

© 2014

MONICA MARIE MERRILL

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

DEFENSIVE BEHAVIORS ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES: THE ROLE OF FEAR,
PERCEIVED RISK, PERCEIVED MOTIVATION AND PAST EXPOSURE TO
SEXUAL VICTIMIZATION

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty of The University of Akron

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Monica Merrill

August, 2014

DEFENSIVE BEHAVIORS ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES: THE ROLE OF FEAR,
PERCEIVED RISK, PERCEIVED MOTIVATION AND PAST EXPOSURE TO
SEXUAL VICTIMIZATION

Monica M. Merrill

Dissertation

Approved:

Accepted:

Advisor
Dr. Emily Asencio

Department Chair
Dr. Matthew Lee

Committee Member
Dr. Kathryn Feltey

Dean of the College
Dr. Chand Midha

Committee Member
Dr. Robert Peralta

Dean of the Graduate School
Dr. George Newkome

Committee Member
Dr. Molly Merryman

Date

Committee Member
Dr. Dena Hanley

ABSTRACT

Rates of sexual violence are notably high on college campuses, with an estimated one in four women being victimized throughout their college career (Fisher, Cullen and Turner 2000). Universities are coming under more and more scrutiny for how they handle cases of reported rapes or sexual assaults, however far less attention is given to the role of Universities in preventing sexual violence. This dissertation examines how college females make the decision to engage in defensive behaviors to protect themselves from sexual victimization. This is done using data collected from college aged females enrolled at a Mid-Western University (n=182). I frame this work by using the rape myth construct (Burt 1980), meaning that rapes are often thought of as incorporating physical violence in a public area with the assailant being a stranger to the victim. I use this frame to examine the effects of fear, perceived risk, perceived motivation of sexual violence and past exposure to rape or sexual assault on the likelihood of females' decision to actually engage in or consider engaging in defensive behaviors. A series of logistic regressions were utilized to see if there were relationships between these variables. Support was found for linking perceived risk and perceived motivations of power and sex to increased likelihood of actual engagement or considering engagement of defensive behaviors. These findings can be directly linked to prevention programs offered at Universities with the goal of increasing defensive behavior to prevent sexual violence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of Problem.....	4
Rates of Sexual Violence.....	4
Sexual Violence on College Campuses.....	5
Impact of Sexual Violence.....	6
Impact on the Individual.....	8
Economic Impact.....	8
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
Defensive Behaviors.....	10
Importance of Incorporating Perceived Motivation of Sexual Violence.....	13
Offender Driven Motivations of Sexual Violence.....	13
Excuses and Justifications.....	14
Rewards of Rape.....	16
Rape Myths.....	18
Past Exposure to Victimization.....	20
Self Blame.....	21
“Secondary Survivors”.....	23

Fear of Crime/Perceived Risk of Victimization.....	24
Differences in Fear and Perceived Risk.....	25
Gender Differences in Fear of Crime.....	26
Research Questions 1 & 2.....	28
Research Question 3.....	29
Research Question 4.....	33
Research Questions 5 & 6.....	34
Research Question 7.....	36
III. RESEARCH DESIGN.....	41
Operationalization of Variables.....	42
Dependent Variable- Defensive Behaviors.....	43
Fear of Crime/ Perceived Risk of Victimization.....	44
Perceived Motivation/Understood Cause.....	45
Exposure to Sexual Violence.....	45
Control Variables.....	46
Data Reduction.....	47
Factor Analysis.....	48
Analytical Plan.....	49
Interaction Tests.....	50
IV. ANALYSIS.....	52
Interaction Tests.....	57
V. DISCUSSION.....	72
Discussion of Logistic Regression Models.....	72

Discussion of Interaction Tests.....	79
Potential Policy Initiatives.....	86
VI. CONCLUSION.....	95
Limitations.....	97
Future Work.....	99
REFERENCES.....	101
APPENDIX.....	117

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1- Demographics	42
2- Variable Frequencies	44
3- Outcome Variable Correlations	47
4- Perceived Motivation Factor Analysis	48
5- Motivation Variable Frequencies	49
6- Correlation Matrix	53
7- Logistic Regression on Engagement in Defensive Behaviors.....	54
8- Logistic Regression on Considering Engagement in Defensive Behaviors	55
9- Logistic Regression with Interaction Effects looking at Likelihood to Engage in Defensive Behaviors	58
10- Logistic Regression with Interaction Effects on Likelihood to Consider Engaging in Defensive Behaviors	61
11-Logistic Regression- Likelihood to Engage in Defensive Behaviors Split by Levels of Fear	62
12- Logistic Regression on Considering Engagement in Defensive Behaviors Split by Levels of Fear	63
13- Logistic Regression on Likelihood to Engage in Defensive Behaviors Split by Levels of Perceived Risk	64
14- Logistic Regression on Considering Engagement in Defensive Behavior Split by Levels of Perceived Risk	65

15- Logistic Regression on Likelihood to Engage in Defensive Behaviors Split by Perceived Motivation	66
16- Logistic Regression on Considering Engagement in Defensive Behaviors Split by Perceived Motivation	67
17- Logistic Regression on Likelihood to Engage in Defensive Behaviors Split by Past Exposure to Sexual Victimization	68
18- Logistic Regression on Likelihood to Consider Engaging in Defensive Behavior Split by Past Exposure to Sexual Victimization.....	70
19- Hypotheses Chart.....	74

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Concerns about sexual violence have been gaining momentum in the national spotlight. High profile offenders, such as Mike Tyson and Kobe Bryant, and high profile cases such as the string of violent rapes in India and the Steubenville Rape Case have helped bring attention to rape and sexual assault. In addition to these types of cases, colleges and Universities have been occupying space in the media regarding either instances of sexual violence on campus or concerns about the administration's handling of reports of rape or sexual assault.

More notable instances of sexual violence on college campuses include the Penn State scandal involving their long-time football coach, and the recent Notre Dame scandal involving members of their football team. In the latter example, official charges were never brought due to the suicide of the main complainant. This is thought to be in response to the way her accusation was handled by University administration, which prompted an investigation into the University's policies and practices regarding rape and sexual assault.

There is a renewed attention to the logistics of how Universities respond to reports of sexual assault. Currently, upwards of fifty Universities are undergoing investigations into how acts of sexual violence are handled on their campuses. These investigations include such things as failure to investigate rapes and sexual assaults,

Clery Act¹ violations, and alleged cover ups of sexual violence by University personnel, among other things. While improving official responses to sexual violence is a very important step in eradicating it altogether, this research focuses on the more overlooked component of sexual violence on college campuses, prevention efforts.

