sex is often used to justify sexual assault and violent behavior towards women. The statistics of violence against women support this assumption of acceptance. A woman is sexually assaulted every two minutes (RAINN, 2013) and every year 1.5 million women report experiencing intimate partner violence (Chang et al., 2006).

Although, as described above, an extensive model of rape culture has been proposed, no research to date has examined whether these attitudinal components create an underlying latent variable theorists have labeled rape culture (Critelli & Bivona, 2008). Many researchers have examined rape culture using one or two of these attitudinal components, or an assumed proxy of rape culture known as rape myth acceptance (Armstrong, Hamilton, & Sweeney, 2006; Boswell & Spade, 1996; Check & Malamuth, 1983; Koss, Leonard, Beezley, & Oros, 1985; Malamuth, 1983; McMahon, 2007; Mulliken, 2004; Rozee, 1993; Sanday, 1996; Talbot, Neill, & Rankin, 2010). Without a
consistent quantification of rape culture, limited conclusions can be drawn about the existence, and in turn extinction of rape culture. Given the proposed role of rape culture in perpetuating and excusing rape, such research is sorely needed.

*Rape Myth Acceptance*

As previously stated, many researchers have used rape myth acceptance as a proxy for rape culture. Burt (1980) defined rape myths as “prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists” (p. 217). Payne and colleagues identified a consistent structure of rape myths in 1999. They found seven related categories of rape myth: she wanted it, she lied, she asked for it, it wasn’t really rape, rape is a trivial event, rape is deviant, and he didn’t mean to. Burt proposed that rape myths are an outgrowth of rape culture, and since then rape myth acceptance has been the main focus of research examining rape culture (Armstrong et al., 2006; Koss et al., 1985; Malamuth, 1983; McMahon, 2007; Mulliken, 2004). These categories of rape myths demonstrate a common theme of victim blaming. Mardorossian (2002) stated, “only gendered crimes generate the kind of victim-blaming rape and domestic violence produce” (p. 756). Blame is a common response to the disclosure of rape or domestic violence (Ullman, 1996). A victim’s behavior is often brought into question, even in the legal realm. In situations of rape women are often asked why they did not do more to stop the rape from occurring, or why they decided, for instance, to go back to a man’s apartment.

The experience of victim blaming often leads to internalization of victim blame. Many women blame themselves following rape and perceive that they could have done more to avoid or control the crime. This self-blame has been related to a number of
negative consequences following rape including substance abuse, symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder, depression, and interpersonal or sexual dysfunction (Ullman, 1996). This victim-blaming tendency is likely related to the grossly underreported nature of rape (Herman, 1984; Mori, Bernat, Glenn, Selle & Zarate, 1995). This concept has been supported with research demonstrating that internalized blame and acceptance of rape myths lead to silencing. Thus, women who blamed themselves for being raped were far less likely to report or disclose sexual assault, perpetuating culture’s acceptance or expectance of rape (Burnett, Mattern, Herakova, Kahl, Tobola & Bornsen, 2009).

In addition to the theme of victim blaming, the notion of accepting falsified information is a core characteristic of rape myths. Research has disputed most, if not all, of the culturally accepted rape myths. First, research has demonstrated that women are far more likely not to report rape than to lie about it (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). As discussed, rape is one of the most underreported crimes in the United States; this statistic debunks the assumption that women often lie about rape. Further, research investigating what “type” of woman is more likely to be raped has been inconclusive; research has instead suggested that all women are vulnerable to rape (Mardorossian, 2002). Statistics of rape provide evidence against the rape myth that rape is a novel event. And finally, research reveals that men who rape are not “deviant” but rather normative in terms of “personality, appearance, intelligence, behavior, and sexual drive” (Herman, 1984, p. 49).

Given the plethora of research rejecting rape myths, a logical next question is why do people continue to hold these assumptions in the face of such strong contradictory evidence? One suggestion is psychological safety. Rape myths have been linked to the
just world belief or the belief that good things happen to good people. Having this belief allows people to feel safe and in control (e.g. if I am good, nothing bad will happen to me). Thus, removing this safety mechanism via admitting that rape myths are false comes with a great risk and cost (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994).

Another potential reason for this acceptance of rape myths, which has yet to be explored, is the proposed relationship between rape myths and rape culture. As described, rape myths are assumed to result from a rape supportive culture (Burt, 1980). Therefore, it may be difficult for individuals to change assumptions regarding rape in a culture that accepts, and excuses, such behavior. Cultural norms and attitudes may need to be adjusted in order for rape myths to be truly undermined in the eyes of society. Research is needed to further solidify the construct of rape culture and in turn determine the proposed relationship between rape culture and rape myth acceptance. Without research evidence, it appears premature to assume that rape myth acceptance is an adequate proxy for rape culture.

Rape Prevention Programming

Literature on rape prevention is one avenue that has consistently used rape myth acceptance as a proxy for rape culture (Banyard, Eckstien, & Moynihan, 2010; McMahon, 2010; McMahon & Banyard, 2012). Before discussing this limitation to the existent literature, it is important to review the history of rape prevention programming on college campuses and the current cultural shift in programming. Until recently, prevention programs have solely focused on individual level change. These educational programs taught women how to avoid being victims, and following a feminist outcry, educated men on how not to be rapists (Schewe & O’Donohue, 1993). Although this has
been the dominant model of programming for years, limited research has been conducted on the efficacy and effectiveness of these approaches.

The extant research demonstrates little to no effect of such programming. Schewe and O’Donohue’s (1993) review of the literature on prevention programming concluded that educational models of rape prevention programming lead to increased defensiveness among participants. As previously discussed, individuals strive to feel safe and in control, even at the expense of accepting misinformation. Limited material was likely absorbed from traditional programming, as many women refuse to believe they could be victims of rape and many men refuse to acknowledge they could perpetuate rape. Further, critics of educational models of rape prevention have suggested that these forms of programming may actually encourage victim blaming. This may occur by primarily focusing on a victim’s behavior and her, or his, role as an active participant in rape scenarios. Victim blaming has been suggested as one component perpetuating a community wide rape culture. Given these legitimate concerns, theorists proposed a new vision for rape prevention programming, the bystander approach (Banyard et al., 2004; Carr & Ward, 2006; CDC, 2004).

*The Bystander Approach to Rape Prevention*

Darley and Latane (1968) first presented the bystander approach to prevention. This approach was proposed in response to research demonstrating that bystanders were unlikely to respond with action in emergencies situations, better known as the bystander effect. Based on their research, Darley and Latane suggested three components that must be present to ignite bystander behavior: awareness of the event, interpretation that immediate attention is warranted, and perception of responsibility. The approach of
bystander intervention has been applied to various prevention efforts including bullying (Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2012), drug overdose (Doe-Simkins, Walley, Epstein, & Moyer, 2009; Lankenau et al., 2013), suicide (Kalafat, Elias, & Gara 1993), and dating violence (Taylor, Stein, Woods, & Mumford, 2011).

In 1995, Katz proposed the bystander approach to rape prevention. Katz argued that teaching individuals how to be proactive bystanders, rather than how not to be victims or perpetrators, would decrease defensiveness and victim blaming and in turn increase effectiveness of rape prevention programming. Since then, many theorists have developed various programs for preventing rape using the bystander approach (Banyard et al., 2004; Berkowitz, 2002; DeKeseredy, Schwartz, & Alvi, 2000; Foubert, 2000; Foubert & Marriott, 1997; Katz, 1994; Slagy & Stringham, 1994). Although these models vary in regards to presentation and target population (e.g. male, female, or combined programs), they all hold the same basic goals and underlying principles. The bystander approach to rape prevention aims to teach individuals how to effectively, and safely, intervene before, during, and after potential rape scenarios.

Banyard and colleagues (2004), creators of Bringing in the Bystander, proposed that increasing prosocial bystander behavior before, during, and after rape and sexual assault will result in community level change. They argue that targeting potential bystanders creates an opportunity for an entire community to actively participate in rape prevention without the risk of defensiveness. Creating a cultural norm of awareness, responsibility, and action, may make a shift in rape supportive attitudes possible. Therefore, while the immediate goal of bystander prevention may be increased bystander
behavior, the ultimate goal is to change the rape supportive culture of many college campuses (Carr & Ward, 2006).

Researchers have begun to investigate the efficacy and effectiveness of the bystander approach to rape prevention. Early findings are positive, demonstrating an increase in bystander willingness to intervene following rape prevention programming and a decrease in rape myth acceptance (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007; Coker et al., 2011; Foubert, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Brasfield, & Hill, 2010; Moynihan, Banyard, Arnold, Eckstein, & Stapleton, 2011). However, research has yet to demonstrate whether this willingness to intervene translates into actual behavioral change.

Research investigating bystander behavior has documented limited efficacy and advocates suggest the need for longitudinal research to demonstrate such behavior change. Further, most research examining the falsification of rape myths has been pre-post in design. Therefore, little is known about the lasting effects of this prevention approach (Gidycz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011; Heppner, Humphrey, Hillenbrand-Gunn, & DeBord, 1995). Given the notion that rape myth acceptance and rape culture are separate, but related, constructs, once an individual leaves the bubble of the prevention environment and enters into the rape supportive culture of college campuses, any reduction seen in rape myths as a result of insulated programming may be temporary.

Proponents of the bystander approach to rape prevention suggest that bystander interventions also alter rape culture (Banyard et al., 2004; Coker et al., 2011). However, no research to date has investigated whether a relationship even exists between bystander behavior and rape culture. Therefore, before accepting the claim that the bystander approach to rape prevention alters the supportive culture of rape, it is imperative to
examine whether this relationship even exists. The idea that rape culture may explain the exceptionally high rate of sexual assault and rape on college campuses suggests that prevention programs should target the attitudes that create a rape supportive environment. Therefore, it is crucial to examine whether there is a direct relationship between bystander behavior and rape culture, which would contribute a compelling rationale for targeting bystander behavior in prevention efforts.

Summary

The purpose of the present investigation is to explore the validity of the construct rape culture, as well as to explore the construct’s relationship with bystander behavior and bystander willingness to intervene. Consistent with previous research (Armstrong et al., 2006; Boswell & Spade, 1996; Check & Malamuth, 1983; Koss et al., 1985; Malamuth, 1983; Rozee, 1993; Sanday, 1996), the present study utilizes the cultural theory of rape (Brownmiller, 1975; Burt, 1980; Herman, 1984; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; 1995) as its theoretical framework. More specifically, the study plans to explore whether traditional gender roles, sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, and acceptance of violence underlie the proposed construct of rape culture. The overall aim of this examination is to first identify a cohesive picture of rape culture grounded in theoretical and empirical research and explore whether such a construct is directly related to bystander behavior and willingness to intervene, which has been the target of recent rape prevention programming in an effort to create a cultural shift on college campuses (Banyard et al., 2010; Banyard et al., 2004; Katz, 1995; Rich, 2010). Such research is consistent with Counseling Psychology’s emphasis on social justice and the field’s historic push stressing the importance of prevention efforts.
CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter one identified the social epidemic of rape and sexual assault on college campuses across the United States, as well as the proposed sociocultural contributing factors. Further, chapter one discussed the movement of rape prevention efforts away from a solely educational model of prevention to a bystander approach, which aims to alter the rape supportive environment of college campuses. The current chapter provides a critical review of the existent literature pertaining to the above-mentioned topics.

Theoretical Work on Rape Culture

In 1975 Susan Brownmiller wrote a feminist classic, *Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape*. Brownmiller (1975) highlighted culture’s role in normalizing and accepting rape. She proposed that from early in life girls are taught that they are defenseless victims who need to fear men, but in the same vain need men to protect them. Prior to Brownmiller, rape had been viewed as a “natural,” and in turn unavoidable, part of the world in which we live. Although this notion was widely accepted, and still exists today, research investigating this claim has fallen short of validation. Research has identified vast differences between and among cultures, and time, in rates and experiences of rape. Further, animal studies on rape have demonstrated diffuse disparities among rape in human society and rape in the wild. One of the most apparent differences
is the gendered occurrence of rape in human society and lack of such experience in the wild.

The term “rape culture” was coined following Brownmiller’s influential work. In 1984, Herman suggested several factors contributing to the existence and continuation of a “rape culture.” First, she suggested that there is an underlying theme linking violence and sexuality stating, “Our society is a rape culture because it encourages rape by teaching males and females that it is natural and normal for sexual relations to involve aggressive behavior on the part of males” (p. 52). Additional evidence for this point is the common occurrence of date rape on college campuses, and throughout society as a whole (Fischer et al., 2000; Koss, 1988; Planty et al., 2013). Despite the general knowledge of its occurrence, date rape is rarely reported to the police. Further, even when date rape is reported, substantial action is rarely taken against the perpetrator (Flintort, 2010; Koss, 1988; Planty et al., 2013). In fact, until recent times, date rape, and more specifically, marital rape, was not considered illegal. It was not until 1993 that all states removed the exemption of marital rape from rape statutes (RAINN, 2013). Consistent with the idea of sexuality and violence being linked in everyday society, research on perpetrators has demonstrated the “normalcy” of individuals who perpetrate rape. Herman (1984) stated that rapists are not deviant, but rather normal in terms of “personality, appearance, intelligence, behavior, and sexual drive” (p. 49).

In addition to the link between sexuality and violence, theorists, including Herman (1984), have hypothesized the role of traditional gender roles in shaping a societal expectation and acceptance of male to female rape (Buchwald et al., 2005; Kimmel, 2005). Traditional gender roles create a rape culture by encouraging aggression
and dominance in men and passivity and submissiveness in women. “American culture produces rapists when it encourages the socialization of men to subscribe to values of control and dominance, callousness and competitiveness, and anger and aggression, and when it discourages the expression by men of vulnerability, sharing, and cooperation” (p. 49). This again clarifies the notion that rapists are not deviant, but rather individuals responding to cultural expectations of aggression and dominance. In fact, men who defy these cultural expectations may receive backlash and be deemed “deviant” or “abnormal” (Guy, 2006; Kimmel, 2005). Furthermore, women are often caught in a double bind during an incidence of rape. On one hand, cultural norms expect women to be “pure” and therefore, fight against male advancements. However, women are also taught to be submissive and passive and therefore, speaking up against male advancements may also be looked down upon based on traditional gender roles. Therefore, following sexual assault, women are often blamed for “putting themselves in risky situations” or not “fitting back,” when culture teaches women that it is not their place, or right, to fight back against men. This statement leads to another theme of rape culture, the devaluation of women, or sexism (Herman, 1984; Griffin, 1971).

Herman (1984) suggested that at the core of rape culture is the assumption that women are less than men. Therefore, sexism maintains the imbalance of power between men and women and thus, limits women’s ability to have their voices heard both figuratively, through victim blaming, and literally, through ignoring the word “no.” In a powerful theoretical piece on rape culture, Griffin (1971) referred to rape as a form of “terrorism” that limits women’s freedom and ability to live independent of men. Thus,
sexism perpetuates women’s limited power and reliance on men and in turn places them at a vulnerable position of both fearing and being dependent upon the “superior” male.

Proposed Model of Rape Culture

Although the term rape culture was coined in the 1970s, a comprehensive model of this construct was not proposed until 1980. Based on feminist and social psychological research, Burt (1980) suggested that rape culture was made up of four underlying attitudes and beliefs. She labeled these: sex role stereotyping, adversarial sexual beliefs, sexual conservatism, and acceptance of interpersonal violence. Sex role stereotyping was defined as the assumption and expectation of traditional gender roles. The “expectation that sexual relationships are fundamentally exploitative, that each party to them is manipulative, sly, cheating, opaque to the other’s understanding, and not to be trusted” (p.218) outlined adversarial sexual beliefs. The construct of sexual conservatism consisted of placing restrictions on sexual behavior. Finally, acceptance of interpersonal violence was defined as the “notion that force and coercion are legitimate ways to gain compliance and specifically that they are legitimate in intimate and sexual relationships” (p.218).

Even though Burt (1980) proposed one of the first theoretical models of rape culture, this was not the primary purpose of her 1980 research. Rather, Burt sought to quantify the concept of rape myth acceptance. Rape myths were defined as “prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists” (p. 217). She hypothesized that these myths were the result of a rape supportive culture, made up of the complex ideology described above.
To assess the hypothesis that rape culture was made up of the beliefs and attitudes described above and that this culture was predictive of rape myth acceptance, Burt (1980) conducted a multiple regression with sex role stereotyping, adversarial sexual beliefs, sexual conservatism, and acceptance of interpersonal violence as predictors of rape myth acceptance in a sample of 598 adults residing in Minnesota (age, $M = 42$, $SD = 17$; 60% female). Based on this analysis, nonsignificant paths were removed from the proposed model of rape culture. Results demonstrated significant prediction of rape myth acceptance via acceptance of interpersonal violence, adversarial sexual beliefs, and sex role stereotyping. These variables together (i.e. rape culture) accounted for 46.6% of rape myth acceptance. No relationship was identified for sexual conservatism. Therefore, sexual conservatism was removed from the model of rape culture. Correlations between the variables explored demonstrated moderate, positive relationships, suggesting that these variables are related, but distinct constructs.

Although Burt’s work was imperative, it was not without its limitations. Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994) set out to expand, and clarify, Burt’s proposed model of both rape myth acceptance and rape culture. The authors elaborated on Burt’s work stating,

Rape myths are false or apocryphal beliefs that are widely held; they explain some important cultural phenomenon; and they serve to justify existing cultural arrangements. When this analysis is combined with the assumptions of the cultural theory of rape, a clear definition of rape myths can be proposed. Rape myths are attitudes and beliefs that are generally false but are widely and persistently held, and that serve to deny and justify male sexual aggression against women (p. 134).

In order to identify a thorough model of rape culture and rape myth acceptance, Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994) conducted a literature review examining all relevant research. Based on this review, the researchers identified several influential factors of rape myths,
including demographic variables and cultural beliefs and attitudes. In regards to
demographics, men were found to generally be more accepting of rape myths as
compared to women (Ashton, 1982; Barnett & Field, 1977; Blumberg & Lester, 1991;
Borden, Karr, & Caldwell-Colbert, 1988; Brady, Chrisler, Hosdale, Osowiecki, & Veal,
1991; Dull & Giacopassi, 1987; Ellis, O’Sullivan, & Sowards, 1992; Fonow, Richardson,
& Wemmerus, 1992; Gilmartin-Zena, 1987, 1988; Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987; Larsen &
Long, 1988; Margolin, Miller, & Moran, 1989; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987; Reilly,
Further, racial minorities (i.e., African Americans and Latino/Hispanics) tended to
endorse greater rape myth acceptance than whites (Dull & Giacopassi, 1987; Fischer,
1987; Giacopassi & Dull, 1986). Finally, knowing someone who was a survivor of rape
contributed to lower agreement with rape myths (Burt, 1980; Field, 1978; Gilmartin-
Zena, 1987; Hamilton & Yee, 1990). All other demographic variables explored did not
result in consistent patterns (e.g., age, education, occupation, knowledge and awareness
of rape) (Burt, 1980; Burt & Albin, 1981; Dull & Giacopassi, 1987; Field, 1978;
hypothesis that rape myth acceptance is a direct result of a rape supportive culture,
Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994) proposed gender, race, and association with a survivor of
rape as influential variables of rape culture.