The ways in which we currently deal with sexual violence have been described as shifting the focus from “stopping rape to managing rape” (Thompson 2014: 351). This change in attention is evidenced in the focus on reactionary measures of college campuses to acts of sexual violence. It is the goal of this research to bring attention to sexual violence on college campuses and aid in shifting the focus from how Universities respond to acts of sexual violence to steps that they can take to prevent it. Prevention efforts are an often understudied facet of sexual violence on college campuses (Thompson 2014) and my hope is that work such as this will inform Universities how to take a more proactive stance on preventing sexual violence from occurring on their campuses.

This dissertation looks at what factors influence the decision to engage in defensive behaviors for college females². Defensive behaviors, for my purposes here, are conceptualized as either carrying a weapon or taking a self defense class. Defensive behaviors are rarely used as the outcome of research (Asencio, Merrill and Steiner 2014;

¹ The Clery Act passed in 1990 requires Universities to disclose information about crime rates on and around their campuses.

² I have chosen to focus this research on female victims and male perpetrators as this is still the most common scenario seen in sexual violence. I recognize that the format of this project places the onus of prevention on females and completely excludes males from the discussion. The goal of this dissertation is not to tackle the socio-structural reasons why sexual violence occurs, but instead to look at what can be done to prevent it. The following details certain behaviors that can be enacted by females that can prevent sexual violence. This work only tells half of the prevention story, the other half focuses on what males can do to prevent sexual violence against females.

Rader 2007). When they are examined as an outcome variable they are typically conceptualized as the type of physical, aggressive behaviors I described above. My goal in this work is to take the knowledge that we have regarding these physical, aggressive defensive behaviors and use it in ways that will encourage other types of behaviors aimed at reducing instances of sexual violence on college campuses.

The defensive behaviors that I am examining involve carrying a weapon or participating in self defense training. These behaviors are the ones typically emphasized in University sexual assault prevention policy. However, these physical defenses are the least likely to be utilized in response to sexual violence (May, Rader and Goodrum 2010; Senn 2013; Sochting et. al 2004). It is my hope that the information gained by examining what affects females' decision to engage in these physical defensive behaviors can be channeled into encouraging more effective forms of prevention efforts, such as assertiveness training, consent seminars, and continuum of force training. These constructs are discussed further in the conclusion section.

I use the rape myth construct (Burt 1980) to guide my hypotheses in this project. I incorporate variables such as fear of rape, perceived risk of rape, and past exposure to victimization to predict the likelihood of college females to engage in defensive behaviors. An additional contribution of this work is that I also incorporate perceived motivation of sexual violence. I look at the effect of understanding rape and/or sexual assault as motivated by power, opportunity and sex on engaging in defensive behaviors.

The next section highlights the importance of understanding sexual violence by discussing the high rates of rape and sexual assaults in society. It is followed up by a

discussion of the prevalence of sexual violence on college campuses in particular as well as a discussion of how these high levels of sexual violence negatively impact society.

Statement of Problem

This section gives an epidemiological overview of the amount of sexual violence present in American society based on both formal reporting agencies and victimization surveys. The trends in these rates for the past fifteen years are also examined. This is followed with a look at the heightened risk for rape and sexual assaults on college campuses.

Rates of sexual violence

Sexual violence is one of the most underreported crimes (Allen 2007; Felson and Pare 2005; Fisher et. al 2000; Koss 1992; Koss, Gidycz and Wisniewski 1987). This is evident in the disparities between data coming from formal reporting agencies and victimization studies. Even so, the rates of rape and sexual assault reported to law enforcement are still high. In 2012 there were 84,376 reported instances of forcible rape, or a rate of .529 per 1,000 people (Federal Bureau of Investigation 2012). When we shift the focus to victimization surveys, the rate of sexual violence is dramatically increased. The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) shows 346,830 instances of rape and sexual assault in 2012, giving us a rate of 1.3 per 1,000 people (Bureau of Justice Statistics 2012). This rate is over double the rate that comes from formal reporting sources.

Formal reporting sources (UCR) and victimization data (NCVS) both show that violent crime has been declining from 1993-2011 (Bureau of Justice Statistics 2012; Federal Bureau of Investigation 2012). Since sexual violence is considered a violent

crime, it would follow that rates of these crimes should have been steadily decreasing as well. The UCR does show that reported rapes have decreased along with other instances of violent crime. However, NCVS data from 2003-2012 shows that rates of rape and sexual assault have remained fairly steady throughout this time (Bureau of Justice Statistics 2012).

The statistics given above include rates for men and women combined. Victims of sex crimes are still mostly women, however men are beginning to report victimization in higher rates as well (Bureau of Justice Statistics 2012). Recent estimates show that between fourteen and sixteen percent of males have experienced a form of sexual assault in their lifetime (Davis, Pollard and Archer 2000; Struckman-Johnson 1991). The rate for females of all ages is estimated to be 1 in 5 (Bureau of Justice Statistics 2012). Even though there has been increased attention to male victims of rape (Davis et. al 2000), the “typical” rape is still thought of as involving a male perpetrator and a female victim (Anderson 2007; Littleton et. al 2009)³.

This section has highlighted the prevalence of sexual violence in the United States. Next, I discuss one specific area where rape and sexual assault are known to happen in much higher rates, college campuses.

Sexual violence on college campuses

Recent attention to the topic of sexual victimization on college campuses has led researchers to explore the possibility that college campuses are “not ivory towers, but instead hotspots for criminal activity” (Fisher, Cullen and Turner, 2000:1). Female

³ Based on the fact that the most common form of sexual violence is male to female and I am using rape myths to guide this research I have chosen to limit this analysis to females sexually victimized by males.

college students, specifically those aged 18-24, are the demographic group at the highest risk for sexual victimization (Koss, Gideycz and Wisniewski 1987; Fisher et. al 2000). When Koss and colleagues (1987) assessed the rates of rape in a national sample of higher education institutions, they found that 15% of college women had experienced a completed rape since the age of 14. Another 12% reported having experienced an attempted rape. A more recent national study of sexual violence on college campuses supports these findings, with estimates that between one fifth and one quarter of college women experience either a completed or an attempted rape while enrolled in college (Fisher et. al 2000).

Several reasons for the high levels of sexual violence on college campuses have been explored in the literature, including expansion of social networks (Armstrong, Hamilton and Sweeney 2006), the increased use of alcohol (Abbey 2002; Koss et. al 1987; Peralta, Tuttle and Steele 2010), the presence of fraternities (Sanday 2007), the increased engagement of risky behavior (Schwartz and Pitts 1995), and high levels of rape myth acceptance among college students (Giacopassi and Dull 1986; Gilmartin-Zena 1987). These theoretical explanations tend to fall into three distinct categories, which are discussed below.