In examining cultural beliefs and attitudes related to rape myth acceptance,
Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994) identified initial support for Burt’s (1980) model of rape
culture. Multiple researchers established a positive relationship between adversarial
sexual beliefs and rape myth acceptance, with individuals reporting more adversarial
sexual beliefs endorsing greater acceptance of rape myths (Burt, 1980; Burt & Albin, 1981; Check & Malamuth, 1985; Fonow et al., 1992; Murphy, Coleman, & Haynes, 1986; Quackenbush, 1989; Reilly et al., 1992; Senn & Radtke, 1990; Ward, 1988). Further, higher rape myth acceptance was associated with higher commitment to traditional gender roles, or sex role stereotyping (Bunting & Reeves, 1983; Burt, 1980; Check & Malamuth, 1983, 1985; Costin, 1985; Costin & Schwarz, 1987; Fischer, 1986; Fonow et al., 1992; Hall, Howard, & Boezio, 1986; Larsen & Long, 1988; Mayerson & Taylor, 1987; Muehlenhard & MacNaughton, 1988; Quackenbush, 1989; Spanos et al, 1992; Weidner, 1983). Finally, acceptance of interpersonal violence was consistently identified as a predictor of rape myth acceptance (Burt, 1980; Burt & Albin, 1981; Check & Malamuth, 1985; Mynatt & Allgeier, 1990; Quackenbush, 1989; Saunders, Lynch, Grayson, & Linz, 1987; Ward, 1988).

Although Lonsway and Fitzgerald’s (1994) meta-analysis established initial support for Burt’s model of rape culture, it also uncovered a number of concerns regarding these conclusions. First, the majority of research examining these relationships utilized Burt’s (1980) proposed measures of adversarial sexual beliefs, sex role stereotyping, acceptance of interpersonal violence, and rape myth acceptance despite their lack of demonstrated reliability and validity. Burt created each of these measures in 1980 in an effort to quantify the construct of rape myth acceptance. “Pretests using large item pools were conducted to select promising items for each scale” (Burt, 1980, p. 221). Following the original construction of these scales, no research was conducted to determine the reliability or validity of these measures. This is especially troublesome given Lonsway and Fitzgerald’s criticism that Burt’s measure of adversarial sexual
beliefs is convoluted with the construct hostility towards women. Upon closer
investigation of the items on Burt’s scale of adversarial sexual beliefs, only two out of
nine discussed beliefs associated with men. Therefore, Lonsway and Fitzgerald suggested
that Burt’s measure might be assessing a general negative attitude towards women, as
compared to gender-neutral adversarial sexual beliefs. Thus, they suggested the
importance of examining hostility towards women as a predictor of rape myth acceptance
and in turn a characteristic of rape culture.

Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994) also identified apprehension regarding Burt’s
measurement of acceptance of interpersonal violence. They argued that Burt’s measure
better assessed the construct of acceptance of violence against women in sexually
intimate relationships. They concluded this given the lack of examination into other
forms of interpersonal relationships (e.g., family, friends). Further, Burt’s (1980) measure
of acceptance of interpersonal violence demonstrated poor internal consistency with a
Cronbach’s alpha of .586. Thus, Lonsway and Fitzgerald suggested the importance of
examining acceptance of violence more generally, including other interpersonal
relationships and acceptance of violence outside of interpersonal relationships (e.g., death
penalty, war). Based on these observations, in 1994 examination, Lonsway and Fitzgerald
fleshed out Burt’s concept of sex role stereotyping to include both adherence to
traditional gender roles and sexism. This was concluded, given that the majority of
research, to date, did not utilize Burt’s measure of sex role stereotyping, but rather
utilized measures of traditional gender roles and/or sexism (Bunting & Reeves, 1983;
Burt, 1980; Check & Malamuth, 1983, 1985; Costin, 1985; Costin & Schwarz, 1987;
Fischer, 1986; Fonow et al., 1992; Hall et al., 1986; Larsen & Long, 1988; Mayerson &
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Taylor, 1987; Muehlenhard & MacNaughton, 1988; Quackenbush, 1989; Spanos et al, 1992; Weidner, 1983).

Given criticisms of the measurement of adversarial sexual beliefs and acceptance of interpersonal violence, Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) set out to clarify Burt’s (1980) theoretical model of rape culture and rape myth acceptance, as well as determine convergent and discriminate validity of the proposed constructs. Lonsway and Fitzgerald adapted Burt’s measures of adversarial sexual beliefs and acceptance of interpersonal violence to more accurately represent the constructs as proposed by Burt in 1980. They then examined the original and adapted measures’ relationship with hostility towards women, which was measured using a well established, empirically sound measure the **Hostility Towards Women Scale** (Check, Malamuth, Elias, & Barton, 1985). Finally, they conducted a series of multiple regressions examining the ability of these measures to predict endorsement of rape myths.

The results of the multiple regressions demonstrated support for Lonsway and Fitzgerald’s (1995) notion that Burt’s (1980) original measures of adversarial sexual beliefs and acceptance of interpersonal violence were convoluted with the construct of hostility towards women. This conclusion was supported given that hostility towards women was identified as a unique predictor of rape myths once it was removed from Burt’s original measures of adversarial sexual beliefs and acceptance of interpersonal violence, which resulted in a pure assessment of each construct.

Although Lonsway and Fitzgerald’s (1995, 1994) work contributed greatly to the clarification of rape culture and rape myth acceptance, it was not without its limitations. First, although Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994) identified traditional gender roles and
sexism as contributors to a rape supportive culture and predictors of rape myth acceptance, they did not explore these variables in their analyses. Second, although Lonsway and Fitzgerald’s 1995 work demonstrated support for the hypothesis that hostility towards women is an important predictor of rape myths and contributor to rape culture, they drew more from this conclusion than may be determined based on the data alone. The authors concluded that the aforementioned constructs likely tap into a “multidimensional misogyny” construct (i.e., rape culture) where “hostility towards women constitutes the core of any such construct” (p. 709). However, such an assumption does not flow directly from the statistical analyses conducted and results of such analyses. Results of the multiple regression consisting of the “pure constructs” (e.g. variables with removed convolution of hostility towards women) identified unique contributions among all the predictors of rape myth acceptance (i.e., adversarial sexual beliefs, acceptance of general violence, and hostility towards women). Further, Pearson correlations of these variables indicated moderate positive relationships, demonstrating related, but distinct, constructs (adversarial sexual beliefs and hostility, $r = .494$; adversarial sexual beliefs and acceptance of general violence, $r = .453$, and hostility towards women and acceptance of general violence, $r = .337$).

As previously mentioned, research strongly points to five unique, but related, constructs underlying the latent variable rape culture (Burt, 1980; Lonsway & Fitzgearld, 1994; 1995). However, given the lack of exploration into model fit of the proposed construct, it is crucial to examine alternative possibilities in order to determine the best fitting model of rape culture. An alternative possibility of model fit includes three underlying constructs of rape culture: traditional gender roles and sexism combined,
adversarial sexual beliefs and hostility towards women combined, and acceptance of
general violence remaining a distinct third variable. This model evolved from prior
research linking traditional gender roles and sexism, as well as adversarial sexual beliefs
and hostility towards women (Burt, 1980; Herman, 1984; Kimmel, 2005; Lonsway &

In previous literature on rape culture, traditional gender roles and sexism have
often been discussed in conjunction. When describing the interconnection of these
variables, Kimmel (2005) stated, “Difference equals power. The difference between male
and female sexuality reproduces men’s power over women” (p. 142). Thus, men and
women are ascribed certain roles (i.e., traditional gender roles) in order to reinforce the
idea that men and women are inherently different and in turn unequal, which is at the
core of sexism. Further, men are socialized via traditional gender roles to be powerful and
dominant, whereas women are socialized to be weak and submissive reinforcing the
notion that women are less than men, a direct connection between these two constructs
(Herman, 1984; Kimmel, 2005). Finally, traditional gender roles and sexism both
underlie the objectification of women by focusing on outer characteristics of women
rather than inner, and seeing women as less than men and valued solely for their relation
to men (Sanday, 1996).

Likewise, in terms of adversarial sexual beliefs and hostility towards women,
mistrust of women strongly underlies both constructs (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). As
assessment of adversarial sexual beliefs was convoluted with the construct of hostility
towards women. Therefore, an adapted measure of hostility towards women was created
to increase gender neutrality. Although the adapted measure is more representative of male and female relationships, the theme of mistrust towards women still remains apparent. Further, research exploring the relationship between adversarial sexual beliefs and hostility towards women demonstrates a significant moderate relationship between these two variables \( r = .50 - .62 \) (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; 1995).

Following the aforementioned studies, Payne, Lonsway, and Fitzgerald (1999) conducted a series of studies to establish a valid and reliable measure of rape myth acceptance, referred to as the *Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale* (IRMA). Payne and colleagues developed a pool of 120 items via an extensive literature review. The pool of items was given to 780 undergraduate students; 604 in phase 1 and 176 in phase 2. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted in phase 1. This analysis resulted in 11 underlying factors; however, some factors only had two items loading on each factor. These factors were subsequently removed from future analyses. After removing these items, the best fitting structural model was a 45-item hierarchical model with an overall latent variable of rape myth acceptance and seven second order latent variables labeled as: she asked for it, it wasn’t really rape, he didn’t mean to, she wanted it, she lied, rape is a trivial event, and rape is a deviant event. Phase two demonstrated additional support for the factor structure identified in phase one. Test-retest reliability was determined \( r = .90 \) for the IRMA by repeating 20% of the items. Studies 4-6 were conducted to establish construct validity of the IRMA. Positive relationships were established between IRMA and traditional gender roles, sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, and acceptance of general violence, indicative of construct validity. Although Payne et al. (1999) established strong support for the model structure of rape myth acceptance, no
research to date has determined, or investigated, such support for the underlying model of rape culture. This work is imperative to future advancement of the field.

*Empirical Research on Rape Culture*

To date, empirical research examining the construct of rape culture has exclusively utilized one or two of the proposed components of rape culture (i.e., traditional gender roles, sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, or acceptance of violence) or examined rape myth acceptance as a proxy for rape culture (Armstrong et al., 2006; Boswell & Spade, 1996; Check & Malamuth, 1983; Koss et al., 1985; Malamuth, 1983; Rozee, 1993; Talbot et al., 2010). Various researchers have suggested that proposed variable(s) are indicative of rape culture if they demonstrate predictive ability of sexually aggressive behavior in men (Check & Malamuth, 1983; Koss et al., 1985; Malamuth, 1983). Below are the most influential studies, to date, exploring the variables underlying rape culture.

Armstrong and colleagues (2006) conducted a qualitative examination of “party rape.” Based on ethnographic observations of women in a “party dorm,” a term commonly used in college communities to describe a dormitory where students often socialize through drinking, and in-depth interviews with 42 residents, the researchers concluded that party rape is mainly a result of a cultural adherence to traditional gender roles. They discussed this in the context of a party environment, consisting of a large group of young, single co-eds immensely concerned with social status and fitting in with fellow coeds.

Boswell and Spade (1996) also conducted a qualitative analysis in an effort to quantify rape culture on college campuses. The authors explored differences between
fraternities identified as “high risk” for rape and “low risk” for rape. Fraternities were placed into these two categories via various methods: formal interviews, informal interviews, and observations. The same methods were used to establish differences between these categories. Results demonstrated gender inequality, or sexism, as the key component differentiating low risk and high risk fraternities. Further influential variables included hostility towards women and acceptance of rape myths. The authors concluded by suggesting the importance of further examination and clarification into the construct of rape culture.

In 1985, Koss and colleagues examined the validity of two predictive models of rape, the psychopathology theory and the cultural theory (i.e., rape culture) in a sample of 1,846 sexually aggressive and nonsexually aggressive undergraduate men. The psychopathology theory of rape hypothesized that sexually aggressive men were psychologically “deviant”, thus resulting in sexually aggressive behavior. On the other hand, the cultural theory of rape, as previously described, proposed that sexually aggressive behavior among men was the result of a social environment that encouraged rape supportive attitudes such as: adversarial sexual beliefs, traditional gender roles, acceptance of violence and the acceptance of rape myths. Results of stepwise discriminate analyses demonstrated support for the cultural theory of rape, with adversarial sexual beliefs, traditional gender roles, acceptance of violence, and rape myth acceptance demonstrating the strongest differentiation between sexually aggressive and nonsexually aggressive undergraduate men. Further, no differences were identified between the groups on variables of psychopathology (i.e., psychopathic deviance, social anxiety scale, and hostility). Therefore, Koss and colleagues concluded that rape was less
about “deviance” and more about a cultural support of rape. This examination demonstrated further support for the aforementioned variables underlying a latent construct of rape culture and the importance of identifying and examining this variable, as it appears to be a main contributor to sexually aggressive behavior on college campuses.

Given the extant research on rape culture to date, as well as the common use of the term “rape culture,” one might assume that the underlying components of this construct have been well established and agreed upon. However, no research to date has directly tested the construct of rape culture as proposed by Burt in 1980, and adapted by Lonsway and Fitzgerald in 1995 (Critelli & Bivona, 2008). Rather, researchers have examined one or two of the variables purposed to underlie rape culture as representative of the overall construct, or utilized rape myth acceptance as a proxy for rape culture. Given the proposed multifaceted nature of rape culture, one cannot assume that one or two of the hypothesized underlying variables fully represent the latent construct as a whole. Furthermore, rape myth acceptance was suggested as a product of rape culture; therefore, one cannot assume equivalence between these two constructs. Moreover, although research has examined the existence and influence of the variables proposed by Burt (1980) and Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) on rape myth acceptance and sexually aggressive behavior (Armstrong et al., 2006; Boswell & Spade, 1996; Check & Malamuth, 1983; Koss et al., 1985; Malamuth, 1983; Rozee, 1993; Talbot et al., 2010), to date the factor structure of rape culture has never been examined via an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) or confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The current study conducted this
research, as such research is sorely needed to support the existence and quantification of rape culture.

In addition to the lack of research examining rape culture as a whole and the factor structure of such a construct, research to date has only explored the proposed components of rape culture at a personal/individual level rather than a peer/community level that has been discussed theoretically. Recently, researchers have hypothesized the importance of going beyond personal level explorations to investigating these variables at a social level, and more specifically at a level of perceived peer support (McMahon, 2007; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2000). Schwartz and DeKeserdy (2000) found that perceived peer support of sexism consistently predicted sexually aggressive behavior across Canadian universities. Male peer support was defined as “[…] the attachments to male peers who sexually and physically assault women and the resources the peers provide that perpetrate and legitimate this abuse” (Schwartz & DeKeserdy, 2000, p. 559).

In 2008, McMahon examined athletes’ support of rape myth acceptance on an individual level, quantitatively, and at a peer level, qualitatively, via peer-involved focus groups. From this study, she found that while athletes’ demonstrated limited personal support for rape myth acceptance, when they were in a group with their fellow peers, they endorsed such myths at significantly higher levels. Therefore, research has begun to demonstrate differences between individual and peer levels of rape myth acceptance, and given the proposed cultural nature of rape culture such differences are likely to exist between the factors suggested to underlie this latent cultural variable (i.e., traditional gender roles, sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, and acceptance of violence).
Bystander Approach to Rape Prevention

As demonstrated above, much work still remains in order to clarify and quantify the hypothesized latent variable of rape culture. However, given the proposed implications of such a construct on rates of rape and sexual violence across the United States, and especially within college campuses, researchers have created a form of rape prevention to target such a culture. Katz proposed the bystander model of rape prevention in 1995 as a result of research demonstrating that bystanders were unlikely to take action in emergency situations, better known as the bystander effect (Darley & Latane, 1968).

Throughout their research, Darley and Latane (1968) identified five necessary components for bystander action to occur: notice the event, interpret the event as an emergency, take responsibility, decide how to act, and choose to act. In 2009, Burn explored these components with 588 college students in order to better understand community action and inaction in potential rape scenarios. She found that all of these components impacted a participants’ willingness to intervene in a potential rape scenario. Specifically, she found that in order for participants to notice the event as a potential rape scenario, they needed knowledge and awareness that rape was common on college campuses, and they needed an altered/expanded definition of rape (e.g., acquaintance rape versus stranger rape). Further, participants’ decision to take action, even when they noticed the event, interpreted it as an emergency, and took responsibility, depended greatly on how “worthy” they saw the victim to be (e.g., sober versus drunk) and whether they saw others taking action, or had previously seen others take action in similar scenarios. Thus, Burn (2009) concluded the importance of change in social norms (i.e., rape culture) for potential rape scenarios to be viewed as a problem and victims to be
viewed as worthy of assistance. Given the aforementioned findings, the bystander approach to rape prevention proposed to alter rape culture via the creation of prosocial examples of bystander behavior, which in turn were hypothesized to alter community norms of inaction and the underlying rape supportive attitudes (Banyard et al., 2010; Banyard et al., 2004; Katz, 1994; Rich, 2010).

**Outcomes of Bystander Interventions**

Recently, the Center for Disease Control (CDC) (2004) and the American College Health Association (ACHA) (Carr & Ward, 2006) published position statements in support of bystander models of rape prevention. Both the CDC and ACHA discussed their support of bystander models in terms of their ability to alter community norms through the creation of prosocial bystander behavior (Carr & Ward, 2006; CDC, 2004). Research assessing the efficacy and effectiveness of bystander models of rape prevention is currently in its infancy. The extant research to date has demonstrated early support for these programs in terms of decreasing rape myth acceptance and increasing bystander willingness to intervene (Banyard, Moynihan, & Crossman, 2009; Banyard et al., 2007; Coker et al., 2011; Foubert et al., 2010; Moynihan et al., 2010; Moynihan, Banyard, Arnold, Eckstein, & Stapleton, 2011; Potter & Moynihan, 2011). However, research has demonstrated limited support in the realm of actual behavior change following these programs and has yet to explore the assumed relationship between bystander intervention and rape culture.

Consistent with research assessing “rape culture,” research exploring the supposed relationship between rape culture and bystander behavior has mainly utilized rape myth acceptance as a proxy for rape culture (Banyard et al., 2010; McMahon, 2010;
McMahon & Banyard, 2012). Within these studies, researchers have consistently found a negative relationship between rape myth acceptance and bystander intervention (i.e., bystander behavior and willingness to intervene). Further, Brown and Messman-Moore (2010) explored the predictive ability of individual versus perceived peer support of rape supportive attitudes on bystander behavior. Questions assessing support for sexual aggression and rape myths were reworded to explore perceived peer support of sexual aggression (e.g., “Most of my peers think sexual assault is wrong”). The researchers utilized rape myth acceptance as their sole indicator of rape supportive attitudes. Results demonstrated that while both individual and perceived peer support of rape myths were predictive of willingness to intervene in potential rape scenarios, perceived peer support was a stronger predictor. When individual and perceived peer support of rape myths were entered together as predictors of willingness to intervene, individual support of rape myths contributed almost no variance ($r^2 = <.001$), while perceived peer support of rape myths remained a significant predictor of willingness to intervene ($r^2 = .10$). The authors concluded that this observation provides support for rape prevention efforts to target more than just individual change, but also change at a cultural, community level. These findings have been used to demonstrate support for the theory underlying the bystander approach to rape prevention, that increasing bystander intervention results in a larger community change which diminishes rape culture.

Recently, researchers have discussed the importance of investigating more than just rape myth acceptance when exploring the proposed relationship between bystander intervention and rape culture (McMahon & Banyard, 2012). Qualitatively, research has begun to explore the relationship between bystander interventions and various rape
supportive attitudes. In 2011, Gidycz and colleagues evaluated the impact of a men’s only bystander program in a sample of 635 undergraduate men. At one and seven months post-intervention, they found a decrease in sexually aggressive behavior, an increase in ability to identify various rape scenarios, and a decrease in involvement with rape supportive peers. They identified perceived peer support of sexual assault as the primary factor impacting their behavior and awareness. This highlights the importance of prosocial role models and the significance of a cultural change in rape supportive attitudes as key variables to target in rape prevention efforts.

Carlson demonstrated further evidence for the impact of peer support of rape supportive attitudes on bystander intervention in 2008. She conducted a series of interviews with 20 college men examining various potential rape scenarios and what factors would impact their decision of action or inaction. The result of these interviews demonstrated the strong role of masculine gender roles on decisions to intervene. Men were far more likely to intervene in a public situation if an unknown man was physically attacking a woman, due to their assumed “duty to protect,” than to act in a private situation if a group of friends were assaulting a woman under the influence (e.g., gang rape). Below are various responses men gave for why they would likely choose inaction in a gang rape or domestic dispute:

Oh definitely, because I entered another man’s territory. The man’s territory being his girl and henceforth by entering his domain I’ve desecrated his territory supposedly. They’re not going to leave; they’re not going to do anything about it. ‘Cuz they’re too scared to look like a pussy leaving the room. I think they’re pressured to cheer him on because they don’t want to look weak in front of their other friends. Basically, if they tried to stop it, you know it would be over for them. People would give them shit about it all the time. They’d probably be looked down upon. They’d be viewed as too sensitive (p.10).
Generally, the pressure to be seen as “masculine” greatly impacted men’s willingness to engage in bystander behavior.

Together, the aforementioned research demonstrates early support for the relationship between rape supportive attitudes (i.e., perceived peer support of sexual assault and traditional gender roles), rape myth acceptance, and bystander intervention. Further, research has begun to establish the importance of exploring peer support of rape supportive attitudes, as peer support was a stronger predictor than individual attitudes of bystander intervention (Brown & Messman-Moore, 2010). However, many questions still remain regarding the validity of the proposed theory that targeting bystander intervention via rape prevention efforts will result in the reduction of rape culture on college campuses.

Given the lack of a consistent and thorough quantification of rape culture, research has yet to explore whether the hypothesized relationship between rape culture and bystander intervention actually exists. Although research has consistently identified a relationship between rape myth acceptance and bystander intervention, rape myth acceptance has been proposed as a result of rape culture and therefore, not an equivalent construct to rape culture. Thus, one may not utilize the existent relationship between rape myth acceptance and bystander intervention as evidence for bystander intervention’s relationship with rape culture. Further, although research has begun to explore the role of various rape supportive attitudes on bystander intervention (Carlson, 2008; Gidycz et al., 2011), research has neglected several attitudes proposed to underlie the latent variable rape culture (i.e., traditional gender roles, sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility
towards women, and acceptance of violence) (Burt, 1980; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; 1995).

Summary

Since the term “rape culture” was coined in the 1970s, scholars have urged rape prevention efforts to target cultural change. Recently, program developers have responded to this long-term call by creating the bystander approach to rape prevention. Although the bystander approach to rape prevention has addressed many of the limitations of previous rape prevention programs, including a decrease in defensiveness and “rebound” effects, little is known about how effective this program is at its ultimate goal, community change (Moynihan et al., 2010; Moynihan et al., 2011).

The desire for community change is based on the cultural theory of rape, which proposed a number of attitudinal components that make up a rape supportive culture. Traditional gender roles, sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, and acceptance of violence create the most cohesive picture of rape culture (Burt, 1980; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; 1995). To date, research has established relationships between one or two of these variables and rape supportive behaviors, such as rape myth acceptance, sexually aggressive behavior, and sexual victimization (Armstrong et al., 2006; Boswell & Spade, 1996; Check & Malamuth, 1983; Koss et al., 1985; Malamuth, 1983; Rozee, 1993; Sanday, 1996). Due to strong support for the relationship between these variables and rape myth acceptance, many researchers have used rape myth acceptance as a proxy for rape culture. However, research and theory propose that rape myth acceptance is created by a rape supportive culture; therefore, it cannot be
concluded, through research or theory, that a change in acceptance of rape myth will result in a cultural change.

Another concern regarding the existent literature on rape culture is the individual nature of exploration. In 2008, Critelli and Bivona proposed the importance of examining peer cultural attitudes as opposed to individual attitudes. The authors argued that individual attitudes do not clearly represent the cultural perception, and in turn influence, of these attitudes on rape. Recently, Gidycz and colleagues (2011) identified that male peer support of rape culture was a stronger predictor of behavior and attitude change than individual support. Therefore, it is important to investigate these components within their cultural context.

**Purpose**

Given the varied and limited quantification of rape culture, little may be concluded from the existent research. I proposed to examine and compare the hypothesized (see Figure 1) and alternative (see Figure 2) models of rape culture discussed above, with traditional gender roles, sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, and acceptance of violence creating a latent variable we today refer to as rape culture. Further, I examined these variables in regards to peer support as opposed to individual identification, as to address criticisms of previous explorations into rape culture. Within the current research peer support was defined as one belonging to the same social group, especially based on age, grade, or status.

After a comprehensive and consistent picture of rape culture was identified, I explored the proposed relationship between rape culture and rape myth acceptance, as well as the hypothesized relationship between rape culture and bystander intervention.
(i.e., behavior and willingness to intervene). This exploration is critical, as the Center for Disease Control (CDC) (CDC, 2004) and the American College Health Association (ACHA) (Carr & Ward, 2006) recently endorsed the bystander approach to rape prevention under the assumption that it targets and alters rape supportive culture. Research is sorely needed to identify whether this relationship exists and thus, whether it is advantageous to target bystander behavior in future rape prevention efforts. Furthermore, due to the assumed gendered nature of rape culture (i.e., male perpetrated, female victimized), sexual victimization’s relationship with rape culture was explored within the current female sample only, while sexually aggressive behavior was investigated for the current male sample. The final purpose of this study was to explore an overall model of rape prevention, based on the extensive literature outlined in the current chapter and the purposes described above. The proposed conceptual model is visually represented in Figure 5 & 6.

**Hypotheses**

The current study sought to examine the validity of the proposed construct of rape culture (Burt, 1980; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). Further, this current study also sought to investigate the hypothesized relationships between rape culture, rape myth acceptance, and bystander intervention. The following hypotheses are presented:

Hypothesis 1: Based on the research summarized above, I proposed two potential models of rape culture. First, the existence of five distinct factors underlying a latent construct labeled rape culture. These five factors are proposed to be: traditional gender roles, sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards
women, and acceptance of violence (see Figure 1). Second, given the lack of
exploration into the proposed model of rape culture described above, I examined
an alternative model based in research, in order to establish the best fitting model
of rape culture. Given the strong relationship between traditional gender roles and
sexism, and adversarial sexual beliefs and hostility towards women (Burt, 1980;
Herman, 1984; Kimmel, 2005; Lonsway & Fitzgearld, 1994; 1995; Sanday,
1996), I explored the existence of a three factor model underlying the latent
construct rape culture with traditional gender roles and sexism combined,
adversarial sexual beliefs and hostility towards women combined, and acceptance
of violence remaining a unique third factor (see Figure 2). Based on theory and
prior research, I hypothesized that the five factor model will demonstrate
significantly better fit as compared to the three factor model.

Hypothesis 2(a): A positive bidirectional relationship will be identified between
the proposed latent variable of rape culture and sexual victimization of women
within the past 12 months (see Figure 3).

Hypothesis 2(b): A positive bidirectional relationship will be identified between
the proposed latent variable of rape culture and sexually aggressive behavior in
men within the past 12 months (see Figure 4).
Hypothesis 3: A positive bidirectional relationship will be identified between the proposed latent variable of rape culture and rape myth acceptance (see path a Figure 5 & 6).

Hypothesis 4: A negative bidirectional relationship will be identified between the proposed latent variable of rape culture and bystander intervention (see path b Figure 5 & 6).

Hypothesis 5: The overall conceptual model proposed will demonstrate good model fit (see Figure 5 & 6).
CHAPTER III

METHODS

This chapter presents the participants, measures, and procedures for the current study. First, the population of interest will be discussed followed by the procedure by which data were collected. The specific measures utilized to assess relevant constructs will be presented next, including issues of validity and reliability. Finally, data screening and handling of missing data will be reviewed in detail.

Participants

Data were collected from 569 men and women currently enrolled in post-secondary education. Participants were primarily recruited from The University of Akron, a large, public, four-year institution located in northeastern Ohio; however, data were also collected from multiple additional campuses across the United States in order to increase generalizability of findings and expand variability among cultural norms. Participants represented all geographic regions of the United States (i.e., Northeast, Midwest, South, and West). Participants who did not at least begin all primary measures were removed from analyses, resulting in the removal of 66 participants, leaving a final sample of 503 (see Results).

When available, participants received extra credit for their participation. Further, participants had the opportunity to be entered for a drawing of 4, $50 visa gift cards following their participation in the aforementioned study. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was obtained prior to initiating the study. Participants were treated
ethically in accordance with the American Psychological Association ethics code regarding research participation (APA, 2002). See Table 1 for additional information regarding participants.

**Procedures**

A copy of all measures may be found in the attached appendices. All measures were completed online and anonymously via Qualtrics. Qualtrics’ software allows participants to pause and return to the survey at a later point, to reduce the chance of participant fatigue. The data suggested that multiple participants utilized this option, as completion time varied from a few seconds, for participants who skipped through the entire survey without answering and were subsequently removed, to multiple days. To allow for anonymity, all identifying information was kept in a separate file from participants’ responses for purposes of assigning extra credit. The technique of snowball sampling (e.g., contacting student list serves and department heads of various colleges and universities, posting study access on Facebook and other social media outlets) was used to gain access to participation from outside the University of Akron’s psychology subject pool where 339 participants completed the study and received subsequent extra credit. First, numerous professors from the Sociology department at the University of Akron agreed to provide extra credit for participation, resulting in 118 participants. Furthermore, a comprehensive list of colleges and universities across the United States was obtained online. Contact information for department heads of Psychology, Sociology, and Women’s Studies were identified from each university. A scripted email was sent to all department heads requesting assistance with recruitment (see Appendix M). The majority of emails did not receive a response; however, a small number of
universities agreed to forward the study to their students. Eastern Illinois University required IRB approval from their University; therefore, IRB approval was requested and received from the IRB board at Eastern Illinois University. The remaining universities accepted IRB approval from the University of Akron. The department head of Women’s Studies at Texas A&M University agreed to provide extra credit for participation, resulting in 46 participants from this university. Additionally, a page was credit via Facebook where participants were able to gain access to the study. Several individuals on Facebook advertised information regarding this page. Also, several relevant groups were contacted on Facebook requesting advertisement of the study (See Table 5 for full list). The majority of groups were nonresponsive (86.2%); however, four groups agreed to advertise the study, with one group responding that they would not advertise the study. See Table 5 for additional information.

Measures

Traditional Gender Roles. The Conformity to Masculine Norm Inventory (CMNI) (see Appendix B) (Parent & Moradi, 2009) and the Conformity to Feminine Norm Inventory (CFNI) (see Appendix C) (Parent & Moradi, 2010) were used to assess perceived peer support of traditional gender roles. Both the CMNI and CFNI were originally created to assess traditional gender roles at an individual level; however, given the above mentioned limitation of the current literature examining rape culture on an individual level rather than a social level, the language was altered to assess traditional gender roles at the level of perceived peer support. All participations responded to both the CMNI to determine peer support of conformity to masculine norms, and the CFNI to establish perceived peer support of conformity to feminine norms.
The CMNI and CFNI are self-report measures rated on 4-point likert scales (0 = *strongly disagree*, 3 = *strongly agree*). The CMNI consists of 46-items, where the CFNI has 45-items. Sample questions of the CMNI include, “Men never ask for help” “Men enjoying taking risks”; sample items from the CFNI are, “Being in a romantic relationship is important to women” “Women would be happier if they were thinner.” For the CMNI and CFNI several items are reverse scored; following this, all items are summed resulting in an overall score of traditional gender roles for men and traditional gender roles for women. Scores for the CMNI range from 0 to 138 and 0 to 135 for the CFNI. In previous research, exploratory factor analyses and follow up confirmatory factor analyses were examined for both the CMNI and CFNI, the final models were indicative of good fit (Parent & Moradi, 2009; 2010). Cronbach’s alphas for the CMNI ranged from .77 to .91 demonstrating good to excellent internal consistency (Parent & Moradi, 2009). Two to three week test re-test reliability ranged from .51 to .96 for the CMNI, indicative of adequate reliability. Regarding the CFNI, cronbach’s alphas ranged from .68 to .89 indicative of fair to excellent internal consistency. The CFNI strongly correlated with conceptually related constructs such as the Bem Sex-Role Inventory Feminine Identity Scale and the Feminine Identity Composite. Further, suggestive of convergent validity, the CFNI was negatively related to Bem Sex-Role Inventory Masculine Identity Scores (Parent & Moradi, 2010). Internal consistency for the current sample was excellent for the CMNI ($r = .92$) and good for the CFNI ($r = .80$).

**Sexism.** The *Ambivalent Sexism Inventory* (ASI) (Glick & Fiske, 1997) (see Appendix D) was used to assess participants perceived peer support of sexist attitudes. As with the CMNI and CFNI, the ASI was originally created to measure individual sexist
attitudes. For the current study, the wording has been changed to assess sexist attitudes at the level of peer support to address this limitation in prior research examining rape culture (McMahon, 2007; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2000).

The ASI measures both benevolent sexism, which is defined as “a subjectively favorable, chivalrous ideology that offers protection and affection to women who embrace conventional roles” (Glick & Fiske, 2001, p.109) and hostile sexism, “antipathy toward women who are viewed as usurping men’s power” (p. 109). The ASI is a 22-item self-report measure. Participants respond using a 6-point likert scale ranging from 0 to 5 (0 = disagree strongly, 5 = agree strongly). Sample questions include, “Women should be cherished and protected by men” and “Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.” The ASI results in three scores: overall sexism, hostile sexism, and benevolent sexism. Overall sexism is computed by averaging all the items, resulting in a score ranging from 0-5. The ASI has demonstrated excellent reliability and validity. This measure has been administered to over 15,000 women and men within and outside the United States. The overall score and subscales all demonstrated acceptable internal consistency (α’s = .8 to .9) in previous research (Glick & Fiske, 1997). Construct validity was established by exploring the ASI’s relationship with other measures of sexism. Correlations with related measures were all significant, ranging from .35-.68. Further, research supported the predictive validity of the ASI by examining scores on the ASI and reported views of women. The ASI demonstrated a unique polarizing phenomenon of sexism, with individuals endorsing both extremely positive and extremely negative views of women. The positive views of women were strongly correlated with the benevolent
sexism subscale, while the hostile sexism subscale significantly predicted negative views. Good internal consistency ($r = .85$) was identified for the current sample.

*Adversarial Sexual Beliefs.* The *Adversarial Heterosexual Beliefs Scale* (AHBS) (see Appendix E) (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995) was used to examine perceived peer support of adversarial sexual beliefs. The AHBS was created as an alternative to Burt’s (1980) original measure in order to address the criticism that Burt’s measure did not adequately represent the gender-neutral construct of adversarial sexual beliefs. Critics of Burt’s original measure suggested that it focused on women’s behavior as manipulative or deceitful within the context of relationships. As previously discussed, Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) urged the importance of clarifying this construct and further, breaking apart the proposed convolution with the construct hostility towards women. Therefore, the AHBS was created to assess the construct of adversarial sexual beliefs between the sexes, rather than exclusively focusing on women’s behavior.

The AHBS is a 15-item self-report measure, participants respond using a 7-point likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Example questions include, “In dating relationships people are mostly out to take advantage of each other” and “It is impossible for men and women to truly understand each other.” Although the AHBS has assessed individual acceptance of adversarial sexual beliefs in prior research, the current study proposed to alter the AHBS to examine perceived peer support of adversarial sexual beliefs to address the limitation of examining a cultural phenomenon on an individual level (McMahon, 2007; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2000). The AHBS was developed with college students. An overall score is computed by summing the 15-items together. There are 3 items that demonstrate nonadversarial sexual beliefs and are
therefore reverse scored prior to summation. Scores range from 15 to 105, with higher scores indicating greater adversarial sexual beliefs. Cronbach’s alphas for this measure have ranged from .78 to .99, indicative of adequate internal consistency (Loh, Gidycz, Lobo, & Luthra, 2005; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). Consistent with previous research, the AHBS resulted in good \((r = .86)\) internal consistency for the current sample.

*Hostility Towards Women.* Hostility Toward Women Scale (HTWS) (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995) (see Appendix F) assessed perceived peer support of hostility towards women. This scale was adapted from Check, Malamuth, Elias, and Barton’s (1985) scale of hostility towards women. The scale was adapted for reasons of clarity, increased validity, and equal applicability for participants of both genders. Similar to the aforementioned measures, the HTWS, in its original form, examined hostile attitudes toward women at an individual level; however, to address the limitations of previous research (McMahon, 2007; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2000) this measure was adapted for the current study to examine these attitudes at the level of peer support.

For the HTWS, participants respond on a 7-point likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*) to 10 self-reported items. The HTWS was originally created with a sample of 429 undergraduate students. Sample questions include, “When it really comes down to it, a lot of women are deceitful” and “I am easily angered by (other) women.” Scores range from 10 to 70 with higher scores demonstrating increased hostility towards women. Two items are suggestive of positivity towards women and are reverse scored. In prior examination into reliability of the HTWS, Cronbach’s alphas have ranged from .83 to .85 (Cowan, 2000; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). The current sample’s
internal consistency for the HTWS was lower than prior research; however, it remained within the “good” range \( (r = .78) \).

*Acceptance of General Violence.* The **Attitudes Toward Violence Scale** (ATVS) (see Appendix G) (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995) was used to assess perceived peer support of acceptance of general violence. Lonsway and Fitzgerald created the ATVS in 1995 to address acceptance of violence generally. This measure was adapted from Velicer, Huckel, and Hansen’s 1989 assessment of acceptance of general violence. Items were chosen to represent the theoretical components described by Velicer and colleagues (1989) including: war, capital punishment, corporal punishment, and interpersonal disputes. Sample questions include, “War is often necessary” and “Children should be spanked for temper tantrums.”