The first category involves individual level characteristics of either the perpetrator or the victim (Armstrong et. al 2006). These characteristics include traits such as gender role attitudes, family background and sexual history. The defensive behavior aspect of this work is located in the individual level. I also incorporate the second, structural level, by looking at defensive behaviors through the lens of the rape myth construct.

The second level deals with rape culture and rape myths. Adherence to widespread societal beliefs about gender, gender roles and sexual behavior contribute to the high rates of sexual violence (Armstrong et. al 2006). The rape myth construct comes out of this level, as it contains commonly held beliefs about sexual violence tied to beliefs about gender and sex held at the societal level. The commonly held belief that males are the initiators of sex and females are responsible for preventing their own victimization are common at the structural level, and this dissertation looks at how these beliefs affect behaviors enacted at the individual level.

The third level, which will be addressed in future work, provides an analysis of how the structure of college campuses maintains and reinforces dangerous situations for college women (Armstrong et. al 2006). This research bridges the gap between the first and second levels, as it incorporates both individual and structural characteristics into the theoretical framework. I contribute to the existing literature by incorporating two distinct levels of analysis.

Since sexual violence is occurring at such high rates, especially on college campuses, it is important to note the consequences that this has on society. The next section provides details about the known impacts of sexual violence.

Impact of Sexual Violence

There are many individual level consequences to being a victim of sexual violence, which makes the high instances of rape and sexual assault cause for concern. There are societal level consequences as well. These are detailed in the following section.

Impact on the individual

Negative psychological effects are common among victims of sexual violence. Past work indicates these effects include increased levels of self-blame (Ullman 2007; Ullman and Brecklin 2002), anxiety (Kilpatrick et. al 1989), and suicidal ideation or suicide (Ullman and Brecklin 2002). These consequences may also include posttraumatic stress disorder (Ullman and Filipas 2001) and major depression (Kilpatrick et. al 2000). These two symptoms, PTSD and major depression, have been found to put victims at higher risk for physical symptoms such as premature aging and early onset of age related diseases (Wolkowitz et. al 2010).

Both immediate and long term physical symptoms have been associated with sexual violence. Bruising, bleeding, vaginal/rectal pain, sexually transmitted infections and possible pregnancy are among the immediate physical effects of rape or sexual assault (Koss, Koss and Woodruff 1991). Other long term negative effects include a wide variety of mental health concerns (Ullman 2007) as well as consistently lower self perceived health rankings (Kilpatrick et. al 2000). The immediate and longitudinal physical symptoms suffered by victims of sexual violence affects the victims in terms of physical pain and lower quality of life. They also account for a large amount of health care spending (Koss et. al 1991). The increased use of health care services translates into negative effects for society as a whole.

Economic impact

Aside from the obvious impact that violence has on society (Ray 2011), sexual violence has a large economic impact as well. Using data from the 1995 NCVS and U.S. Census, Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) estimated that the cost for each incident of sexual

violence is \$87,000. According to the NCVS, there were 302, 091 female victims of sexual violence that year bringing the total economic losses for 1995 to over \$26 billion dollars. This study was repeated on a state level by Post et. al (2002), where they analyzed the economic costs of sexual violence in Michigan. Post and colleagues (2002) estimated that sexual violence alone in the state of Michigan cost \$6.5 billion per year. If this was distributed evenly across the population of the state in the form of a “sexual violence tax”, the average family of four would be paying an additional \$2, 750 in taxes per year (Post et. al 2002). These numbers show that sexual violence has a definite economic impact on society.

This section overviewed effects that sexual violence has on both the individual victim and society. This, coupled with the high rates discussed earlier, calls for more academic work to explore how high risk areas, such as Universities, can aid in preventing sexual violence. The upcoming section provides an overview of the existing literature for the importance of studying defensive behavior, past work done in this area and the importance of concepts such as fear of crime, perceived risk of victimization, perceived motivation of sexual violence and past exposure to victimization.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

I begin this section by discussing the dependent variable, defensive behaviors, and continue through other constructs such as gender, fear, perceived risk, perceived motivation and past exposure to sexual victimization. The specific research questions and hypotheses are then laid out, coupled with the appropriate literature.

Defensive Behaviors

Constrained behaviors are any behavior that one engages in aimed at preventing criminal victimization (May et. al 2010). These behaviors are typically broken down into two categories, avoidance behaviors and defensive behaviors. Avoidance behaviors are typically characterized as any behavior that is changed with the aim of avoiding criminal victimization. Examples of this may include avoiding certain people, staying out of certain areas or any other type of restrained activity (Ferrarro and LaGrange 1987). Defensive behaviors include direct action taken by an individual such as carrying a weapon or taking a self-defense class (Ferrarro and LaGrange 1987). For the purposes of this study I have chosen to focus specifically on defensive behaviors.

When defensive behaviors are examined in the criminological and victimization literature, they are almost exclusively focused on physical forms of defensive behavior. This may include things like carrying a weapon or taking a self defense class, as it does in this particular study. One of the flaws with this approach to defensive behavior in

regards to sexual violence is that these types of defensive behaviors are not often utilized in rapes or sexual assaults (May et. al 2010; Nurius et. al 2000; Senn et. al 2013; Sochting et. al 2004). Physical or aggressive forms of defense are far less likely to be used against someone known to a female victim, who is often the aggressor in rapes or sexual assaults (Banyard 2014).

Differences in socialization may account for females' resistance to using such physical methods of defense against sexual victimization (Kimmel 2004). However, past work has shown that individual differences affect the decision to engage in these more physical defensive behaviors (Asencio et. al 2014; Brecklin 2004). Those who report higher levels of self worth and self efficacy are more likely to engage in physical, protective behaviors (Asencio et. al 2014). Fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization were also found to interact with these components of self esteem, affecting the decision to engage in defensive behaviors or to not engage in defensive behaviors (Asencio et. al 2014).

It is the goal of this project to identify what factors may influence females to engage in these physical defensive behaviors. If females are engaging in these intensive forms of defensive behavior, or even considering engaging in these defensive behaviors, they are acknowledging that they are willing to protect themselves from sexual violence. By tapping into what motivates the least likely defensive behaviors, we can use that information to encourage less physical, more effective behaviors aimed specifically at preventing sexual violence.

The work done focusing on defensive behaviors as an outcome variable has been sparse (Asencio et. al 2014; Brecklin 2004; May et. al 2010). This is problematic as

engaging in these behaviors has been found to have positive implications for those who report using some form of defensive behavior. Those who engage in some form of defensive behavior often report lower levels of vulnerability (Garofalo 1981). Those who engaged in this behavior during a criminal attack were able to mitigate some of the negative consequences of their victimization (Perloff 1983) and were even, sometimes, able to de-escalate the attack (Thompson et. al 1999). These positive effects show that gaining insight into who is more likely to engage in these type of behaviors is an important area of research, and one that this project contributes to.