The ATVS is a 20-item self-report measure. Participants respond to each using a 5-point likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 5 (*strongly disagree*). Items are summed resulting in an overall score of acceptance of general violence ranging from 20 to 100. Examination into reliability and validity demonstrated a good level of internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = .87) and item-to-item correlations ranging from .35 to .65 (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). Additional research has been conducted on the measure from which the ATVS was adapted. Cronbach’s alphas range from .89 to .92 for the acceptance of violence measure created by Velicer and colleagues (1989). Test-retest reliability was reported as .94. Further, differences in support of violence were identified between groups, as expected by research and theory (e.g., gender differences, socioeconomic status differences) (Velicer et al., 1989). The current sample resulted in good internal consistency \( (r = .88) \).
Rape Myth Acceptance. In 1980 Martha Burt created the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS). Although this measure was used extensively in literature, limited research has been conducted on the reliability and validity of this scale (Payne et al., 1999). Further the research that has been conducted demonstrated structural issues with the RMAS. Due to the limitations of the RMAS, Payne and colleagues created the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMA) (see Appendix H). The structure of the IRMA was empirically and theoretically driven from a large item pool derived from experts in the field, as well as an extensive literature review on rape myths. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses determined a hierarchical model of rape myths with an overall general rape myth component, as well as seven subcomponents: (1) She asked for it, (2) It wasn’t really rape, (3) He didn’t mean to, (4) She wanted it, (5) She lied, (6) Rape is a trivial event, (7) Rape is a deviant event. The IRMA was developed with college students. The IRMA is a 45-item self-report measure of individual acceptance of rape myths. Participants rate their answers on a 5-point likert scale (1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree). Items are summed with scores ranging from 45-225; with higher scores indicating higher acceptance of rape myths. Construct validity of the IRMA has been determined by examining its relation to theoretically related constructs including: traditional gender roles, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, and attitudes towards violence. Correlations ranged from \( r = .47 \) to \( .74 \) demonstrating support that the IRMA assesses acceptance of rape myths. Further, cronbach’s alphas for the IRMA, total score and subscales, ranged from .74 to .93 indicative of internal consistency (Payne et al., 1999). Excellent internal consistency \( (r = .95) \) was identified for the current sample.
Bystander Willingness. The Willingness to Help Scale (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004) is a 51-item self-report measure created to assess how likely an individual is to intervene in a potential rape scenario. This measure was created due to the lack of assessments available to measure both bystander willingness to intervene and bystander behavior. Sample questions include, “Walk a stranger home from a party who had too much to drink” “Speak up against sexist jokes” “Call 911 if someone is calling for help.” Participants respond on a 5-point likert scale of how likely they are to engage in these behaviors (1 = not at all likely to 5 = extremely likely) (see Appendix I). This measure was created via an extensive literature review and consultation with experts in the field of sexual violence. Once a series of questions had been created, Banyard and colleagues (2007) conducted a pilot study and a formative evaluation of this measure with a sample of 389 college students. Early examination into the reliability of this measure demonstrated positive results, with Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .80 to .94 (Banyard, 2008; Banyard et al., 2007; Banyard et al., 2010; Coker et al., 2011; Foubert et al., 2010; Moynihan et al., 2010; Moynihan et al., 2011). Given the limited assessment instruments available and the common use of the Willingness to Help Scale in previous research examining bystander behavior and interventions (Banyard, 2008; Banyard et al., 2007; Banyard et al., 2009; Banyard et al., 2010; Coker et al., 2011; Foubert et al., 2010; Moynihan et al., 2010; Moynihan et al., 2011; Potter & Moynihan, 2011), the current study proposed the use of this measure. Excellent internal consistency (r = .96) was identified for the current sample.

Bystander Behavior. The same 51-items described above are used in the Bystander Behavior Scale (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004) to assess engagement in
prosocial behavior over the course of the prior two months. Participants respond categorically, yes or no, to whether they engaged in the presented action during the past two months (see Appendix J). For scoring, the 51-items are summed resulting in scores ranging from 0-51, with higher scores indicative of more bystander behavior. The creation of this measure coincided with the Willingness to Help Scale. Therefore, Banyard and colleagues, given the limited available assessments of bystander behavior also created this measure with a sample of 389 college students. Examination into the reliability on this measure demonstrates positive internal consistency, with Cronbach’s alphas ranging from 0.82 to 0.89 (Banyard, 2008; Banyard et al., 2007; Coker et al., 2011; McMahon, 2010; Moynihan et al, 2010). Although limited investigations have been conducted into the reliability and validity of this measure, this is the most commonly used assessment of bystander behavior in the current literature (Banyard, 2008; Banyard et al., 2007; Banyard et al., 2009; Coker et al., 2011; McMahon, 2010; Moynihan et al, 2010; Potter & Moynihan, 2011); therefore, the current study utilized this measure to assess bystander behavior. Consistent with previous research, good internal consistency ($r = .88$) was identified within the current sample.

**Sexual Victimization.** The Sexual Experiences Survey: Short Form Victimization (SES-SFV) (Koss et al., 2006a) was used to assess sexual trauma history of female participants. The SES-SFV is a self-report measure developed to assess coerced sexual activity. The SES-SFV measures various forms of sexual trauma in order to decrease the unreported nature of sexual trauma. Sample questions include “Someone had oral sex with me or made me have oral sex with them without my consent” and “A man put his penis into my vagina, or someone inserted fingers or objects without my consent.”
Participants responded how many times these 7 situations happened to them (0, 1, 2, 3+) and how these situations occurred. Finally, participants’ answered a few brief questions about their answers including if they have ever been raped (see Appendix K). The SES-SFV is an alternate form of Koss and Oros (1982) Sexual Experiences Survey (SES). The SES-SFV was designed to collect further information on the reported sexual experiences including how many times the events occurred and how they occurred. The internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) of the SES, reported by Koss and Gidycz (1985), was high for women ($r = .74$). A high correlation ($r = .70$) between the SES and other related measures of sexual trauma was also found. The reliability and validity were established using a college sample. The SES assesses sexual trauma since the age of 14 years old and in the past 12 months. The SES-SFV was scored both categorically (0 – nonvictim: all 7 items unchecked, 1 – victim of sexual trauma: any item checked at least once), and ordinaly (0 – nonvictim: all 7 items unchecked, 1 – sexual contact: item 1 checked any number of times on c, d, & e, with no other responses, 2 – sexual coercion: any item 2-7 checked any number of times to a or b & unchecked for c through e on 1-7, 3 – attempted rape: items 5, 6, or 7 checked any number of times to c, d, or e ignoring the other answers, and 4 – rape: items 3, 4, and 5 checked any number of times to c, d, or e ignoring the other answers) (Koss et al., 2007). The current study focused on experiences within the previous 12 months, given the interest in rape and sexual assault on college campuses. Good internal consistency ($r = .81$) was identified for the current sample.

The SES is the most commonly cited method of assessing sexual trauma in college-aged women (Koss, 1993). Additionally, the Ms. Magazine project (Koss, 1988), a national examination of sexual victimization and aggression on college campuses,
utilized the SES. Therefore, for reasons of comparison, the current study used the SES as its primarily assessment of sexual victimization in college women. Furthermore, the authors of the SES spent considerable efforts to reduce the use of stigmatized language within the assessment. Words such as crime, rape, and sexual assault are not used throughout the entire assessment. Only following the completion of the SES are participants asked whether they were ever raped or sexually assaulted in order to compare self identification of rape and sexual assault to endorsement of behaviors that are consistent with the definition of rape and sexual assault. The notion of concealing was of utmost importance to the authors of the SES given the considerable criticisms of the stigmatized language utilized within other assessments of sexual victimization and aggression, including the national crime victimization survey (NCVS) (Fischer et al., 2000; Koss, 1993).

*Sexually Aggressive Behavior. The Sexual Experiences Survey: Short Form*

Perpetration (SES-SFP) (see Appendix L) (Koss et al., 2006b) was used to assess sexually aggressive behavior in male participants. The SES-SFP is made up of the same 7 self-report questions described above in the SES-SFV; however, assessing perpetration of the behaviors presented. Sample questions include, “I had oral sex with someone or had someone perform oral sex on me without their consent”, and “I put my penis or I inserted fingers or objects into a woman’s vagina without her consent.” The SES-SFP is scored exactly the same as the SES-SFV, including scores for both the past 12 months and since the age of 14. Consistent, with the SES-SFV, the SES-SFP was designed to collect additional information not collected in the original SES, including the number of times the behavior occurred and what context the behavior occurred in (Koss et al., 2007). The
SES demonstrated high internal-consistency for men \((r = .80)\). A moderate correlation was found between the SES and structured interviews of sexually aggressive behaviors \((r = .61)\), indicative of construct validity. When inconsistencies were identified they tended to demonstrate men endorsing sexually aggressive behaviors on the SES, while denying such behaviors via the interview. Koss and Gidycz (1985) hypothesized that, “Changed responses may indicate false self-reports, but they may also suggest that participants are willing to reveal behavior anonymously that they do not wish to discuss openly” (p. 423).

Consistent with the SES-SFV, the current study focused on behaviors within the past 12 months, given the interest in rape and sexual assault on college campuses. Excellent internal consistency \((r = .94)\) was identified within the current sample.

**Data Screening and Missing Data**

Consistent with Schlomer, Bauman, and Card’s (2010) suggestions, three steps were explored to manage the current study’s missing data. First, the authors suggest reporting the amount of missing data. Second, the pattern of missingness should be explored, and finally, the most appropriate method of handling data should be determined based on the predetermined pattern of missingness. Scale descriptives (see Table 3) were determined by utilizing ipsative mean replacement for participants who completed at least 2/3 of each measure. Ipsative mean replacement was chosen given its superiority to standard mean replacement. Unlike standard mean replacement, ipsative mean replacement identifies the unique, individual mean for each participant and replaces the individuals missing data with their unique mean. Many measures site 2/3 completion as necessary for interpretation; therefore, ipsative mean replacement was only computed for individuals who completed at least 2/3 of the individual measure to avoid drawing bias.
conclusions. Scale scores were only utilized in subsequent analyses for bystander willingness to intervene and bystander behavior, whereas item level data were utilized for the remaining measures; see Results for further detail. Given the length and online nature of the current study, several participants dropped out of the study prior to the completion. Given the necessity of data within each primary measure, all participants who did not begin the final primary measure were removed from all subsequent analyses (n = 66).

One of the benefits of MPLUS software is the default of full information maximum likelihood (FIML) to increase the utility of the available data. Therefore, participants who began all primary measures were included in the dataset. As suggested, missing data patterns were analyzed within MPLUS to determine what percentage of the data was missing. Of the 503 participants included in the dataset, complete data were available for 486 (96.6%). The two most common missing data patterns, which were identified for four and two participants, respectively, included one missing data point each. Four participants had begun the bystander behavior scale, but did not complete it, this may be due to fatigue, as it was the last primary measure within the current study. Two participants did not answer one item on the traditional masculine gender roles measure (CMNI), #27 - *more often than not, losing does not bother them*. The remaining 12 missing data patterns accounted for one participant for each pattern, indicating that data were not systematically missing.

Given the aforementioned conclusions, the data pattern of the current study appears to be missing at random (MAR) or missing completely at random (MCAR). Not missing at random (NMAR) data are identified when missing data points are systematically related to what the participants would have answered had they answered
the item (Rubin, 1976). The distinction between MAR and MCAR is whether or not the missing item is related to another variable within the dataset. Researchers have highlighted the difficulty of determining whether data are MAR or MCAR, especially when missing data are limited (Schlomer et al., 2010). However, given MPLUS’ default of FIML, it is not necessary to determine the distinction between MAR and MCAR data, as FIML is an appropriate technique for both patterns of missingness (Enders & Bandalos, 2001). Therefore, FIML was utilized for all subsequent analyses to account for missing data.

Data Normality

Consistent with assumptions of SEM, the data were examined for univariate and multivariate normality. Normality was assessed following Tabachnick and Fidell’s (2007) recommendations. First, all means, minimums, and maximums for each scale were explored to assure they fell within the expected range. Next, univariate normality was assessed by converting all scale scores to z-scores. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest that z-scores above 3.29 may suggest the existence of univariate outliers. Based upon this cut off, outliers were identified for several scales and cases. For CFNI (traditional feminine gender roles) cases 473 and 304 were highlighted as potential outliers. For CMNI (traditional masculine gender roles) cases 27 and 198 were identified as potential outliers. For WTH (willingness to help) cases 460, 221, 69, 239, and 288 and finally, for BBS (bystander behavior) cases 61, 90, 223, 370, and 451 were suggested as potential univariate outliers. However, before the removal of univariate outliers, Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest further exploration into multivariate outliers, as univariate outliers...
are expected within large datasets. Therefore, the data were next examined for the existence of multivariate outliers.

Several steps are suggested when exploring multivariate normality. First, Mahalanobis distance was calculated for the combination of indicators to be used in the subsequent analyses. Once Mahalanobis distance scores were computed, they were compared to the chi-square distribution utilizing the number of variables as the degrees of freedom (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). For the current study, the critical value is larger than 124.3, as item level data are utilized for the majority of subsequent analyses. None of the cases included a Mahalanobis distance of this magnitude. Cook’s distance was also explored for all scales, with the suggested critical value of 1.00. The mean Cook’s distance score in the current sample was .002, with a standard deviation of .003, and a minimum score of .000 and maximum of .024. Thus, no cases were identified as problematic based on these metrics. Finally, leverage scores were computed for all cases in the current dataset. Consistent with Tabachnick and Fidell’s (2007) recommendations, cases which value exceeds 2(k/N), where k is the number of indicators and N is the sample size, are suggested to be multivariate outliers. The critical value of the current dataset is .577, utilizing this anchor no problematic cases were identified. The mean leverage score for the current sample was .018 with a standard deviation of .011, a minimum of .003, and a maximum of .074. As no cases were identified as consistent outliers, all cases remained in the dataset for subsequent analyses.

Finally, skewness and kurtosis of the current data was explored. West, Finch, and Curran (1995) suggest the existence of skewness when scores fall above 2.0, and 7.0 for
kurtosis. Based on these standards, all measures utilized in the final model appear to be normally distributed within the current sample.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Demographic variables (i.e., age, race, sexual orientation, income, religious orientation and year in school) were compared between participants who began all primary measures ($N = 503$) and those who were removed ($n = 66$) due to drop out; no significant differences were detected. Demographic variables for those included in the analyses can be found in Table 1.

Hypothesis 1

To assess hypothesis 1, two hierarchical confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted with the proposed first order factors and the second order, or latent, factor of rape culture. Two apriori hypotheses have been suggested based on the theory of rape culture and empirical research presented above (Burt, 1980; Herman, 1984; Kimmel, 2005; Lonsway & Fitzgearld, 1994; 1995; Sanday, 1996). These theories suggest the existence of a five-factor (traditional gender roles, sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, acceptance of violence) solution for rape culture (see Figure 1), or a three-factor solution (traditional gender roles and sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs and hostility towards women, and acceptance of violence) (see Figure 2). As outlined by Kline (2010), a CFA in Mplus results in several model fit indices for the proposed factor solution to show how that solution fits the data. Frequently utilized fit indices include: the model chi-square, root mean square error or approximation (RMSEA), comparative fit
index (CFI), and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). The model chi-square is a good standard, but is the toughest to achieve due to the strong influence of sample size. The model chi-square is indicative of good fit if $p$ is greater than .05. Given the influence of sample size, additional research (Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) has suggested the importance of examining the ratio between the chi-square value and the degrees of freedom ($\chi^2/df$). If this ratio falls below 2, Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest this to be indicative of positive fit. For the RMSEA, good fit is determined when the value is equal to or less than .05, if the value is greater than .1, a serious problem with the fit is assumed. Ideally values should be greater than or equal to .95 for the CFI, and finally, .08 is a cut off value for SRMR, but the closer the value is to zero the better (Kline, 2010). The model demonstrating the best fit will be utilized for the remaining analyses.

Consistent with the hypothesis, the model of rape culture with five underlying latent factors (see Figure 1) demonstrated significantly better fit ($\chi^2 = 28,281.59; df = 11,775$) as compared to the model with three underlying factors ($\chi^2 = 30,793.65; df = 11,777$) (see Figure 2). However, neither hypothesized model was indicative of positive fit (five factor model, $\chi^2/df = 2.4$, RMSEA = .053, CFI = .437, SRMR = .084; three factor model, $\chi^2/df = 2.61$, RMSEA = .057, CFI = .352, SRMR = .096). Therefore, because a major goal of this study was to establish a sound model of rape culture, several additional analyses were conducted.

In order to better understand the data, I conducted a series of exploratory factor analyses (EFA) with varimax rotation. A varimax rotation was utilized in order to increase simple-structure and enhance ability to identify each item with a single factor.
First, to see what items grouped together I conducted an EFA on all items, examining the fit indices of 1 through 10 factors. Consistent with the proposed notion of a latent factor underlying all measured constructs, the majority of items significantly and positively loaded on a single factor. However, the model fit of a single factor structure was poor ($\chi^2/df = 3.14$, RMSEA = .065, CFI = .229, SRMR = .101) signifying the existence of a more complex model. A 68-factor model was suggested via parallel analysis and correlation matrix eigenvalues were indicative of a 40-factor model. Due to the proposed complex nature of the model, I explored each measure, or proposed construct, independently resulting in 6 separate EFAs. Prior to conducting this series of EFAs, CFAs were explored for each measure independently, based on the proposed structure of the measurements (Glick & Fiske, 1997; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995; Parent & Moradi, 2009, 2010). Unfortunately, for the current sample, measurement structure was not confirmed for any of the measures. Therefore, independent EFAs were conducted, with the proposed measurement structures in mind to assist with determination of final factor structure. Thus, conceptual and empirical criteria were used when establishing the final factor structure for each measure.

First, an EFA exploring 1 through 10 factors was conducted on all the CMNI items (traditional masculine gender roles). The parallel analysis suggested a 22-factor structure, whereas the correlation matrix eigenvalues suggested a 10-factor structure. Upon investigating the various fit indices and parsimony of the factor structures, a six-factor model (1- importance of status, 2- avoidance of vulnerability, 3- control of women, 4- violence, 5- importance of accomplishments, 6- emphasis on work; see Figure 7) was identified as the best fitting factor structure for CMNI ($\chi^2: df = 2.44$, RMSEA = .053, CFI
Although fit was significantly better for the 7 factor model of CMNI ($\chi^2/df = 2.18$, RMSEA = .049, CFI = .906, SRMR = .030), the seventh factor had no unique strong loadings and thus, demonstrated further support for the 6 factor structure. Additionally, the 6 factor structure strongly resembled the aforementioned proposed measurement structure (Parent & Moradi, 2009)

Next, an EFA exploring 1 through 10 factors was explored for all CFNI items (traditional feminine gender roles). A 21-factor structure was suggested via the parallel analysis, where as a 12 factor structure was suggested via the correlation matrix eigenvalues. The five-factor structure (1- heterosexual feminine traits, 2-homemaking, 3- humbleness, 4- sexual purity, 5- mothering; see Figure 8) demonstrated positive fit and parsimony ($\chi^2:df = 2.64$, RMSEA = .057, CFI = .801, SRMR = .044). Consistent with the CMNI model, the six-factor structure demonstrated significantly better fit ($\chi^2/df = 2.43$, RMSEA = .053, CFI = .835, SRMR = .039); however, only 2 items loaded significantly on the sixth factor. Furthermore, the 5 factor structure had several consistent factors with the proposed measurement structure of the CFNI (Parent & Moradi, 2010).

Consistently, an EFA exploring 1 through 10 factors was explored for all ASI items (sexism). The parallel analysis suggested a 10-factor model. However, the correlation matrix eigenvalues advocated for a 3-factor model, this was supported via the data. The 3-factor model (1- hostile sexism, 2- superiority of women [benevolent sexism 1], 3- protection of women [benevolent sexism 2]; see Figure 9) demonstrated positive fit ($\chi^2:df = 2.91$, RMSEA = .062, CFI = .924, SRMR = .033), parsimony, and consistency with theory and examination of the ASI in previous research (Glick & Fiske, 1997).
In line with the correlation matrix eigenvalues for the HTW (hostility towards women) EFA, a 2-factor-model (1- general hostility, 2- negative impact of women on the self; see Figure 10) was identified as the best fitting model ($\chi^2/df = 4.77$, RMSEA = .087, CFI = .95, SRMR = .042). Similarly to the EFAs for traditional gender roles, a three-factor structure demonstrated significantly better fit ($\chi^2/df = 1.68$, RMSEA = .037, CFI = .995, SRMR = .013); however, no items significantly loaded on the third factor.

The correlation matrix eigenvalues for the EFA for all HSB (adversarial sexual behaviors) items suggested a three-factor model. This was supported via exploration into the various fit indices ($\chi^2/df = 2.76$, RMSEA = .059, CFI = .954, SRMR = .032) and parsimony (1-sex and power, 2- biological difference between the sexes; see Figure 11).

Finally, an EFA was performed with all AV (acceptance of violence) items. The parallel analysis suggested a 10-factor solution, with the correlation matrix eigenvalues indicating a 5-factor solution. Investigation into the data was indicative of a 4-factor model (1- eye for an eye, 2- government violence, 3- child punishment, 4- intimate partner violence; see Figure 12). Again, although the five-factor model demonstrated significantly better fit ($\chi^2/df = 2.67$, RMSEA = .058, CFI = .965, SRMR = .027) than the four-factor model ($\chi^2:df = 4.09$, RMSEA = .078, CFI = .925, SRMR = .035), only two items significantly loaded on the proposed fifth factor. Additionally, the four-factor model demonstrated similar factor structure to previous theory and research on the AV (Velicer et al., 1989).

Following the identification of individual factor structures for each proposed construct, a hierarchical confirmatory factor analysis was conducted with the proposed first order factor structures (i.e., traditional gender roles – masculine and feminine,
sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, and acceptance of violence) placed under the overall second-order factor of rape culture. This CFA resulted in significantly better fit than the original models ($\chi^2/df = 1.73$, RMSEA = .038, CFI = .712, SRMR = .075); however, upon investigation into the model results, a number of potentially problematic items and factors were identified. Several items either loaded negatively on the proposed factor, or did not achieve significance. Further, significant issues arose from the two factors related to benevolent sexism, the work factor underlying traditional masculine gender roles, as well as all factors underlying traditional feminine gender roles, with exception of heteronormative feminine traits. Therefore, given the identified concerns, all problematic items were removed (see Table 2 for a full list). Following this removal, a second hierarchical CFA was run (see Figure 13). This model resulted in positive fit ($\chi^2/df = 1.75$, RMSEA = .039, CFI = .795, SRMR = .066), with all items and factors loading positively and significantly within the factor structure.

Following the determination of the best fitting model of rape culture, measurement equivalence for various demographic variables was attempted via multiple group analyses. However, due to the imbalance between group memberships, multiple group analysis was not possible. Upon personal correspondence with Muthen and Muthen (2014), I explored model fit for all groups, independently, which had enough participants to draw conclusions. Therefore, to examine model fit for men as compared to women, I explored the fit selecting only male observations ($\chi^2/df = 1.91$, RMSEA = .082, CFI = .462, SRMR = .100), and reversely selecting only female observations ($\chi^2/df = 1.63$, RMSEA = .042, CFI = .773, SRMR = .067), indicative of superior fit for female students. These analyses identified several important findings that inform conclusions from the
current research and shine light on future necessary research. The model fit for White students ($\chi^2/df = 1.65$, RMSEA = .041, CFI = .791, SRMR = .068) was better than the fit for students of Color ($\chi^2/df = 3.15$, RMSEA = .147, CFI = .215, SRMR = .109). Additionally, model fit for Christian students ($\chi^2/df = 1.62$, RMSEA = .043, CFI = .757, SRMR = .069) was better than for students who identified as non-Christian ($\chi^2/df = 2.19$, RMSEA = .103, CFI = .402, SRMR = .109). The proposed model demonstrated better fit for individuals indicating membership within middle to upper socioeconomic status (SES) ($\chi^2/df = 1.66$, RMSEA = .046, CFI = .745, SRMR = .075) as compared to those falling within lower SES membership ($\chi^2/df = 1.68$, RMSEA = .061, CFI = .616, SRMR = .085). Further, the proposed model demonstrated superior fit for individuals who reported having knowledge of someone in their life experiencing rape ($\chi^2/df = 1.59$, RMSEA = .044, CFI = .759, SRMR = .069) versus those who did not ($\chi^2/df = 1.75$, RMSEA = .062, CFI = .615, SRMR = .087). Finally, as the majority of students were recruited from The University of Akron, this model appears to be most representative of rape culture on The University of Akron’s campus ($\chi^2/df = 1.66$, RMSEA = .041, CFI = .771, SRMR = .070) as opposed to other campuses ($\chi^2/df = 2.27$, RMSEA = .108, CFI = .379, SRMR = .099). Therefore, rather than running separate analyses for each group, as this is beyond the scope of the current study, the aforementioned variables (i.e., sex, race, religion, SES, personal relationship with survivor(s), and college/university) were controlled for in all subsequent analyses given the less superior fit of rape culture. Given these findings, a final CFA was performed with controls entered; this model was also indicative of positive fit ($\chi^2/df = 1.79$, RMSEA = .040, CFI = .766, SRMR = .068). Upon establishment of the final model of rape culture, the amount of predictability for each first
order latent factor was investigated. For the second-order latent factor of rape culture, predictability ranged from 95% (hostility towards women) to 18% (traditional gender roles) (See Table 4 for full results).

Although differences between model fit were identified, it is important to note that the majority of fit indices remained within the acceptable range. The only subgroups that resulted in poor fit and subsequent issues with factor loadings were students of color, males, and non-Christian participants. For these groups, the primary factor indicating poor fit appeared to be the factor representing traditional gender roles. This is important to note, as all other factors (i.e., hostile sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, and acceptance of violence) appear to hold constant and thus load positively and significantly on rape culture. Finally, the model of rape culture including only Non-University of Akron students also demonstrated poor fit; however, all items and factors loaded significantly under the construct of rape culture, indicative of issues related to sample size as opposed to model structure.

Unfortunately several demographic variables did not have enough individuals in the underrepresented group to warrant representative findings. Therefore, observational differences were not explored for those involved in rape prevention programming, the military, student athletes, members of Greek life, sexual minorities, non-religious/non-religiously affiliated individuals, and graduate students (see Table 1 for n). Further research is urged to explore these variables and their potential impact on the proposed model of rape culture.
Hypothesis 2a and 2b

To investigate the relationship between sexual victimization, sexual aggression, and rape culture, hypotheses 2a and b, two separate analyses were conducted via Mplus (Kline, 2010). For hypothesis 2a, a bidirectional path analysis between rape culture and sexual victimization in women was explored (see Figure 3). The proposed model with a bidirectional path between rape culture and sexual victimization was indicative of good fit ($\chi^2/df = 1.80$, RMSEA = .040, CFI = .763, SRMR = .069) and the relationship between rape culture and sexual victimization approached significance ($\beta = 199, p = .06$).

Consistently, for hypothesis 2b a path analysis between rape culture and sexual aggression in men was explored (see Figure 4). Unlike the model involving sexual victimization, the current model demonstrated poor fit ($\chi^2/df = 1.97$, RMSEA = .084, CFI = .416, SRMR = .102). Furthermore, a relationship between rape culture and sexual aggression was not identified within the current sample contrary to previous research and theory ($\beta = .047, p = .67$).

Hypothesis 3

To explore hypothesis 3, the existence of a positive bidirectional relationship between the proposed latent variable of rape culture and rape myth acceptance (see Figures 5 & 6), three separate analyses were conducted. First, a hierarchical CFA was conducted with the seven first order factors (i.e. she asked for it, it wasn’t really rape, he didn’t mean to, she wanted it, she lied, rape is a trivial event, rape is a deviant event) and the second order factor of rape myth acceptance. Consistent with previous research (Payne et al., 1999), this model demonstrated positive fit ($\chi^2/df = 2.58$, RMSEA = .056, CFI = .873, SRMR = .069).
Next, a path analysis between rape culture and rape myth acceptance was explored. First, the path between rape culture and rape myth acceptance was fixed to zero, indicating equivalence between the constructs of rape culture and rape myth acceptance ($\chi^2/df = 1.78$, RMSEA = .039, CFI = .746, SRMR = .102). The same analysis was then conducted with a free path between rape culture and rape myth acceptance ($\chi^2/df = 1.78$, RMSEA = .039, CFI = .749, SRMR = .078) (Kline, 2010). As expected, this null hypothesis was rejected as the free path ($\chi^2 = 19,537.580; df = 10,999$) resulted in significantly better fit than the fixed path ($\chi^2 = 19,625.559; df = 11,008$). As anticipated, a moderate positive bidirectional relationship between these two constructs was identified ($\beta = .350, p < .001$), indicating that higher values of rape culture result in higher endorsement of rape myth acceptance and vice versa.

**Hypothesis 4**

Consistent with the analyses proposed to assess hypothesis 3, a hierarchical CFA was conducted with the first order factors (i.e. bystander behavior and bystander willingness to intervene) and the second order factor of bystander intervention to examine hypothesis 4, the existence of a negative bidirectional relationship between the proposed latent variable of rape culture and bystander intervention (see Figures 5 & 6). Unfortunately, model fit for the hierarchical CFA of bystander intervention resulted in poor fit ($\chi^2/df = 3.51$, RMSEA = .071, CFI = .445, SRMR = .088). Although both factors significantly loaded on the underlying latent factor, bystander intervention (bystander behavior, $\beta = .006, p < .05$; willingness to intervene, $\beta = .689, p < .001$), several items did not significantly load on the underlying constructs of bystander behavior and willingness to intervene.
Due to lack of model fit, I conducted two separate exploratory factor analyses (EFA) with the items underlying the construct of bystander behavior and separately, the bystander willingness to help items. For the bystander behavior construct, a 24-factor model was suggested via parallel analysis and a 16-factor model via correlation matrix eigenvalues, whereas a 24-factor model was suggested for willingness to intervene via parallel analysis and a 9-factor model via correlation matrix eigenvalues. Upon exploration into the various model structures, the factor loadings appeared random and positive model fit was difficult to achieve. Therefore, because previous research utilized count scores of bystander behavior and sum scores for willingness to intervene, I decided to utilize these scores for future analyses.

Based on these assumptions, separate path analyses were conducted between rape culture with bystander behavior, as well as rape culture with willingness to intervene. Consistent with the aforementioned path analyses, each path was first fixed to zero (bystander behavior, $\chi^2/df = 1.95$, RMSEA = .043, CFI = .730, SRMR = .115; willingness to intervene, $\chi^2/df = 1.08$, RMSEA = .041, CFI = .748, SRMR = .097). Following this, a second analysis was conducted with a free path between rape culture and bystander behavior ($\chi^2/df = 1.91$, RMSEA = .043, CFI = .742, SRMR = .076), and separately rape culture and willingness to intervene ($\chi^2/df = 1.81$, RMSEA = .040, CFI = .761, SRMR = .069). For both bystander behavior (fixed path, $\chi^2 = 11,664.913$, $df = 5,980$; free path, $\chi^2 = 19,537.580$, $df = 10,999$) and willingness to intervene (fixed path, $\chi^2 = 11,065.774$, $df = 5,980$; free path, $\chi^2 = 10,803.998$, $df = 5,976$) the null hypothesis was rejected. Contrary to hypotheses, no relationship was identified between rape culture and bystander behavior ($\beta = 3.23$, $p = .093$). However, consistent with hypotheses a
negative bidirectional relationship was identified between rape culture and willingness to intervene ($\beta = -6.43, p < .001$). This relationship suggests that an environment with less perceived rape culture is related to more bystander willingness to intervene than an environment with more perceived rape culture and vice versa.

**Hypothesis 5**

Finally, using structural equation modeling, fit of the full conceptual model was explored to examine hypothesis 5 (see Figure 5). Alterations were made from the original conceptual model to incorporate information identified from previous analyses (see Figure 14). The path between rape culture and bystander behavior was removed, given the absence of a relationship. Further, the alternative, data driven model of rape culture was utilized as opposed to either of the poor fitting conceptual models. Goodness of fit was determined by the exploring various indices of fit (i.e., model chi-square, RMSEA, CFI, and SRMR) described above ($\chi^2/df = 1.72$, RMSEA = .038, CFI = .765, SRMR = .074). Further, factor loadings for each of the proposed factors were explored demonstrating strong and positive loadings for all items and factors. Finally, each proposed path was examined for significance. A statistically significant, positive, bidirectional relationship between rape culture and rape myth acceptance was identified ($\beta = .571, p < .001$). Further, the path between rape culture and bystander willingness to intervene resulted in a negative bidirectional relationship ($\beta = -7.441, p < .001$). Finally, consistent with prior research (Banyard et al., 2009; Banyard et al., 2007; Coker et al., 2011; Foubert et al., 2010; Moynihan et al., 2010; Moynihan et al., 2011; Potter & Moynihan, 2011), a significant, negative, bidirectional relationship was identified between rape myth acceptance and bystander willingness to intervene ($\beta = -14.324, p < .001$).
Satisfaction of each of these components indicates support for the proposed conceptual model (Kline, 2010). However, an expected relationship between bystander behavior and willingness to intervene was not identified ($\beta = -3.908, p = .942$).

Therefore, a final analysis was conducted removing the path between bystander behavior and willingness to intervene (see Figure 15). This model was indicative of positive fit ($\chi^2/df = 1.73, \text{RMSEA} = .038, \text{CFI} = .774, \text{SRMR} = .073$) with all items and factors loading significantly and significant relationships between each proposed path (rape culture and rape myth acceptance, $\beta = .581, p < .001$; rape culture and willingness to intervene, $\beta = -7.442, p < .001$; rape myth acceptance and willingness to intervene, $\beta = -14.115, p < .001$; rape myth acceptance and bystander behavior, $\beta = -1.424, p < .05$).
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The current study added to the existent literature on rape prevention in a number of ways. First, a comprehensive model of rape culture was established imbedded in previous research and theory (Burt, 1980; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; 1995). Following the establishment of such a model, various unanswered hypotheses were explored, including the existence of a bidirectional relationship between rape culture, rape myth acceptance, bystander behavior, and bystander willingness to intervene. The following chapter discusses these findings in detail and addresses their implications for future research and practice.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis one proposed two potential models of rape culture: a five factor model [traditional gender roles, sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, and acceptance of violence (see Figure 1)] and a three factor model [traditional gender roles and sexism combined, adversarial sexual beliefs and hostility towards women combined, and acceptance of violence remaining a unique third factor (see Figure 2)]. Based on theory and prior research, I hypothesized that the five factor model would demonstrate significantly better fit as compared to the three factor model. Consistent with hypotheses, the five factor hierarchical model of rape culture demonstrated superior fit to the comparison three factor hierarchical model. However, contrary to expectations both
proposed models established the necessity for further alterations. Consistent with the original five factor structure, the best fitting model of rape culture has similar underlying first-order factors: traditional gender roles, hostile sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, and acceptance of the violence (see Figure 13). However, this model also diverged from the original hypothesized model in several ways.

First and foremost, the best fitting model of rape culture for the current study is significantly more complex than the originally proposed five factor model. This complexity includes the existence of factors underlying the five factors creating the latent variable rape culture. One of the main issues with the hypothesized model of rape culture was the combination of traditional feminine and masculine gender roles. Therefore, in the best fitting model of rape culture, traditional feminine and masculine gender roles were separated into first-order factors underlying the second-order factor of traditional gender roles (see Figure 13).

Furthermore, the data demonstrated unique, but complementary, factors underlying both feminine and masculine traditional gender roles. Within the current sample, traditional feminine gender roles were encompassed by five underlying factors: heteronormative feminine roles, homemaking, humbleness, sexual purity, and mothering (see Figure 8). Heteronormative feminine roles assume that women are preoccupied with their appearance and finding a partner. Homemaking highlights the importance of taking care of the home and those who enter the home. Humbleness is defined by downplaying achievements and success. Sexual purity is characterized by the absence of casual sex and the preservation of sex for committed relationships such as marriage. Finally, mothering is defined as the enjoyment of children and the sense of purpose prescribed to caretaking.
Although the aforementioned five factor model of traditional feminine gender roles was identified for the current sample, the same cannot be said for its hypothesized relationship to rape culture. When traditional feminine gender roles was added to the model of rape culture, the only underlying factor that both positively and significantly loaded was heteronormative feminine gender roles. Homemaking, sexual purity, and mothering did not significantly contribute to the underlying latent variable, rape culture. On the other hand, humbleness was significantly, but negatively, related to rape culture. One explanation for these findings is that unlike heteronormative feminine gender roles, homemaking, sexual purity, mothering, and humbleness are often neutrally or positively associated with women. Therefore, rather than all traditional feminine gender roles contributing to rape culture, it appears that rape culture incorporates only negative views of women. This notion is consistent with additional underlying components of rape culture (i.e., hostility towards women). Thus, the final model of rape culture did not include subfactors of homemaking, sexual purity, mothering and humbleness (see Figure 13). Future research should explore an indirect relationship between these “positive” traditional feminine gender roles and rape culture, as defiance of these roles may significantly contribute to the continued perpetration of rape and sexual assault within our culture.

Consistent with traditional feminine gender roles, several unique, but complementary, factors were identified underlying traditional masculine gender roles. For the current study, six factors made up traditional masculine gender roles: importance of status, avoidance of vulnerability, work, control of women, violence, and importance of accomplishments (see Figure 7). Importance of status encompassed men’s
preoccupation with being seen positively by others, especially in terms of sexual orientation (i.e. straight) and power (i.e. winning). Avoidance of vulnerability is the tendency to elude asking for assistance, talking about feelings, or dealing with shame. The work factor highlights work as a first priority and the most important component of life. Control of women emphasizes the view of women as subservient, sexual objects for men to do with what they please. Violence is the assumption that male aggression is justified and in some cases warranted. Finally, importance of accomplishments highlights the prominence of risk taking in order to achieve rewards.

Unlike traditional feminine gender roles, the majority of factors underlying traditional masculine gender roles demonstrate significant contribution to the underlying latent variable, rape culture. Work was the only factor removed from subsequent analyses. Unlike the aforementioned factors that were removed, work significantly, and positively, loaded on rape culture. However, several items under the construct did not load significantly and upon removal of the construct, model fit of rape culture improved significantly. One rationale for the removal of this factor is the use of extreme wording within several items. Examples include: “Believe work is the most important part of life” “Believe work comes first.” Therefore, participants may have answered differently if the wording was less definite (e.g., “Believe work is an important part of life”, “Believe work is a high priority”). This may have been especially influential as the current sample was made up of college students, who developmentally speaking may not see work as a main priority.

Prior research utilizing the CMNI with college students demonstrates similar concern regarding the subfactor work (Iwamoto, Cheng, Lee, Takamatsu, & Gordon,
Parent and Moradi (2009) found that work did not significantly relate to any of the other subfactors of the CMNI. Additionally, the items loadings for the work subfactor ranged from .72 to .34, with several items loadings under the proposed cut off of .4. In research with college students (Iwamoto et al., 2011; Parent & Moradi, 2009; 2011; Parent et al., 2011), the subfactor work consistently has one of the lowest mean scores, although the current sample demonstrated a mean of 5.95 with a standard deviation of 1.95, with 0 as the lowest score possible and 12 as the highest. Additionally, the CMNI has been primarily explored with male samples only; therefore, future research should explore the efficacy of this model with women and non-binary gendered individuals. Finally, societal norms are continuing to change with more and more emphasis on women prioritizing work, and dual-income families; therefore, work may be becoming less affiliated solely with men.

Next, the best fitting model of sexism resulted in three underlying factors: hostile sexism, superiority of women, and protection of women (see Figure 9). These distinctions within sexism are consistent with previous research (Glick & Fiske, 1997; 2001). Prior research has discussed a clear distinction between two major forms of sexism: hostile and benevolent. Hostile sexism is defined as overt prejudice against women, whereas benevolent sexism is related to more covert forms of oppression including the assumption that women possess a quality of purity that men do not (e.g., superiority of women) or that men should put women’s protection before their own (e.g., protection of women). Consistent with theory, superiority and protection of women were included underlying the latent variable benevolent sexism. As hypothesized, hostile sexism positively loaded
on rape culture. However, contrary to expectations, benevolent sexism negatively loaded under rape culture. Therefore, the current study suggested that while overt prejudice contributes to the existence and perpetration of rape culture, benevolent sexism reduces such a culture.