While Universities do incorporate sexual assault prevention strategies into their curriculum, they most often involve items such as debunking rape myths and changing attitudes towards rape and rape victims (Anderson and Whitson 2004; Lonsway et. al 1998). While this is a very important area of research there has been no empirical work linking changes in attitudes about rape to decreased instances of sexual victimization on college campuses (Anderson and Whitson 2004; Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1996; Lonsway et. al 1998).

The next section outlines each of the variables used in the study and their past contributions to our current understanding of sexual violence. All of these variables are then discussed more in depth in the next section as they relate to each specific research question.

Importance of Incorporating Perceived Motivation of Sexual Violence

The majority of past research that has looked at the topic of sexual offender motivation falls into one of two camps. First, research involves direct interviews with those who have been convicted and imprisoned for the crimes of rape and/or sexual

assault. This type of research is typically qualitative in nature and focuses on investigating the motives and justifications offenders provide for their actions (Scully and Marolla 1985;1986). This camp of research is integral in uncovering the motivations behind rape and/or sexual assault, however it has yet to be directly used to further the knowledge brought about by the second camp of research.

The second camp of research has focused on social interpretations of offender motivation through the use of third-party observations. Studies provide a random sampling of people with vignettes describing a rape and/or sexual assault and ask them to infer the motivation of the offender and the attribution of blame (Whatley 1999). This is a valid form of research when dealing with rape and sexual assault. It is most often done with college students, due to their accentuated risk for sexual victimization (Fisher et. al 2000), as well as their close proximity to academics engaging in this type of research. I intend to build on the existing knowledge in the area of third-party perceptions of offender motivation by examining the effect it has on the likelihood of college females to engage in defensive behavior.

Offender driven explanations of sexual violence

Scully & Marolla (1984) were among the first to bring attention to the sociological aspects of rape and sexual assault. Prior to their work, rape was commonly conceived of as an individual level problem. Structural contributions to attitudes involving violence against women were ignored, and rape was explained as a rare crime committed by men with some form of mental illness (Beech, Ward & Fisher 2006; Scully & Marolla 1984; Scully & Marolla 1985). It was this research that shed light onto the way that social structure interacted with individuals to create a conducive climate for this

type of crime to be committed. One of their key contributions to our current understanding of rape and sexual assault comes from interviews with convicted rapists.

Although the logistics of the reflective approach taken by Scully & Marolla (1984; 1985) prevent us from understanding forth-coming acts of violence, this method allows for the benefit of hindsight to rationalize actions. The following sections discuss the excuses or justifications given by offenders and the explanation of their behavior. The excuses and justifications focus on either a denial of wrongdoing or the behavior of the victim through the eyes of the offender. The upcoming section discusses the specific motivations as explained by the offenders.

Excuses and justifications

Scully & Marolla (1984) engaged the question of how offenders understood and explained their violent sexual behavior, finding that they took one of two paths when confronted, invoking either an excuse or a justification. Offenders are giving retrospective accounts when asked to explain their bad behavior, so these are framed slightly differently than when offenders were asked about the rewards of their behavior. Offenders who did conceptualize their behavior as rape employed excuses, and these were categorized into three distinct forms: the excessive use of alcohol/drugs, emotional problems, and the ‘nice-guy’ image (Scully & Marolla 1984).

Of those that admitted that they had committed a rape, 77% attributed at least part of their behavior to their consumption of alcohol (Scully & Marolla 1984). This was used as a way to ‘excuse’ their bad behavior, thus not attributing the blame to any character flaw, but conceptualizing the rape only an isolated behavior brought on by alcohol or drugs. Emotional problems were also cited as a contributing factor to the

offense, often in the form of childhood trauma or a recent precipitating incident, such as the break-up of a marriage and/or relationship (Scully & Marolla 1984). The final excuse category conceptualized by Scully & Marolla (1984) involved the “nice-guy image”. This includes a plethora of apologies and insinuations that this crime does not make them a bad person. The offender’s reliance on apologies is meant to show their remorse, allowing them to admit guilt while simultaneously seeking a pardon for their behavior (Scully & Marolla 1984).

Justifications were a way for an offender to deny that a rape had taken place. Scully and Marolla (1984) provided five distinct ways in which offenders justified their actions: women were seductresses, women said ‘no’ when they meant ‘yes’, most women relax and enjoy it, ‘nice girls’ don’t get raped, and guilty of a minor wrong-doing (Scully & Marolla 1984). Each of these categories provides a way for the offender to maintain his belief that he engaged in no wrong-doing, while simultaneously admitting to sexual intercourse with a woman in what, given their location during the research process, the criminal justice system had determined to be a rape.

The first two categories, women as seductresses and women saying no when they mean yes can be summed up in the cultural expectations of women and their sexuality (Scully & Marolla 1984). Offenders would either blatantly state that the victim had seduced them, often exaggerating their tale to extreme versions, or they would admit that the victim had been reluctant at first, but was simply being “coy” and responding to societal pressures to be demure and ladylike (Scully & Marolla 1984). The belief that victims enjoyed the sexual encounter regardless of consent mitigated the offender’s

ability to conceptualize his actions as a form of rape, as offenders' confused perceived enjoyment for consent (Scully & Marolla 1984).

The most frequent form of denial was based in the offender's description of the victim, evoking certain demographic or behavioral characteristics that made a particular woman "unable" to be raped (Scully & Marolla 1984). The second most common category involved admittance of a sexual encounter with a victim in conjunction with some other type of bad behavior such as using a weapon or contributing to the delinquency of minors, but not rape (Scully & Marolla 1984). What each of these excuses has in common is that the offender is consistently prioritizing the behavior of the victim over their own behavior (Scully & Marolla 1984), essentially situating their understanding of the attack as caused completely by the victim. The upcoming section removes the focus from the victim and places it on the offender and how they themselves explained what they had to gain from engaging in sexual violence.

Rewards of rape

These interviews yielded what Scully & Marolla (1985) termed the rewards of rape, which they conceptualized into six distinct categories. Two of these categories, *reward/punishment* and *recreation/adventure*, dealt with rapists' blatant displays of masculinity. *Reward/punishment* assumed a collective liability, or that any woman at all could be "punished" for the act of the woman who originally had angered the offender (Scully & Marolla 1985). This also could be applied to the use of rape of a woman "belonging" to another man as a way to punish the man (Scully & Marolla 1985). Motivations that fell into the category of *recreation/adventure* generally highlighted a

form of “male camaraderie” (1985:259) enacted by engaging in a rape or sexual assault as members of a particular group.

A temporary self-esteem boost was offered as motivation for what Scully & Marolla (1985) termed *feeling good*. The majority of men in this sample had comparatively low levels of self-esteem when interviewed (Scully & Marolla 1985), which may have been a function of their imprisonment. However, the majority of men interviewed did indicate that they experienced increased levels of self-esteem directly after the rape (Scully and Marolla 1985).