Several possible explanations for this relationship exist. First, multiple studies have identified either no relationship (Abrams, Tiki, Masser, & Bohner, 2003; Begany & Milburn, 2002; Forbes & Adams-Curtis, 2001; Forbes, Adams-Curtis & White, 2004; Russell & Trigg, 2004) or a negative relationship (Allen & Swan, 2009; Sakalli, 2001) between benevolent sexism and attitudes promoting violence against women. The existent relationship between benevolent sexism and positive attitudes towards women is one such explanation (Glick & Fiske, 1997). As previously discussed, an underlying theme of rape culture is negativity towards women. Therefore, due to the established relationship between benevolent sexism and positive views of women, a negative relationship between rape culture and benevolent sexism would be expected. Given the proposed protective role of benevolent sexism, Sakalli (2001) suggested targeting benevolent sexism as a way to decrease violence against women and in turn rape culture.

Additional research discourages the acceptance of benevolent sexism as something to foster for several reasons. First, benevolent sexism has been linked to several negative outcomes including depression and maintenance of gender inequality (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Glick & Fiske, 2001). Further, research suggests that the positive tone of benevolent sexism is only reserved for women who fit the high, idealistic standards proposed via this construct. Thus, similar to “positive” feminine gender roles, an indirect relationship should be explored between benevolent sexism and rape culture.
Research has consistently identified a positive relationship between benevolent sexism and hostile sexism. Therefore, benevolent sexism may indirectly impact rape culture via hostile sexism. For example, when women do not fit the roles ascribed via benevolent sexism, hostile sexism may arise. Glick and Fiske (2001) stated, “Despite the greater social acceptability of benevolent sexism, our research suggests that it serves as a crucial complement to hostile sexism that helps to pacify women’s resistance to societal gender inequality” (p. 109). Alternatively, research has identified a relationship between rape myth acceptance and benevolent sexism (Sakalli-Ugurlu, Yalcin, & Glick, 2007; Viki & Abrams, 2002). Therefore, benevolent sexism may indirectly impact rape culture through its relationship with rape myth acceptance. Future research investigating these hypotheses is warranted.

The component of adversarial sexual beliefs resulted in two underlying factors: sex and power, and biological differences between the sexes (see Figure 10). The first factor is the belief that most men and women use each other for sex or to achieve power. The second factor encompasses the belief that men and women are inherently different and therefore can never be equal or understand one another.

The best fitting model for hostility towards women included two factors: general hostile view of women and negative impact of women on the self (see Figure 11). The general hostile view of women factor highlights women as deviant, manipulative individuals. Negative impact of women on the self contains ways in which women negatively impact the individual, personally.

Finally, the last factor underlying rape culture is acceptance of violence. The best fitting model of acceptance of violence demonstrated four underlying factors: eye for an
eye, government violence, child punishment, and intimate partner violence (see Figure 12). Eye for an eye is the assumption that wrongdoing should be punished by inflicting the same pain on the offender. Acceptance of government violence is the notion that government’s have the right, and in some cases the obligation, to use violence. Child punishment is the acceptance of physical punishment as a valid method of controlling and disciplining children. Acceptance of intimate partner violence is the belief that in some cases violence is justified against an intimate partner.

The model detailed above demonstrated positive model fit across participants within the current sample; however, when subgroups were investigated several discrepancies were identified. Subgroups that demonstrated problematic model fit with the presented model of rape culture included: men, people of Color, and non-Christian participants. Within the current sample, the construct of traditional gender roles was the main contributor to poor model fit for these subgroups. Therefore, future research is needed to understand the potential group differences of rape culture.

Hypothesis 2a and b

The second hypothesis proposed the existence of positive bidirectional relationships between rape culture and sexual victimization in women and sexual aggression in men over the previous 12 months (see Figures 2 and 3). Neither relationship was supported in the current study. However, the relationship between rape culture and sexual victimization in women approached significance suggesting the importance of further exploration into this hypothesis. One potential reason for these unexpected findings is the complex nature of the model and the necessity of splitting the sample based on sex. In order to explore the proposed models of rape culture (see Figures
1 and 2), a minimum of 500 participants was necessary. Therefore, given the increased complexity of the model (see Figure 13) and the fact that data on victimization was only collected from women \((n = 366)\) and aggression only from men \((n = 137)\), more participants are needed for each group to accurately examine this hypothesis. Future research should examine this in larger or combined male/female samples.

**Hypothesis 3**

Hypothesis 3 predicted the existence of a positive bidirectional relationship between rape culture and rape myth acceptance (see path a Figure 5 & 6). Results support this hypothesis, suggesting that perceived peer support of rape culture increases one’s individual likelihood of accepting rape myths, and one’s individual acceptance of rape myths increases their perceived peer support of rape culture. This is an important finding for several reasons. First, as previously mentioned, rape myth acceptance is often used as a proxy for rape culture (Banyard et al., 2010; McMahon, 2010; McMahon & Banyard, 2012). Therefore, this is the first study confirming the effect of rape culture on rape myth acceptance, as well as the impact of rape myth acceptance on rape culture. Thus, preventative measures establishing a reduction in rape myth acceptance following involvement in their programming may impact rape culture, as proposed by several authors (Banyard et al., 2004; Carr & Ward, 2006; Coker et al., 2011). However, future research is needed to confirm the existence of this effect. This finding also supports the effect of culture on individual beliefs. Thus, it is important to target both cultural and individual change as they appear to be inherently linked, and one changing without the other may be futile.
Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis proposed a negative bidirectional relationship between rape culture and bystander intervention, where bystander intervention was made up of bystander behavior and bystander willingness to intervene (see path b Figure 5 & 6). Contrary to expectations, bystander behavior and willingness to intervene did not jointly load under a latent variable. Furthermore, item-level analyses with both bystander behavior and willingness to intervene resulted in models with poor fit and lack of cohesion. For this reason, count and sum scores were used for bystander behavior and willingness to intervene in all analyses. Use of count and sum scores are consistent with previous research examining these constructs (Banyard, 2008; Banyard et al., 2007; Banyard et al., 2009; Coker et al., 2011; McMahon, 2010; Moynihan et al, 2010; Potter & Moynihan, 2011).

Furthermore, once sum and count scores were established no relationship was established between bystander behavior and willingness to intervene (see Figure 14). This finding is consistent with previous research demonstrating little-to-no relation between what individuals believe they would do during bystander experiences and what they actually do (Darley & Latane, 1968). Thus, this highlights the importance of measuring actual behavior rather than, or at minimum in addition to, one’s perceived willingness. This also brings into question the meaningfulness of increasing one’s perceived bystander willingness, when this appears to have limited applicability to actual bystander behavior. However, an additional reason for the lack of relationship between perceived willingness to intervene and bystander behavior is the low rate of reported bystander behavior within the current sample (see Table 3). Several hypotheses may be proposed for the lack of
bystander behavior within the current sample. First, bystander behavior is dependent on opportunity; thus, the opportunity to engage in such behavior may have been absent resulting in a low rate of bystander behavior. An alternative explanation for the low rate of bystander behavior is lack of action within the current sample, consistent with the bystander effect. Furthermore, reliability and validity statistics are limited for the measures utilized to assess bystander behavior and willingness to intervene, which may have influenced the current results.

In addition to apparent differences between the constructs of bystander behavior and bystander willingness, while a negative bidirectional relationship was found between rape culture and bystander willingness, no such relationship was found between rape culture and bystander behavior. Therefore, for the current sample, individuals who endorsed higher rape supportive cultures reported less willingness to intervene in potential rape scenarios, and those who were more willing to intervene reported less rape supportive cultures. However, contrary to hypotheses, for the current sample, bystander behavior appeared to have no direct relationship to rape culture. This finding suggests that bystander behavior may not be the most efficacious target for dismantling rape culture. Therefore, although bystander rape prevention programs have demonstrated positive effects, focusing all our efforts on bystander behavior may not be fruitful. Future research efforts should explore additional components that may impact rape culture.

**Hypothesis 5**

The final hypothesis proposed the existence of a well fitting conceptual model with bidirectional relationships between rape culture, rape myth acceptance, and bystander intervention (see Figures 5 & 6). Given the aforementioned results, various
alterations were made to this model. First, the best fitting model of rape culture was utilized consisting of: traditional gender roles, hostile sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, and acceptance of violence (see Figure 13). Next, count and sum scores were employed for bystander behavior and willingness to intervene, thus, removing the latent variable of bystander intervention. As previously mentioned, the current study was unable to identify a well fitting model of bystander behavior or willingness to intervene; therefore, consistent with previous research, sum and count scores were utilized (Banyard, 2008; Banyard et al., 2007; Banyard et al., 2009; Coker et al., 2011; McMahon, 2010; Moynihan et al, 2010; Potter & Moynihan, 2011).

Additionally, the current study did not identify a relationship between bystander behavior and rape culture, thus resulting in the removal of this path from the final conceptual model. As discussed, this finding is crucial as current rape prevention programming aims to alter rape culture via bystander behavior (Banyard et al., 2004; Carr & Ward, 2006; Coker et al., 2011). This finding highlights the importance of targeting additional factors, if the ultimate goal of prevention programming is to alter a rape supportive culture. Consistently, analyses did not support a relationship between bystander behavior and willingness to intervene. Therefore, this path was removed from the final conceptual model. As previously discussed, this finding suggests the distinction between what individuals perceive they are willing to do and what they actually do (Darley & Latane, 1968).

Thus, given these adjustments the final conceptual model resulted in positive fit (see Figure 15). Consistent with previous research, negative bidirectional relationships were identified between rape myth acceptance and bystander behavior and willingness to
intervene (Banyard et al., 2010; McMahon, 2010; McMahon & Banyard, 2012). Thus, the more individuals endorsed rape myths the less likely they were to have intervened or report willingness to intervene in potential rape scenarios (e.g., stop a man from taking a drunk girl up to his room). And, the more bystander behavior or willingness to intervene individuals reported the less likely they were to endorse various rape myths. This finding is significant as research on the bystander model of rape prevention has consistently demonstrated reductions in rape myth acceptance following such programming (Banyard et al., 2010; McMahon, 2010; McMahon & Banyard, 2012). Therefore, given the existence of a bidirectional relationship between these constructs in the current research, a reduction in rape myth acceptance may ultimately increase bystander behavior on college campuses, a primary goal of the bystander model of rape prevention (Banyard et al., 2004; Carr & Ward, 2006; Coker et al., 2011).

Additionally, the final conceptual model demonstrated a positive bidirectional relationship between rape culture and rape myth acceptance (see Figure 15). Therefore, as proposed by theory, rape supportive attitudes within one’s culture increase individuals’ tendency to believe rape myths such as, she wanted it or she lied (Brownmiller, 1975; Buchwald et al., 2005; Burt, 1980; Herman, 1984). Furthermore, the current study suggests that individual acceptance of rape myths is related to increased perceptions of rape supportive attitudes within their environment. As previously discussed, this finding alludes to the importance of targeting both rape supportive attitudes and rape myth acceptance in future prevention programming, as they appear to reinforce one another. Thus, altering one without the other may result in limited retention of change, as
reduction of rape myths in a rape supportive culture may subsequently lead to the reemergence of previously accepted beliefs.

Finally, the conceptual model identified a negative bidirectional relationship between rape culture and bystander willingness to intervene (see Figure 15). Thus, individuals who perceived more rape supportive attitudes within their culture reported less willingness to intervene in potential rape scenarios, whereas individuals who reported more willingness to intervene perceived less rape supportive attitudes. Therefore, increasing one’s willingness to intervene via bystander rape prevention programming may assist in dismantling rape culture. However, given the absence of a relationship between rape culture and bystander behavior or willingness to intervene and bystander behavior limited actual behavioral change may occur via this model of rape prevention. Thus, additional components may be necessary to create actual behavior and cultural change on college campuses including, but not limited to, bystander behavior. Future research should explore this conceptual model with other samples to confirm its utility and inform future rape prevention programming.

Implications for Theory

The present study contributes significantly to the theory of rape culture. The hypothesized five-factor model of rape culture was partially supported within the current sample. All proposed factors (i.e., traditional gender roles, sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, and acceptance of violence) significantly contributed to the underlying latent factor labeled rape culture. However, the current study also identified several important areas for future research and potential modifications to the proposed model.
As aforementioned, several factors were removed from the final model of rape culture, as they did not demonstrate significant contribution. Consistently, all subsequently removed factors shared the theme of positive views of women (i.e., humbleness, homemaking, sexual purity, mothering, and benevolent sexism). This suggests that negative views of women are central to rape culture, which is consistent with the factors sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs and hostility towards women. Further, the factor hostility towards women demonstrated the highest contribution to rape culture, thus further supporting this theme (see Table 4).

Societal views of sexual relations and violence were also identified as core components of rape culture (i.e., traditional gender roles, adversarial sexual beliefs, and acceptance of violence). These themes are consistent with the proposed theory of rape culture (Burt, 1980; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; 1995) suggesting the influence of objectifying the female body, and the general cultural obsession with sex and violence on rape and sexual assault within the United States.

These findings also suggest the importance of further exploration and investigation into the theory of rape culture. Although the current study demonstrated initial support for the theory of rape culture proposed by Burt in 1980, it also suggested several alterations to the proposed theory. Furthermore, this theory was initially proposed in 1980 and subsequent theoretical work has not been investigated since the 90s (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; 1995); therefore, updated theoretical research is warranted. Future research should explore the potential contributing effects of substance use, personality, hook-up culture/sex positivity on college campuses, as well as the influence of the media and legal systems in creating and reinforcing rape culture.
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Implications for Interventions

In addition to theoretical implications, the current research sheds light on the importance of additional adaptations to present rape prevention programming. In recent years, rape prevention programming has come a long way via implementation of the bystander model of rape prevention. This model has demonstrated several strengths including the reduction of defensiveness among participants, consistent reduction in acceptance of rape myths and growth in participant’s willingness to intervene in potential rape scenarios (Banyard et al., 2007; Coker et al., 2011; Foubert et al., 2010; Moynihan, et al., 2011). However, as previously mentioned, limited research to date has identified actual changes in bystander behavior following the implementation of bystander programming.

Furthermore, the current study suggests the importance of targeting more than bystander behavior to create cultural change on college campuses. Thus, future research should explore the utility of a “bystander-plus” model of rape prevention. Such a model would maintain the benefits of the bystander model of rape prevention, while adding additional components to target cultural change. As previously mentioned, the current study suggests several components that may be crucial for creating cultural change including addressing our current views of women, sex, and violence.

In sum, it appears crucial to move beyond the bystander model of rape prevention if we are to have an impact on rape culture. Future research on the proposed alternatives to the bystander model, as well as further identification of important components, is crucial as this silent epidemic continues on college campuses across the United States.
Limitations

Although the current research added to rape prevention literature in several ways, it is important to highlight several limitations. The first and potentially greatest limitation of the current research is the cross-sectional nature of our data. Data for the current study were collected at one point in time; therefore, cautious interpretations of cause and effect of these phenomena is strongly encouraged. The cross-sectional nature of our data was one of the main reasons for exploring the bidirectionality of all proposed relationships. Additionally, the current research utilized an EFA and CFA within the same dataset. As determination of a well-fitting model of rape culture was a core component of the current research, an EFA was performed to better understand the data as neither hypothesized model of rape culture met positive fit criteria. Therefore, future research is needed to confirm the best fitting model of rape culture with additional samples. Such research is also required to confirm the relationships identified between rape culture, rape myth acceptance, bystander behavior, and willingness to intervene. However, given the empirically driven nature of the factor structure within the current study, such replication may be difficult.

Given the complex nature of the current study several participants dropped out of the study prior to completion and were thus excluded from subsequent analyses. Although no demographic differences were identified between those who completed the study and those who did not, future efforts should focus on decreasing participant fatigue. The current study sought to alleviate some fatigue by allowing participants to save their data and reenter once they had time to decompress. Furthermore, data were collected solely using self-report measures. Future research may want to utilize a mix of self-
reports and face-to-face clinical interviews in order to address the concern of relying exclusively on one method of data collection.

Although efforts were made to increase generalizability, the current sample was predominately made up of white, middle-class, heterosexual, female students from The University of Akron. Therefore, future research should explore rape culture and the existence of these relationships with more diverse, representative samples. Finally, consistent with the theory of rape culture, the current study exclusively explored male perpetrated rape of female victims. This ignores the experience of many individuals, and therefore, an important area of future research is the effect of rape culture on female perpetration and male victimization.

Conclusions

The current research identified a cohesive model of rape culture based in theory and research (see Figure 13) (Burt, 1980; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; 1995). Five first-order latent factors make up this model: traditional gender roles, hostile sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards women, and acceptance of violence. Masculine sex roles and heteronormative feminine gender roles (e.g., emphasis on appearance and finding a partner) underlie gender role stereotyping. Neutral (e.g., homemaking) or positive feminine gender roles (e.g., humbleness) were not related to rape culture within the current model suggesting the superior influence of negative perceptions of women as opposed to traditional feminine gender roles overall. Consistently, benevolent sexism negatively loaded on rape culture whereas hostile sexism positively contributed. This finding strengthens the underlying theme of negative views of women, as opposed to the potential positive perceptions of women compromised
within benevolent sexism. The third construct underlying rape culture, hostility towards women, further highlights this theme underlying rape culture. Within this construct, women are seen as deviant and inherently evil. This theme is crucial as it creates an understanding of women as intrinsically harmful and thus deserving of wrongdoing. This assumption allows for the excusal and preservation of rape and sexual assault against women.

Adversarial sexual beliefs focus on the “natural” differences between the sexes and the relationship between sex and power. This construct generates an environment where rape and sexual assault are expected, or understood as “unavoidable” components of male-female relations. The final construct of rape culture, acceptance of violence, permeates our culture from governmental violence to intimate relationships. This cultural acceptance further validates individual acts of violence, which effectively maintains rape and sexual assault. Perceptions that violence is in some cases necessary, or even desired, allows for further justification of all violent acts.

Furthermore, the current research advocates for moving beyond the bystander model of rape prevention as no relationship was identified between rape culture and bystander behavior within the current sample. Although additional research is needed to confirm this finding, it would appear that additive components are obligatory to target and dismantle rape culture. The comprehensive model of rape culture suggests the importance of targeting negative societal views of women and cultural expectations of sexual relationships and violence in addition to bystander action.
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Table 1  Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N=503)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively Heterosexual</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominately Heterosexual</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally Hetero and Homosexual</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominately Homosexual</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively Homosexual</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N=503) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year in School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} year</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} year</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} year</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th} year</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5\textsuperscript{th} year and beyond</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard time buying necessities</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just enough for necessities</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes could buy extras</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could afford almost anything wanted</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Akron</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Akron, Wayne College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Akron, Summit College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alverno College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens State University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel College of Medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Illinois University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carroll University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial University of Newfoundland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlin College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College of Wooster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Rivers University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-County Technical College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Arkansas, Little Rock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N=503) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Denver</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Glasgow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Hampshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin, River Falls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Military Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greek Life Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Athletic Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N=503) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rape Prevention Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Know Survivor of Sexual Assault</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Aggression (men)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonperpetrator</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Contact</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Coercion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Rape</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Trauma Severity (women)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonvictim</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Contact</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Coercion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Rape</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Some participants’ responses are missing due to the option to not answer; race/ethnicity other: Multiracial and “other” classification; religion other: Judaism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Unitarianism, Paganism, and “other” classification; Sexual Aggression was only completed by males (n = 137) and rates reflect behavior in the previous year; Sexual Trauma Severity was only completed by females (n = 366) and rates reflect experiences in the previous year.
Table 2  Items Removed from Final model of Rape Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminine Gender Roles:</td>
<td>2. Believe it is important to keep their living space clean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking</td>
<td>5. Clean the house on a regular basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Believe that their friendships should be maintained at all costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Enjoy spending time making their living space look nice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Believe being nice to others is extremely important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Don’t go out of their way to keep in touch with friends (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. Make it a point to get together with their friends regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. Don’t care if their living space looks messy (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. Always try to make people feel special.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34. Believe there is no point to cleaning because things will get dirty again (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35. Are not afraid to hurt people’s feelings to get what they want (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39. Rarely go out of their way to act nice (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44. Don’t feel guilty if they lose contact with a friend (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45. Would feel ashamed if someone thought they were mean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine Gender Roles:</td>
<td>4. Tell everyone about their accomplishments (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humbleness</td>
<td>10. When they succeed, they tell their friends about it (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. Always downplay their achievements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. Are not afraid to tell people about their achievements (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine Gender Roles:</td>
<td>9. Would feel guilty if they had a one-night stand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Purity</td>
<td>18. Believe it is not necessary to be in a committed relationship to have sex (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. Would feel comfortable having casual sex (R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. Would only have sex with the person they love.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42. Would only have sex if they were in a committed relationship like marriage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine Gender Roles:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine Gender Roles:</td>
<td>11. Believe work is the most important part of life. 23. Don’t like giving all their attention to work (R). 31. Feel good when work is their first priority. 39. Believe work comes first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine Gender Roles*</td>
<td>12. Would only have sex if they were in a committed relationship (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent Sexism</td>
<td>1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman. 3. In a disaster, women ought to be rescued before men. 6. People are not truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex. 8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess. 9. Women should be cherished and protected by men. 12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores. 13. Men are incomplete without women. 17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man. 19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility. 20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives. 22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexism*</td>
<td>5. Women are too easily offended. 7. Feminists are seeking for women to have more power than men. 18. Many women get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances. 21. Feminists are making unreasonable demands of men.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 Items Removed from Final model of Rape Culture (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Adversarial Sexual Beliefs*      | 14. Men and women share more similarities than differences (R)  
|                                  | 15. It is possible for a man and a woman to “just be friends” (R).                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Hostility Towards Women*         | 6. When it really comes down to it, a lot of women are deceitful  
|                                  | 8. I am sure I get a raw deal from (other) women in my life.                                                                                                                                                                                                         |

*Note. (R) = item reverse scored; * = items did not significantly load on the identified factor.*
Table 3 Pearson’s Correlations Among Independent and Dependent Variables (N =503)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMNI</td>
<td>75.28</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.15***</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFNI</td>
<td>29.68</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>39.17</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>-.20***</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTW</td>
<td>29.21</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>-.16***</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRMAS</td>
<td>100.90</td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTH</td>
<td>199.75</td>
<td>34.18</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CMNI reflects one’s perceived peer support of traditional masculine gender roles (range 0 to 123); CFNI reflects one’s perceived peer support of heteronormative feminine gender roles (range 0 to 42); ASI reflects one’s perceived peer acceptance of hostile sexism (range 0-6); ASB reflects one’s perceived peer support of adversarial sexual beliefs (range 13-91); HTW reflects one’s perceived peer support of hostility towards women (range 8-56); IRMAS reflects one’s personal acceptance of rape myths (range 45-225); WTH reflects one’s personal willingness to help in potential rape scenarios (range 51-225); BBS reflects one’s personal prior bystander behavior (range 0-51); Only items included in the final rape culture model (see Figure 13) were used in these analyses; “p < .05, ”p < .01, “***p < .001.
Table 4 Predictability of First-Order Latent Factors for Rape Culture (N=503)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Order Factor</th>
<th>First Order Factor</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>S. E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Masculine Gender Roles</td>
<td>Importance of Status</td>
<td>.505***</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance of Vulnerability</td>
<td>.574***</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control of Women</td>
<td>.639***</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>.352***</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of Accomplishments</td>
<td>.643***</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Gender Roles</td>
<td>Traditional Masculine Sex Roles</td>
<td>.513***</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heteronormative Feminine Sex Roles</td>
<td>.461***</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversarial Sexual Beliefs</td>
<td>Sex and Power</td>
<td>.887***</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Differences of Sexes</td>
<td>.833***</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility Towards Women</td>
<td>General Negativity</td>
<td>.538***</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Impact on Self</td>
<td>.401***</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of Violence</td>
<td>Eye for an Eye</td>
<td>.591***</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government Violence</td>
<td>.543***</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child Punishment</td>
<td>.413***</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape Culture</td>
<td>Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>.271***</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex Role Stereotyping</td>
<td>.175**</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hostile Sexism</td>
<td>.738***</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adversarial Sexual Beliefs</td>
<td>.654***</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hostility Towards Women</td>
<td>.953***</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance of Violence</td>
<td>.464***</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 Groups Contacted via Facebook and Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dating Students.com</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Game Day</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niche</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Dose</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity College Pub</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Million Vaginas</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carroll University</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Humor</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT News</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Parenthood</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Health Experts</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Sexual Health</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Sexual Resource Center</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAAD</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Society for the Advancement of Sexual Health</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS Resource Center of Ohio</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Advertised study; study was shared by 2 additional groups- Ohio AIDS Coalition and LGBTQ Nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 Groups Contacted via Facebook and Outcomes (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Men’s and Women’s Programs</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Advertised study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Republicans</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Advertised study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Colleges</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Official Dating Point</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single University and Dating School</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Refused to advertise study due to lack of affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Speed Dating</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi College Hook Ups and Dating</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Dating USA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Dating</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College Guide to Dating</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Dating University</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday Feminism</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Advertised study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Hypothesized Model of the Latent Variable Rape Culture
Figure 2. Alternative Model of the Latent Variable Rape Culture
Figure 3. Proposed Relationship between Rape Culture and Sexual Victimization of Women
Figure 4. Proposed Relationship between Rape Culture and Sexual Aggression in Men
Figure 5. Conceptual Model

*Note.* (a) Demonstrates the proposed relationship between rape culture and rape myth acceptance; (b) demonstrates the proposed relationship between rape culture and bystander intervention.
Figure 6. Alternative Model

*Note.* (a) Demonstrates the proposed relationship between rape culture and rape myth acceptance; (b) demonstrates the proposed relationship between rape culture and bystander intervention.
Figure 7. EFA Model of Masculine Sex Roles
Figure 8. EFA Model of Feminine Sex Roles
Figure 9. EFA Model of Sexism
Figure 10. EFA Model of Adversarial Sexual Beliefs
Figure 11. EFA Model of Hostility Towards Women
Figure 12. EFA Model of Acceptance of Violence
Figure 13. Best Fitting Modeling of Rape Culture

Note. *** = p < .001; 1.00 = Path Fixed to 1.
Figure 14. Final Conceptual Model with Relationship between Bystander Behavior and Bystander Willingness to Intervene

Note. *** = p < .001.
Figure 15. Final Conceptual Model without Relationship between Bystander Behavior and Bystander Willingness to Intervene

*Note.* 

\* = \( p < .05 \); \*** = \( p < .001 \).
APPENDICES
## APPENDIX A

### DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions about yourself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How old are you?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your biological sex?</th>
<th>A. Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What best describes your sexual orientation?</th>
<th>A. Exclusively heterosexual with no homosexual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Predominantly heterosexual, only incidentally homosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Predominantly heterosexual, but more than incidentally homosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Equally heterosexual and homosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Predominantly homosexual, but more than incidentally heterosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Predominantly homosexual, only incidentally heterosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Exclusively homosexual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you classify your race/ethnicity?</th>
<th>A. Arab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Caucasian/White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Hispanic/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Indigenous or Aboriginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Multiracial/Biracial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Would rather not say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What best describes your religious orientation?</th>
<th>A. Christianity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Islam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Judaism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Buddhism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Hinduism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Taoism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Confucianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Unitarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Paganism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Agnostic</td>
<td>K. Atheist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following describes your family’s income?</td>
<td>A. My family has a hard time buying the things we need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What year in school are you?</td>
<td>A. 1(^{st}) year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What school do you attend?</td>
<td>A. Cleveland State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you involved in Greek life (sorority/fraternity)?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you involved in Athletics?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what athletics are you involved in? (Check all that apply)</td>
<td>_____ Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you/have you ever been involved with the military?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever participated in rape prevention programming?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know someone who has been raped or sexually assaulted?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

CONFORMITY MASCULINE NORMS INVENTORY

Thinking about your peers actions, feelings and beliefs, please indicate how much you believe your peers would agree or disagree with each statement by circling "Strongly Disagree", "Disagree", "Agree," or "Strongly agree" to the left of the statement. There are no right or wrong responses to the statements. It is best if you respond with your first impression when answering. When answering the questions below please use the following definition of peers: individuals who belong to the same social group as you, especially based on age, grade, or status.

Most men….

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In general, would do anything to win</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If they could, would frequently change sexual partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hate asking for help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Believe that violence is never justified (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Believe that being thought of as gay is not a bad thing (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In general, do not like risky situations (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Believe winning is not their first priority (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Enjoy taking risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Are disgusted by any kind of violence (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Ask for help when they need it (R)

11. Believe work is the most important part of life

Most men…. |

| 12. Would only have sex if they were in a committed relationship (R) |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree        | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 13. Bring up their feelings when talking to others (R) |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree        | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 14. Would be furious if someone thought they were gay |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree        | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 15. Don’t mind losing (R) |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree        | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 16. Take risks |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree        | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 17. It would not bother them if someone thought they were gay (R) |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree        | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 18. Never share their feelings |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree        | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 19. Believe sometimes violent action is necessary |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree        | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 20. Control the women in their life |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree        | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 21. Would feel good if they had many sexual partners |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree        | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 22. Believe it is important to win |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree        | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 23. Don’t like giving all their attention to work (R) |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree        | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 24. Believe it would be awful if people thought they were gay |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree        | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 25. Like talking about their feelings (R) |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree        | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 26. Will never ask for help |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree        | Agree | Strongly Agree |
Most men….

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. More often than not, losing does not bother them (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Frequently put themselves in risk situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Believe women should be subservient to men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Are willing to get into a physical fight if necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Feel good when work is their first priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Tend to keep their feelings to themselves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Believe winning is not important to them (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Believe that violence is almost never justified (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Are happiest when they’re risking danger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Believe it would be enjoyable to date more than one person at a time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Would feel uncomfortable if someone thought they were gay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Are not ashamed to ask for help (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Believe work comes first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Tend to share their feelings (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most men . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. No matter what the situation they would never act violently (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Believe that things tend to be better when men are in charge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Are bothered when they have to ask for help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Love it when men are in charge of women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Hate it when people ask them to talk about their feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Try to avoid being perceived as gay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Items designated with a (R) are reverse scored
APPENDIX C

CONFORMITY TO FEMININE NORMS INVENTORY

Thinking about your peers actions, feelings and beliefs, please indicate how much you believe your peers would agree or disagree with each statement by circling "Strongly Disagree", "Disagree", "Agree," or "Strongly agree" to the left of the statement. There are no right or wrong responses to the statements. It is best if you respond with your first impression when answering. When answering the questions below please use the following definition of peers: individuals who belong to the same social group as you, especially based on age, grade, or status.

Most women….

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Would be happier if they were thinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Believe it is important to keep their living space clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Spend more than 30 minutes a day doing their hair and make-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tell everyone about their accomplishments (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clean the house on a regular basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Feel attractive without makeup (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Believe that their friendships should be maintained at all costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Find children annoying (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Would feel guilty if they had a one-night stand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When they succeed, they tell their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
friends about it (R) | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree

Most women….

| 11. Believe having a romantic relationship is essential in life |
| 12. Enjoy spending time making their living space look nice |
| 13. Believe being nice to others is extremely important |
| 14. Wear makeup regularly |
| 15. Don’t go out of their way to keep in touch with friends (R) |
| 16. Believe most people enjoy children more than they do (R) |
| 17. Would like to lose a few pounds |
| 18. Believe it is not necessary to be in a committed relationship to have sex (R) |
| 19. Hate telling people about their accomplishments |
| 20. Get ready in the morning without looking in the mirror very much (R) |
| 21. Would feel burdened if they had to maintain a lot of friendships (R) |
| 22. Would feel comfortable having causal sex (R) |
| 23. Make it a point to get together with their friends regularly |
| 24. Always downplay their achievements |
| 25. Believe being in a romantic |
relationships is important

26. Don’t care if their living space looks messy (R)

Most women….

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Never wear makeup (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Always try to make people feel special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Are not afraid to tell people about their achievements (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Life plans do not rely on having a romantic relationship (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Are always trying to lose weight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Would only have sex with the person they love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. When they have a romantic relationship, they enjoy focusing their energies on it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Believe there is no point to cleaning because things will get dirty again (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Are not afraid to hurt people’s feelings to get what they want (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Believe that taking care of children is extremely fulfilling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Would be perfectly happy with themselves even if they gained weight (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. If they were single, their life would be complete without a partner (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Rarely go out of their way to act nice (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
40. Actively avoid children (R)

Most women….

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Are terrified of gaining weight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Would only have sex if they were in a committed relationship like marriage (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Like being around children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Don’t feel guilty if they lose contact with a friend (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Would feel ashamed if someone thought they were mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Items designated with a (R) are reverse scored
**APPENDIX D**

**AMBIVALENT SEXISM INVENTORY**

Below is a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you believe your peers would agree or disagree with each statement using the scale below. When answering the questions below please use the following definition of peers: individuals who belong to the same social group as you, especially based on age, grade, or status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 disagree strongly</th>
<th>1 disagree somewhat</th>
<th>2 disagree slightly</th>
<th>3 agree slightly</th>
<th>4 agree somewhat</th>
<th>5 agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for “equality”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In a disaster, women ought to be rescued before men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Women are too easily offended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 disagree strongly</td>
<td>1 disagree somewhat</td>
<td>2 disagree slightly</td>
<td>3 agree slightly</td>
<td>4 agree somewhat</td>
<td>5 agree strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People are not truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Feminists are seeking for women to have more power than men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Men are incomplete without women.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 disagree strongly</td>
<td>1 disagree somewhat</td>
<td>2 disagree slightly</td>
<td>3 agree slightly</td>
<td>4 agree somewhat</td>
<td>5 agree strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Women exaggerate problems they have at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Many women get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 disagree strongly</td>
<td>1 disagree somewhat</td>
<td>2 disagree slightly</td>
<td>3 agree slightly</td>
<td>4 agree somewhat</td>
<td>5 agree strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Feminists are making unreasonable demands of men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX E**

**ADVERSARIAL HETEROSEXUAL BELIEFS**

Please respond to how much you believe your *peers* would agree with the following statements. When answering the questions below please use the following definition of *peers*: individuals who belong to the same social group as you, especially based on age, grade, or status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In dating relationships people are mostly out to take advantage of each other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If you don’t show whose boss in the beginning of a relationship you will be taken advantage of later.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most people are pretty devious and manipulative when they are trying to attract someone of the opposite sex.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Men and women are generally out to use each other.

5. It’s impossible for men and women to truly understand each other.

6. In the work force any gain by one sex necessitates a loss for the other.

7. When women enter the work force they are taking jobs away from men.

8. Men and women cannot really be friends.

9. Sex is like a game where one person “wins” and the other “loses”.

10. In all societies it is inevitable that one sex is dominant.

11. It is natural for one spouse to be in control of the other.

12. When it comes to sex, most people are just trying to use the other person.

13. It is possible for the sexes to be equal in society (R).

14. Men and women share more similarities than differences (R).

15. It is possible for a man and a woman to “just be friends” (R).

Notes. Items designated with a (R) are reverse scored
APPENDIX F

HOSTILITY TOWARDS WOMEN

Please respond to how much you believe you peers would agree with the following statements. When answering the questions below please use the following definition of peers: individuals who belong to the same social group as you, especially based on age, grade, or status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel that many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I believe that most women tell the truth. (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I usually find myself agreeing with (other) women (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think that most women lie to get ahead.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Generally, it is safer not to trust women.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When it really comes down to it, a lot of women are deceitful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am easily angered by (other) women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am sure I get a raw deal from (other) women in my life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sometimes (other) women bother me by just being around.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. (Other) women are responsible for most of my troubles.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Items designated with a (R) are reversed scored.
APPENDIX G

ACCEPTANCE OF VIOLENCE

Please respond to the following questions, as you believe your peers would answer. When answering the questions below please use the following definition of peers: individuals who belong to the same social group as you, especially based on age, grade, or status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Violent crimes should be punished violently.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The death penalty should be part of every penal code.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Any prisoner deserves to be mistreated by other prisoners in jail.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Any nation should be ready with a strong military at all times.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The manufacture of weapons is necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. War is often necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The government should send armed soldiers to control violent university riots.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Our country should be aggressive with its military internationally.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Killing of civilians should be accepted as an unavoidable part of war.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Our country has the right to protect its borders forcefully.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A child’s habitual disobedience should be punished physically.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Giving mischievous children a quick slap is the best way to quickly end trouble.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Children should be spanked for temper tantrums.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Punishing children physically when they deserve it will make them responsible, mature adults.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Young children who refuse to obey should be whipped.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. It is all right for a partner to hit the other if they are unfaithful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. It is all right for a partner to slap the other if insulted or ridiculed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It is all right for a partner to slap the other’s face if challenged.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. An adult should whip a child for breaking the law.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. It is all right for a partner to hit the other if they flirt with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

ILLINOIS RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE SCALE
Please respond to the following questions, based on how much **you** agree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Although most women wouldn’t admit it, they generally find being physically forced into sex a real “turn on”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When men rape, it is because of their strong desire for sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If a woman is willing to “make out” with a guy, then it’s not big deal if he goes a little further and has sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Women who are caught having an illicit affair sometimes claim that it was rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Newspapers should not release the name of a rape victim to the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Many so-called rape victims are actually women who had sex and “changed” their minds afterwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Many women secretly desire to be raped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Rape mainly occurs on the “bad” side of town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Usually, it is only women who do things like hang out in bars and sleep around that are raped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Most rapists are not caught by the police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. If a woman doesn’t physically fight back, you can’t really say that it was rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Men from nice middle-class homes almost never rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Rape isn’t as big a problem as some feminists would like people to think</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. When women go around wearing low-cut tops or short skirts, they’re just asking for trouble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. A rape probably didn’t happen if the woman has no bruises or marks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Many women find being forced to have sex very arousing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. If a woman goes home with a man she doesn’t know, it is her own fault if she is raped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Rapists are usually sexually frustrated individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. All women should have access to self-defense classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is usually only women who dress suggestively that are raped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Some women prefer to have sex forced on them so they don’t have to feel guilty about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>If the rapist doesn’t have a weapon, you really can’t call it a rape.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>When a woman is a sexual tease, eventually she is going to get into trouble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Being raped isn’t as bad as being mugged and beaten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Rape is unlikely to happen in the woman’s own familiar neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>In reality, women are almost never raped by their boyfriends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Women tend to exaggerate how much rape effects them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>When a man is very sexually aroused, he may not even realize that the woman is resisting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>A lot of women lead a man on and then they cry rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>It is preferable that a female police officer conduct the questioning when a woman reports a rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>A lot of times, women who claim they were raped just have emotional problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>If a woman doesn’t physically resist sex – even when protesting verbally – it really can’t be considered rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Rape almost never happens in the woman’s own home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>A woman who “teases” men deserves anything that might happen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. When women are raped, it’s often because the way they said “no” was ambiguous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. If a woman isn’t a virgin, then it shouldn’t be a big deal if her date forces her to have sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Men don’t usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. This society should devote more effort to preventing rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. A woman who dresses in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tries to force her to have sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Rape happens when a man’s sex drive gets out of control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on the first date is implying that she wants to have sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Many women actually enjoy sex after the guy uses a little force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. If a woman claims to have been raped but has no bruises or scrapes, she probably shouldn't be taken too seriously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

WILLINGNESS TO HELP SCALE
Please read the following list of behaviors and check how likely you are to engage in these behaviors using the following scale:

1  not at all likely  2  3  4  5  extremely likely

1. Call 911 and tell the hospital my suspicions if I suspect that my friend has been drugged.  1  2  3  4  5
2. Call 911 if I hear someone yelling and fighting.  1  2  3  4  5
3. Try to get help if I suspect a stranger at a party has been drugged.  1  2  3  4  5
4. Call 911 if I hear someone calling for help.  1  2  3  4  5
5. Go investigate if I am awakened at night by someone calling for help.  1  2  3  4  5
6. Call 911 if my friend needs help.  1  2  3  4  5
7. Talk to the friends of a drunk person to make sure they don’t leave their drunk friend behind at the party.  1  2  3  4  5
8. If I see someone at a party who has had too much to drink, I ask them if they need to be walked home so they can go to sleep.  1  2  3  4  5
9. If my roommate or friend said that they had an unwanted sexual experience but they don’t call it “rape” I question them further.  1  2  3  4  5
10. Walk a stranger home from a party who has had too much to drink.  1  2  3  4  5
11. Walk a friend home from a party who has had too much to drink.  1  2  3  4  5
12. If a woman is being shoved or yelled at by a man, I ask her if she needs help.  1  2  3  4  5
13. If I hear what sounds like yelling and fighting through my dorm walls I knock on the door to see if everything is ok.