Sexual motivation played a large role in the remaining three categories: *sexual access*, *added bonus* and *impersonal sex and power*. *Impersonal sex and power* involved admittance that forced sex was the form of sex most preferred by the offender because they did not have to be concerned with pleasing a partner and were in complete control (Scully & Marolla 1985). What Scully & Marolla (1985) termed *added bonus*, simply involved a crime of opportunity, and *sexual access* was a purely sexual motivation.

These findings highlighted the roles of gender and power found at the societal level (Scully & Marolla 1985) and provided valuable insight into what rewards rape and sexual assault had for men convicted of these crimes. These explanations provided insight into the incentives for raping a woman, but cannot be extended to speak for how society understands the rewards of sexual violence. The next section details common societal understandings of sexual violence in the form of rape myths.

Rape Myths

The concept of rape myths came emerged from work done by Brownmiller (1975) and Burt (1980). According to Burt, rape myths are “prejudicial, stereotyped or false

beliefs about rape, rape victims and rapists” (1980: 217). This definition has been critiqued as vague and informal (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994; Suarez and Gadalla 2010), leading to variation in the research and the findings regarding rape myths. This variation led Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994) to propose a new, more formal definition of rape myths, “attitudes and beliefs that are generally false but widely and persistently held, and that serve to deny and justify male sexual aggression against women” (1994: 134). This definition has been the dominant definition in the literature, which has clarified a good deal of the research.

While the operationalizations of these components are variable and fluid (Suarez and Gadalla 2010), common components of rape myths include, females fabricate rape after they have had a consensual sexual experience that they regret (Clark and Carroll 2008), women who are raped are promiscuous (Burt 1980), have bad reputations, dress provocatively (Burt 1980; Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994), and only certain types of women are raped (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994). Other components include the offender and victim have no existing or past relationship (Burt 1980), that a rape must include violence, that a man cannot stop once he is aroused (Ryan 2011) and that the victim must engage in a certain emotional response (Koss 1985).

It is a commonly held assumption that these rape myths are prevalent throughout U.S. society and one that has been backed up through research (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994). Most recent work focuses on differences in rape myth acceptance by group (gender, race, education level, etc.), while not measuring how much these rape myths are still embedded in society. Past work has looked at this among specific groups. Field (1978) examined police officers, rapists, crisis counselors and ordinary citizens, finding

that there were, indeed, high levels of rape myth acceptance across the groups.

Giacopassi and Dull (1986) and Gilmartin-Zena (1987) also found high levels of rape myth acceptance among college students. High levels of rape myth acceptance are problematic for society because of the ideas contained within them. They are also highly correlated with other forms of intolerance, including racism, sexism, homophobia, ageism, classism and religious intolerance (Aosved and Long 2006; Suarez and Gadalla 2010).

Rape myths are important to the study of sexual violence for a number of reasons. The first being that males who indicate high levels of rape myth acceptance have been found to be more likely to engage in sexual violence than men who indicate low levels of acceptance (Bohner et. al 2009; Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994; Muelenhard 1988). Past work done with convicted offenders of sexual violence also show higher rates of rape myth acceptance than other participants (Field 1978). One theoretical explanation for this is that rape myths act as “psychological neutralizers” that justify their use of force in sexual interactions (Grubb and Taylor 2013).

Secondly, acceptance of the component of the rape myth that deals with females falsifying rape accusations after regrettable consensual sex can lead to an over-estimation of false rape accusations. Past research tells us that false rape accusations make up about 2% of all reported rapes (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994), although this number is consistently over-estimated by observers (Grubb and Taylor 2013). This may be due to the isolated examples of false accusations being widely reported in the media (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994). The idea that rape accusations are often false may lead victims to be wary of reporting or disclosing their victimization.

Finally, rape myth acceptance promotes a standard of victim blaming (Abbey, McAuslan and Ross; Grubb and Taylor 2013). This not only minimizes the actions of the rapist, but opens the victim up to many forms of secondary victimization from family, friends and the public (Yamawaki, Darby and Queiroz 2007). The presence of this victim blaming ideology has been found in the criminal justice system, where discretionary decisions made by both prosecutors and police have been tainted by this belief, thus affecting the outcome for the offender (Felson and Pare 1995; Frohman 1991).

This section has illustrated the definitions of rape myths, the prevalence of these ideas in society as well as the importance of continuing to produce knowledge in this area of research. Because these myths are so pervasive in society, I am using them as a theoretical guide to inform my research questions as well as my hypotheses.

Past Exposure to Victimization

Victims of sexual assault find themselves occupying a unique role, as they have been the victim of a crime but are often not granted the same amount of believability and/or sympathy that victims of other types of crime often receive (Grubb and Harrower 2009). This is especially true if the circumstances of their assault do not correspond to what is commonly referred to as our “societal rape script” (Burt 1980), meaning that the offender was not a stranger, the assault involved no penetration and violence was not used (Burt 1980). Victims who are acquainted with their rapist often are not granted the full “victim identity” as they are often seen as, at least partially, to blame for their victimization (Grubb and Harrower 2009). This often leads victims to keep their victimization hidden (Koss 1992).

Those who do report their victimization are often brushed off by law enforcement due to prevalent attitudes of victim blaming (Felson and Pare 2005). Many factors have been found to contribute to the common conception that rape victims are to blame for their victimization. These factors include amount of resistance put forth by victim (Buzash 1989; Yescavage 1999), previous sexual experiences (L'Armand & Pepitone 1982), use of alcohol by victim (Abbey, Saenz & Buck 2005; Stormo, Lang & Strizke 2006), victim's physical attractiveness (Deitz, Litman & Bentley 1984), victim's clothing choice when attacked (Workman & Freeburg 1999), and relationship to offender (L'Armand & Pepitone 1982). This societal tendency to blame victims of sexual assault, especially those who were acquainted with their attackers, often leads to the victim also blaming herself for her victimization (Grubbs 1990).

Victim blaming is especially problematic as it has been found that having been a victim of sexual assault or rape in adulthood increases one's risk of sexual revictimization (Classen, Palesh & Aggarwal 2005). This is especially true for females who are victimized on college campuses, as research shows that between 14-26% of these women will be revictimized within one academic year (Diagle, Fisher and Cullen 2008). The internalization of blame for the original rape or sexual assault has also been shown to increase likelihood of revictimization (Tjaden & Thoennes 2000).

Self blame

The concept of victim self-blame has dominated the literature regarding rape and sexual assault in psychology and sociology (see Ullman 2007 for a review). This concept has been commonly separated into two distinct categories, behavioral self-blame and characterological self-blame (Janoff-Bulman 1979). Behavioral self-blame deals with a

particular behavior enacted by the victim that they believe contributed to their victimization, i.e. walking alone at night (Janoff-Bulman 1979). Characterological self-blame is the more challenging of the two, and involves attributing their victimization to a “relatively nonmodifiable source”, as in one’s character (1979:1798). The latter of the two, characterological self blame, is the more problematic. This type of blame leads to higher rates of depression and increased likelihood for revictimization (Janoff-Bulman 1979).

As previously mentioned, there have been positive implications for those who have engaged in defensive behaviors, such as lessened levels of vulnerability (Garofalo 1981). Those who engaged in this behavior during a criminal attack were able to mitigate some of the negative consequences of their victimization, including levels of vulnerability and depression (Perloff 1983). These positive effects show that gaining insight into who is more likely to engage in these type of behaviors is an important area of research.

An additional contribution of this project is the inclusion of those who have been exposed to sexual violence. For our purposes here, being exposed to sexual violence includes those who have been a victimized themselves as well as those who know someone who has been victimized in this way. Past work has, typically, focused only on primary victims of sexual violence. The next section discusses the relevance of including those who have reported knowing a victim of rape or sexual assault.

“Secondary survivors”

Being the primary victim of a rape or sexual assault is not the only way to be affected by an act of sexual violence. Often times, those close to the victim suffer

negative effects from their loved one's victimization (Ahrens and Campbell 2000; Branch and Richards 2013). Remer and Ferguson (1995) compare victimization to a "ripple effect" sending damage out from the center to all those who surround the primary victim. This is especially true if these informal sources of social support are the ones receiving the actual disclosure of a sexual victimization (Branch and Richards 2013).

College women have been found to be at a heightened risk for rape and sexual assault (Fisher et. al 2000). These women are often times geographically separated from home and family members leaving them to turn to alternative sources of social support such as other college students (Filipas and Ullman 2001; Starzynski et. al 2005; Ullman and Peter-Hagene 2014). While disclosing a sexual victimization to friends may be a good way for the victim to gain important social support, said friends are not likely to be prepared to handle such a disclosure (Ahrens and Campbell 2000; Branch and Richards 2013; Filipas and Ullman 2001), and they may suffer consequences because of this ill-preparedness (Branch and Richards 2013).

Research on this group of "secondary survivors" is just emerging. Past work has focused on the response of these sources of support for victims of sexual assault (Starzynski et. al 2005), but only one study to date has examined the effect that such disclosures have on those receiving the disclosure. Branch and Richards (2013) incorporated a feminist methodology and engaged in interviews with college students who had received disclosures of sexual violence from friends. Four main themes emerged from the data including "anger", "feelings of shock", "feeling of concern", and "changes in worldview".

The final theme found in this work, “changes in worldview” suggests that receiving a disclosure of sexual victimization changed how the participants thought about the world as a whole (Branch and Richards 2013). Participants reported changes in their feelings of fairness, sense of security, and even in how they thought about rape (Branch and Richards 2013). The finding that receiving a disclosure changes one’s worldview guides this final piece of my research project.

This section has overviewed the literature dealing with both primary and secondary victims of sexual assault. The upcoming section looks at a related factor, fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization. Overall levels of fear and perceived risk of victimization are discussed, as well as some of the methodological issues with these concepts. The upcoming section gives each specific research question coupled with the hypotheses.

Fear of Crime/Perceived Risk of Victimization

This research focuses on likelihood to engage in defensive behaviors, which is a relatively new area of study when used as an outcome variable (Asencio et. al 2014; Rader 2007). Due to this, I am grounding my hypotheses in adjacent literature. I have chosen to use the established literature on rape myths in order to make this connection. Past work shows that there are high levels of rape myth acceptance (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994), particularly on college campuses (Giacopassi and Dull 1986; Gilmartin-Zena 1987). More recent work shows that college students are still conceptualizing rape as an act committed by a stranger (Anderson 2007; Hickman and Muelenhard 1997), which is consistent with rape myths. This means that college students are thinking of

rape in very stereotypical ways. This will be reflected in their levels of fear and perceived risk.

The following section provides a clear delineation of the concepts fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization, a discussion of both the fear of crime literature and perceived risk literatures, gender differences in fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization and concludes with the specific research questions, hypotheses and relevant literature.

Fear of crime/perceived risk of victimization differences

Fear of crime had long been the construct that guided the literature on crime and victimization. Fear of crime is now used only when the emotional response to a particular crime is the desired outcome (Ferraro and LaGrange 1987; Garofalo 1973; Taylor and Hale 1976). More recently, this construct is coupled with a separate measure, perceived risk of victimization. This measure is said to focus on the likelihood that a person thinks he/she will fall victim to a crime (Ferraro 1995; Ferraro and LaGrange 1987). Therefore, perceived risk is measuring a cognitive response to crime and fear is focused on the emotional reaction.

There is empirical support for separating these concepts. Warr and Stafford (1983) were among the first to test fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization separately. This research was done with a mail survey and 399 respondents. The respondents were asked their level of fear for sixteen specific crimes (both property and violent) and how afraid they were of the same specific crimes. Findings show that they reported different levels of fear than they did perceived risk of victimization. This empirical difference reinforces the theoretical assertion that they are two distinct

concepts, validating their separation (Ferraro and LaGrange 1987; Warr and Stafford 1983).

I have chosen to separate these constructs for the above empirical reason as well as two theoretical reasons. Both reasons are based on past work done looking at gender differences in both fear of crime and perceived victimization. The next section details the existing literature on how gender affects a participant's level of fear or their perceived risk of victimization. I then discuss why this is important in my research, and why I chose to limit my sample to females.

Gender differences in fear of crime

The gender disparity in fear of crime has been well established (Ferraro 1995; LaGrange and Ferraro 1989; Skogan and Maxfield 1989; Warr 1984). Ferraro's (1995) findings showed females to be 23% more fearful of nonsexual crimes than men but almost 300% more fearful of rape than men. This finding is inconsistent with the actual data on crime, that shows men are far more likely to be the victims of violent crimes (with the exception of rape and sexual assault) than women (Reid and Konrad 2004). The "gender-fear paradox" in fear of sexual crimes may be lessened today as more attention has been given to male victims of sexual violence, however recent studies show that a wide gap still remains (Fisher and May 2009). This, coupled with the fact that females are the most likely victims of sexual violence on college campuses, is why I chose to limit this study to females only.

Some of the more popular explanations for the gender-fear paradox include the differences in physical size and ability between men and women (Hale 1996; Killias and Clerici 2000; Snedker 2012). Women, who are typically of a smaller stature, may feel

that they do not have the ability to successfully resist a physical attack, thus raising their levels of fear (Hale 1996). Socialization differences in males and females are also often cited as a reason for the discrepancy in reported fear (Kimmel 2004). Sutton and Farrell (2005) extend this logic and theorize that, due to their different socializations, females are more comfortable reporting higher levels of fear than males.