14. If I hear what sounds like yelling or fighting through my dorm or apartment walls, I talk with a resident counselor or someone else who can help.

15. If I saw a friend grabbing, pushing, or insulting their partner I would confront them.

16. If I saw a friend grabbing, pushing, or insulting their partner I would get help from other friends or university staff.

17. If I saw a friend taking a very intoxicated person up the stairs to my friend’s room, I would say something and ask what my friend was doing.

18. If I saw several strangers dragging a passed out woman up to their room, I would get help and try to intervene.

19. If I hear an acquaintance talking about forcing someone to have sex with them, I speak up against it and express concern for the person who was forced.

20. Say something to a person whose drink I saw spiked with a drug even if I didn’t know them.

21. Grab someone else’s cup and pour their drink out if I saw that someone slipped something into it.

22. Ask a friend who seems upset if they are okay or need help.

23. Ask an acquaintance who seems upset if they are okay or need help.

24. Ask a stranger who seems upset if they are okay or need help.

25. Call a rape crisis center or talk to a resident counselor for help if a friend told me they were sexually assaulted.

26. Call a rape crisis center or talk to a resident counselor for help if an acquaintance told me they were sexually assaulted.

27. Call a rape crisis center or talk to a resident counselor for help if a stranger told me they were sexually assaulted.

28. Approach a friend if I thought they were in an abusive relationship and let them know that I’m here to help.

29. Let a friend I suspect has been sexually assaulted know that I am available for help and support.
30. Share information about sexual assault and violence with my friend.
   1 2 3 4 5
31. Confront friends who make excuses for abusive behavior by others.
   1 2 3 4 5
32. Speak up against racist jokes.
   1 2 3 4 5
33. Speak up against sexist jokes
   1 2 3 4 5
34. Speak up against homophobic jokes.
   1 2 3 4 5
35. Speak up against commercials that depict violence against women.
   1 2 3 4 5
36. Speak up in class if a professor explains that women like to be raped.
   1 2 3 4 5
37. Speak up if I hear someone say “she deserved to be raped.”
   1 2 3 4 5
38. Watch my drinks and my friends’ drinks at parties.
   1 2 3 4 5
39. Make sure I leave the party with the same people I came with.
   1 2 3 4 5
40. Ask for verbal consent when I am intimate with my partner, even we are in a long-term relationship.
   1 2 3 4 5
41. I won’t stop sexual activity when asked to if I am already sexually aroused.
   1 2 3 4 5
42. When I hear a sexist comment I indicate my displeasure.
   1 2 3 4 5
43. I obtain verbal consent before engaging in sexual behavior.
   1 2 3 4 5
44. If I hear that a teammate, dorm mate, fraternity brother, sorority sister has been accused of sexual violence, I keep any information I may have to myself.
   1 2 3 4 5
45. Educate myself about sexual violence and what I can do about it.
   1 2 3 4 5
46. Call 911 if a stranger needs help.
   1 2 3 4 5
47. I see a man and his girlfriend whom I know in a heated argument. The man’s fist is clenched and his partner looks upset. I ask if everything is ok.
   1 2 3 4 5
48. I see a man talking to a woman at a bar. He is sitting very close to her and by the look on her face I can see she is uncomfortable. I ask her if she is ok.
   1 2 3 4 5
49. I see a man and his girlfriend. I don’t know them but the man’s fist is clenched and his partner looks upset. I ask if everything is ok.
   1 2 3 4 5
50. I encourage people who say they have had unwanted sexual experiences to keep quiet so they don’t get others in trouble.

1 2 3 4 5

51. If I know information about an incident of sexual violence, I tell authorities what I know in case it is helpful.

1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Call 911 and tell the hospital my suspicions if I suspect that my friend has been drugged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Call 911 if I hear someone yelling and fighting.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Try to get help if I suspect a stranger at a party has been drugged.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Call 911 if I hear someone calling for help.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Go investigate if I am awakened at night by someone calling for help.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Call 911 if my friend needs help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Talk to the friends of a drunk person to make sure they don’t leave their drunk friend behind at the party</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>If I see someone at a party who has had too much to drink, I ask them if they need to be walked home so they can go to sleep.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>If my roommate or friend said that they had an unwanted sexual experience but they don’t call it “rape” I question them further.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Walk a stranger home from a party who has had too much to drink.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Walk a friend home from a party who has had too much to drink.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>If a woman is being shoved or yelled at by a man, I ask her if she needs help.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>If I hear what sounds like yelling and fighting through my dorm walls I knock on the door to see if everything is ok.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>If I hear what sounds like yelling or fighting through my dorm or apartment walls, I talk with a resident counselor or someone else who can help</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. If I saw a friend grabbing, pushing, or insulting their partner I would confront them.  
   Yes              No

16. If I saw a friend grabbing, pushing, or insulting their partner I would get help from other friends or university staff.  
   Yes              No

17. If I saw a friend taking a very intoxicated person up the stairs to my friend’s room, I would say something and ask what my friend was doing.  
   Yes              No

18. If I saw several strangers dragging a passed out woman up to their room, I would get help and try to intervene.  
   Yes              No

19. If I hear an acquaintance talking about forcing someone to have sex with them, I speak up against it and express concern for the person who was forced.  
   Yes              No

20. Say something to a person whose drink I saw spiked with a drug even if I didn’t know them.  
   Yes              No

21. Grab someone else’s cup and pour their drink out if I saw that someone slipped something into it.  
   Yes              No

22. Ask a friend who seems upset if they are okay or need help.  
   Yes              No

23. Ask an acquaintance who seems upset if they are okay or need help.  
   Yes              No

24. Ask a stranger who seems upset if they are okay or need help.  
   Yes              No

25. Call a rape crisis center or talk to a resident counselor for help if a friend told me they were sexually assaulted.  
   Yes              No

26. Call a rape crisis center or talk to a resident counselor for help if an acquaintance told me they were sexually assaulted.  
   Yes              No

27. Call a rape crisis center or talk to a resident counselor for help if a stranger told me they were sexually assaulted.  
   Yes              No

28. Approach a friend if I thought they were in an abusive relationship and let them know that I’m here to help.  
   Yes              No

29. Let a friend I suspect has been sexually assaulted know that I am available for help and support.  
   Yes              No

30. Share information about sexual assault and violence with my friend.  
   Yes              No

31. Confront friends who make excuses for abusive behavior by others.  
   Yes              No

32. Speak up against racist jokes.  
   Yes              No

33. Speak up against sexist jokes  
   Yes              No
34. Speak up against homophobic jokes.
   Yes  No
35. Speak up against commercials that depict violence against women.
   Yes  No
36. Speak up in class if a professor explains that women like to be raped.
   Yes  No
37. Speak up if I hear someone say “she deserved to be raped.”
   Yes  No
38. Watch my drinks and my friends’ drinks at parties.
   Yes  No
39. Make sure I leave the party with the same people I came with.
   Yes  No
40. Ask for verbal consent when I am intimate with my partner, even if we are in a long-term relationship.
   Yes  No
41. I won’t stop sexual activity when asked to if I am already sexually aroused.
   Yes  No
42. When I hear a sexist comment I indicate my displeasure.
   Yes  No
43. I obtain verbal consent before engaging in sexual behavior.
   Yes  No
44. If I hear that a teammate, dorm mate, fraternity brother, sorority sister has been accused of sexual violence, I keep any information I may have to myself.
   Yes  No
45. Educate myself about sexual violence and what I can do about it.
   Yes  No
46. Call 911 if a stranger needs help.
   Yes  No
47. I see a man and his girlfriend whom I know in a heated argument. The man’s fist is clenched and his partner looks upset. I ask if everything is ok.
   Yes  No
48. I see a man talking to a woman at a bar. He is sitting very close to her and by the look on her face I can see she is uncomfortable. I ask her if she is ok.
   Yes  No
49. I see a man and his girlfriend. I don’t know them but the man’s fist is clenched and his partner looks upset. I ask if everything is ok.
   Yes  No
50. I encourage people who say they have had unwanted sexual experiences to keep quiet so they don’t get others in trouble.
   Yes  No
51. If I know information about an incident of sexual violence, I tell authorities what I know in case it is helpful.
   Yes  No

Please list other behaviors you have engaged in that involved helping someone in a risky situation and that are not listed in the set of questions above.
APPENDIX K

SEXUAL EXPERIENCES SURVEY (SFV)
The following questions concern sexual experiences that you may have had that were unwanted. We know that these are personal questions, so we do not ask your name or other identifying information. Your information is completely confidential. We hope that this helps you to feel comfortable answering each question honestly. Place a check mark in the box [ ] showing the number of times each experience has happened to you. If several experiences occurred on the same occasion--for example, if one night someone told you some lies and had sex with you when you were drunk, you would check both boxes a and c. The past 12 months refers to the past year going back from today. Since age 14 refers to your life starting on your 14th birthday and stopping one year ago from today.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Experiences</th>
<th>How many times in the past 12 months?</th>
<th>How many times since age 14?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Someone fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of my body</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt) or removed some of my clothes without my</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration)** by:**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pressuring me after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Someone had oral sex with me or made me have oral sex with them without my consent by:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How many times in the past 12 months?</th>
<th>How many times since age 14?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening. Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **If you are a male, check box and skip to item 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How many times in the past 12 months?</th>
<th>How many times since age 14?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening. Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **A man put his penis into my vagina, or someone inserted fingers or objects without my consent by:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How many times in the past 12 months?</th>
<th>How many times since age 14?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening. Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **A man put his penis into my butt, or someone inserted fingers or objects without my consent by:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening. Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Even though it didn’t happen, someone TRIED to have oral sex with me, or make me have oral sex with them without my consent by:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening. Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **If you are male, check this box and skip to item 7.** 

Even though it didn’t happen, a man **TRIED to put his penis into my vagina, or someone tried to stick in fingers or objects without my consent by:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How many times in the past 12 months?</th>
<th>How many times since age 14?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Even though it didn’t happen, a man **TRIED to put his penis into my butt, or someone tried to stick in objects or fingers without my consent by:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How many times in the past 12 months?</th>
<th>How many times since age 14?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn’t want to.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e. Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

8. I am: Female ☐  Male ☐
My age is ____________ years and ____________ months.

9. Did any of the experiences described in this survey happen to you 1 or more times?
   Yes ☐  No ☐
What was the sex of the person or persons who did them to you?
   Female only ☐
   Male only ☐
   Both females and males ☐
   I reported no experiences ☐

10. Have you ever been raped?   Yes ☐  No ☐
APPENDIX L

SEXUAL EXPERIENCES SURVEY (SFP)
The following questions concern sexual experiences. We know these are personal questions, so we do not ask your name or other identifying information. Your information is completely confidential. We hope this helps you to feel comfortable answering each question honestly. Place a check mark in the box □ showing the number of times each experience has happened. If several experiences occurred on the same occasion—for example, if one night you told some lies and had sex with someone who was drunk, you would check both boxes a and c. The past 12 months refers to the past year going back from today. Since age 14 refers to your life starting on your 14th birthday and stopping one year ago from today.

### Sexual Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How many times in the past 12 months?</th>
<th>How many times since age 14?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>I fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of someone’s body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt) or removed some of their clothes without their consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration) by:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn’t want to.</td>
<td>□□□□ □□□□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn’t want to.</td>
<td>□□□□ □□□□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.</td>
<td>□□□□ □□□□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.</td>
<td>□□□□ □□□□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. I had oral sex with someone or had someone perform oral sex on me without their consent by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>How many times in the past 12 months?</th>
<th>How many times since age 14?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn’t want to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn’t want to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I put my penis (men only) or I put my fingers or objects (all respondents) into a woman’s vagina without her consent by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>How many times in the past 12 months?</th>
<th>How many times since age 14?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn’t want to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn’t want to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I put in my penis (men only) or I put my fingers or objects (all respondents) into someone’s butt without their consent by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Even though it did not happen, I TRIED to have oral sex with someone or make them have oral sex with me without their consent by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many times in the past 12 months?</th>
<th>How many times since age 14?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many times in the past 12 months?</th>
<th>How many times since age 14?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Even though it did not happen, I TRIED to put in my penis (men only) or I tried to put my fingers or objects (all respondents) into a woman’s vagina without their consent by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Even though it did not happen, I TRIED to put in my penis (men only) or I tried to put my fingers or objects (all respondents) into a woman’s vagina without their consent by:</th>
<th>How many times in the past 12 months?</th>
<th>How many times since age 14?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn’t want to.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they didn’t want to.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Even though it did not happen, I TRIED to put in my penis (men only) or I tried to put my fingers or objects (all respondents) into someone’s butt without their consent by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Even though it did not happen, I TRIED to put in my penis (men only) or I tried to put my fingers or objects (all respondents) into someone’s butt without their consent by:</th>
<th>How many times in the past 12 months?</th>
<th>How many times since age 14?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises about the future I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn’t want to.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after they said they</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
<td>0 1 2 3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
<td>[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Taking advantage when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.


d. Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them.


e. Using force, for example holding them down with my body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.

8. I am: Female □ Male □
My age is ___________ years and ___________ months.

9. Did you do any of the acts described in this survey 1 or more times?
Yes □ No □
If yes, what was the sex of the person or persons to whom you did them?
Female only □
Male only □
Both females and males □
I reported no experiences □

10. Do you think you may have ever raped someone? Yes □ No □
APPENDIX M

LETTER TO DEPARTMENT HEADS

Dear (X),

My name is Nicole Johnson and I am a doctoral candidate in Counseling Psychology at the University of Akron. I am currently conducting my doctoral dissertation and need your assistance. The purpose of my dissertation is to examine perceived peer attitudes surrounding interpersonal relationships and to investigate social and sexual experiences on college campuses. This study has been approved by the University of Akron Institutional Review Board.

This study involves responding to several questionnaires, some of which deal with emotionally sensitive topics such as: prior sexual experiences, assumptions regarding gender, sex, and relationships and bystander involvement and behavior. I am seeking to obtain data from approximately 1,000 participants. The survey takes approximately 60-90 minutes to complete via the link provided below.

To participate in this study, participants must be at least 18 years old and currently enrolled in post-secondary education (i.e. college or university). The link below takes you to a page with further information regarding the current study including: confidentiality, participant rights, and risks and benefits for participating.

Students, at the University of Akron, who are enrolled in psychology courses that offer extra credit for participating in research are able to receive extra credit for their participation in this study. As I am interested in recruiting a diverse and inclusive sample, I request that you forward this message to students within your department. Further, it would be greatly appreciated if you considered offering students extra credit for their participation in my research.

Below is abbreviated information on my study. Please consider forwarding this to your students.

Please feel free to contact me, Nicole Johnson, at nlj12@zips.uakron.edu with any further questions and/or concerns regarding the aforementioned study. Thank you so much for your time and consideration,

Nicole Johnson
Students:
Participants will be asked to complete a variety of questionnaires examining perceived peer attitudes surrounding interpersonal relationships and to investigate social and sexual experiences on college campuses. Participation should take approximately 60 minutes. Those who complete this survey will have the opportunity to enter a drawing to win one of four $50 visa gift cards.

Due to the sensitive nature of the subject, participants may feel psychological discomfort in revealing information about the emotionally sensitive topics listed above. You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time if you find the questions too distressing or personal. You may also skip any particular question(s) you find too uncomfortable. If you would like to participate, please click the link below, which will take you to an informed consent page with more information about the study.

https://akron.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_4YJMJLX5qNAGEf3

Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,

Nicole
APPENDIX N

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH

Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs
Akron, OH 44325-2102
330.972.7688 Office

NOTICE OF APPROVAL

July 14, 2014

Nicole L. Johnson
3944 Gardiner Run
Copley, Ohio 44321

From: Sharon McWhorter, IRB Administrator

Re: IRB Number 20130610-2 “Measuring Peer Attitudes and Sexual Experiences on College Campuses”

Thank you for submitting your Application for Continuing Review of Research Involving Human Subjects for the referenced project. Your protocol represents minimal risk to subjects and has been approved under Expedited Category #7.

Approval Date: July 11, 2014
Expiration Date: July 9, 2015
Continuation Application Due: June 25, 2015

In addition, the following is/are approved:
- [ ] Waiver of documentation of consent
- [ ] Waiver or alteration of consent
- [ ] Research involving children
- [ ] Research involving prisoners

Please adhere to the following IRB policies:

- IRB approval is given for not more than 12 months. If your project will be active for longer than one year, it is your responsibility to submit a continuation application prior to the expiration date. We request submission two weeks prior to expiration to ensure sufficient time for review.
- A copy of the approved consent form must be submitted with any continuation application.
- If you plan to make any changes to the approved protocol you must submit a continuation application for change and it must be approved by the IRB before being implemented.
- Any adverse reactions/incidents must be reported immediately to the IRB.
- If this research is being conducted for a master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation, you must file a copy of this letter with the thesis or dissertation.
- When your project terminates you must submit a Final Report Form in order to close your IRB file.

Additional information and all IRB forms can be accessed on the IRB web site at:
http://www.uah Akron.edu/research/orrsp/compliance/IRBHome.php

Cc: D. Johnson – Advisor
Cc: Valerie Callanan – IRB Chair

☑ Approved consent form(s) enclosed