Warr is among the first to point out that for women, “fear of crime *is* fear of rape” (1984:700). Ferraro (1995) expanded on this idea and termed this phenomenon the “shadow of sexual assault”. This term encompasses the idea that women report higher levels of fear and perceived risk of all crimes because for women every violent crime has the potential to escalate into a sexual assault, therefore the fear of sexual violence “shadows” women’s fear of other crimes (Ferraro 1995). Ferraro (1995) found empirical support for this concept and it has been supported more recently by Fisher and Sloan (2003).

The shadow of sexual assault has become a popular theoretical explanation regarding gender differences in fear of crime and has spawned research interest including additional variables. Wilcox et. al (2006) found support for the shadow hypothesis while controlling for victim offender relationship. This was an important contribution as we know that most acts of sexual violence are not committed by strangers, but by those known to the victim in some way (Burt 1980; Fisher et. al 2000; Koss et. al 1987).

Based on the empirical support for the effect that sexual assault has on all other aspects of fear of crime for females (Ferraro 1995; Fisher and Sloan 2003), I have limited the fear and perceived risk variables in this project to rape only. Limiting the variable to fear or perceived risk of rape specifically is an additional contribution of this

project, as often fear and perceived risk are not measured by specific crimes, but as a combination of both property and violent crimes together. This is typically seen as a shortcoming in the literature (Fisher and Sloan 2003; Reid and Konrad 2004).

Our present society reports high levels of fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization (Scheingold 2011). These high levels of fear have consequences for our decisions and behaviors. For example, females who report high levels of fear of crime are more likely to choose an aggressive male as a partner (Snyder et. al 2011). This shows that levels of fear and perceived risk do have a connection to future behavior, which is the focus of this project. The next section outlines my first two research questions, which focus on how levels of fear and perceived risk affect the decision to engage in defensive behaviors.

Research Questions 1 & 2

My first two research questions look at the relationship between fear of crime, perceived risk of victimization and engaging in defensive behaviors. Past work has begun to show some of the differences between those who choose to engage in defensive behaviors and those who do not (Asencio et. al 2014; Rader 2007). This is an often overlooked area of study, but important if the goal is to minimize instances of sexual violence. The specific questions is as follows: *What is the effect of fear of rape and perceived risk of sexual victimization on the likelihood to engage in or consider engaging in defensive behaviors?*

Here, I draw on the rape myth framework to make this connection. Rape myth acceptance has been shown to be high (Giacopassi and Dull 1986; Gilmartin-Zena 1987; Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994). Also, when college students are asked, specifically, to

describe what they think of as a typical rape the majority of them describe a scenario that fits in the rape work frame (Anderson 2007; Barbaret et. al 2003; Hickman and Muelenhard 1997; Wilcox-Jordan and Pritchard 2007). Defensive behaviors, such as carrying a weapon or taking a self-defense class are targeted at this preventing this type of sexual violence. Based on this, I am hypothesizing that those females who report high levels of fear as well as high levels of perceived risk will be more likely to engage in, or consider engaging in defensive behaviors.

H1: Fear of rape will increase the likelihood of an individual to engage in defensive behavior.

H1a: Those who have high levels of fear of rape will be more likely to have considered engaging in defensive behavior.

H2: Perceived risk of rape will increase the likelihood of an individual to engage in defensive behavior.

H2a: Those who have high levels of perceived risk of rape will be more likely to have considered engaging in defensive behaviors than those who have not.

Research Question 3

This project focuses on three perceived motivations: power, sex, and opportunity.⁴ As previously mentioned, the area of perceived motivation has been often overlooked in the sexual violence literature. The specific research questions is as follows: *What is the effect of the perceived motivation behind sexual violence on the likelihood to potentially engage in or actually engage in defensive behaviors?*

⁴ The rationale for these three motivations above all others is given in the research design section.

Past work has shown that it is an important area of study due to the fact that how an act of sexual violence is perceived often changes how an individual reacts to that act (Field 1978; Mitchell et. al 2009; Sizemore 2013). However, there is little guidance on how to incorporate this perception into any relationship with defensive behavior. I have chosen to use the theoretical construct of rape myth to form my hypotheses, each of which is discussed below.

Past work has shown understanding sexual violence as being motivated by power is a common understanding (Asoved and Long 2006; Locke and Mahalik 2005; Zurbriggen and Yost 2004). This understanding is based in Brownmiller's (1975) theory that female to male rape is a manifestation of patriarchal power. According to this theory, in societies that have high levels of patriarchy the need to dominate women is so culturally engrained that the entire society becomes "rape-prone" (Sanday 1981; 2003). Such a society may then be described as one where "rape is used as one mean...by which men enforce a status hierarchy that is to their own advantage and the disadvantage of women" (Chiroro et. al 2004: 429).

Having an understanding that sexual violence is motivated by power implies that, at least, one is aware of the power inequities in society based on gender. Past work has shown that understanding power as the motivation behind sexual violence is highly correlated with rape myth acceptance (Hockett et. al 2009). If females who recognize the gender power differential are thinking of rape in ways that are consistent with a rape myth scenario, it would follow that they would be more likely to engage, or consider engaging, in defensive behaviors..

H3- Understanding that sexual violence is motivated by power will increase one's likelihood to engage in defensive behavior.

H3a- Understanding that sexual violence is motivated by power will increase the likelihood to have considered engaging in defensive behaviors.

The next motivational factor I consider is opportunity⁵. Here, opportunity is defined as seeing the victim as an easy target or because the opportunity for sexual violence presented itself. The idea that sexual violence is a crime of opportunity is something not typically looked at in research on the motivation behind sexual violence however I employ it here because of the amount of participants in my study who chose this as a potential motivation as well as the direct link that it has to the theoretical construct of rape myths.

The theory that rape is a crime of opportunity is an idea that undergirds the rape myth. Constructs such as rapes happen in public places (Burt 1980) and are often functions of a blitz attack (Burt 1980; Ryan 2011) support the connection with opportunity. Another supporting factor is the rape myth component that women can avoid these situations if they engage in defensive behaviors to actively protect themselves against sexual violence (Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994). This provides a direct link to the outcome variable in this study, defensive behavior, and led me to the following hypothesis:

H4: Understanding opportunity as the motivation for sexual violence will increase the likelihood of engaging in defensive behaviors.

⁵ The analysis done to create this variable is discussed further in the data reduction section.

H4a: Understanding opportunity as the motivation for sexual violence will increase the likelihood of having considered engaging in defensive behaviors

A purely sexual motivation is also often thought of as the driving force behind most acts of sexual violence (Barnett and Field 1977; Field 1978). More recent work shows that this is the most common explanation given for sexual violence (Anderson and Swainson 2001). There can be different interpretations of how sex is thought about regarding rape and sexual assault. One interpretation is that the urge to rape for sexual reasons is a biological drive based in reproduction (Archer and Vaughn 2001). Other sex based motivations include the idea that men cannot overcome their biological urges (Ryan 2011) or that men enjoy sex more when they do not have to worry about pleasing their partner (Scully and Marolla 1985).

Adopting any of these views would be accepting at least some component of the traditional rape myth. This means that they would be more likely to engage in behaviors that they feel would protect them from this traditional understanding of sexual violence, such as carrying a weapon or taking a self defense class. Based on these facts, I constructed the following hypothesis:

H5- Understanding sex as the motivation behind sexual violence will increase the likelihood of engaging in defensive behavior.

H5a- Understanding sex as a motivation behind sexual violence will increase the likelihood to have considered engaging in defensive behavior.

Research Question 4

Few studies set out to examine the effect of past exposure to sexual victimization on the decision to engage in defensive behavior. The findings from these studies suggest that there is no relationship between past sexual victimization and engaging in constrained behavior, which is defined as a combination of defensive behaviors or avoidance behaviors (Rader et. al 2007; Wilcox et. al 2007). This is surprising in light of the fact that other forms of victimization, such as property crimes and non-sexual violent victimization, do increase one's engagement in defensive behavior (Rader et. al 2007; Wilcox et. al 2007).

Each of the previous studies that focused on the relationship between past sexual victimization and defensive behavior only included those who had been direct victims of sexual violence in this variable. This project expands this category to include those who have known someone who has been victimized in this way and primary victims. The specific research questions is as follows: *Does past exposure to sexual victimization affect the likelihood that one will engage in defensive behavior?* This larger number will increase the statistical power of the model as well as theoretically expand the connection, if any, between past exposure to sexual victimization and engaging in defensive behaviors.

In line with the construct of rape myth, it is logical to think that those who have been exposed to sexual violence would engage in defensive behavior at a higher rate than those who do not. I am hypothesizing something different, that those who have had past exposure to sexual victimization will be less likely to engage, or consider engaging, in defensive behaviors than those who have not had past exposure to sexual victimization.

This logic is based on the idea that rape is committed by strangers in public places (Burt 1980). While I am still using this construct to frame my hypothesis, I am approaching it in a different way.

Most acts of sexual violence are not, in fact, consistent with this component of the rape myth (Burt 1980; Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994). These acts of sexual violence are typically committed by acquaintances or dates of the victims (Bureau of Justice Statistics 2012). With this in mind, it is logical to conclude that those who have been exposed to victimization (either primary or secondary) have likely experienced an act of sexual violence at the hands of a date or acquaintance. This leads me to believe that, contrary to previous work, those who have been exposed to sexual violence will be less likely to engage in defensive behaviors, as their exposure to sexual violence has likely been different from the stereotypical rape.

H6- Those who have been exposed to sexual violence will be less likely to engage in defensive behaviors than those who have not been exposed to sexual violence.

H6a: Those who have been exposed to sexual violence will be less likely to consider engaging in defensive behaviors than those who have not been exposed to sexual violence.

Research Question 5 & 6

The literature dealing with the relationship between fear of crime and past sexual victimization has produced conflicting results. To my knowledge, only two studies have examined this direct relationship. One finds that past sexual victimization increases levels of fear (Wilcox et. al 2007) and the other finds that it has no significant effect on levels of fear (Schafer et. al 2006). This calls for a more focused study into this

relationship, which this project will provide. The specific research questions is as follows: *Does having high levels of fear/perceived risk of sexual victimization increase the likelihood of engaging in defensive behaviors for those who have had previous exposure to sexual violence?*

Similar to hypothesis six, I am theorizing that while rape myths do play a large role in how females understand sexual violence and if they actively choose to defend against it, this influence may be mitigated for those who have had past exposure to sexual victimization. In other words, their experiences may be more salient to their decision to engage in defensive behaviors than the pervasiveness of rape myths in society. With this in mind I have constructed the following hypothesis:

H7: High levels of fear will intensify the relationship between past exposure to sexual victimization and engaging in defensive behaviors.

H7a: High levels of fear will intensify the relationship between past exposure to victimization and having considered engaging in defensive behaviors.

The relationship between perceived risk and past sexual victimization has been more thoroughly examined in the literature. Past work has shown that females who have been sexually victimized in the past do perceive a higher likelihood for further victimization than those who have not (Gidycz, McNamara and Edwards 2006; Koss et. al 1998; Naugle 2000; Norris, Nurius and Graham 1996). This is encouraging as past victims of sexual violence are at heightened risk for revictimization (Classen et. al 2005). Based on this past work I have constructed the following hypothesis:

H8: High levels of perceived risk of victimization will intensify the relationship between past exposure to victimization and engaging in defensive behavior.

H8a: High levels of perceived risk of victimization will intensify the relationship between past exposure to victimization and considering engagement in defensive behavior.

Research Question 7

Knowing the motivation behind sexual violence has been found to influence the behavior of criminal justice officials (Field 1978) and members of society in general (Mitchell et. al 2009; Sizemore 2013). These studies found changes in hypothetical sentencing of the offender based on motivation (Mitchell et. al 2009) and hypothetical sentencing of the offender (Mitchell et. al 2009; Sizemore 2013) based on different known motivations for the attack. Here, I extend this work and theorize that how one perceives the motivation behind sexual violence will influence their likelihood to engage in defensive behavior, particularly if they have been exposed to sexual violence in the past. The specific research questions is as follows: *Does the perceived motivation behind sexual violence moderate the relationship between past exposure to victimization and considering engaging in or actually engaging in defensive behavior?*

Based on my previous assertion that those who have been exposed to sexual violence have likely been exposed in a way not consistent with the rape myth scenario, I extend this logic to incorporate different aspects of perceived motivation. In this section I briefly overview my hypotheses on each motivation variable included in this study, power, opportunity and sex.

Those who have been previously exposed to sexual victimization may have been in a situation where this crime was committed based on an existing relationship, such as a date or acquaintance rape. This power differential is common in acquaintance and date rape situations (DeKeseredy and Schwartz 1993; Lloyd and Emory 2000), where some amount of sexual coercion on the part of the male is an almost expected part of the dating experience (Basow and Mineri 2011; Lloyd and Emory 2000). This may make a female who has had this experience more likely to cite power as a potential motivation for sexual violence.

This means that understanding power as the motivation behind sexual violence may have an effect on the likelihood to engage in defensive behavior for those who have been previously exposed to victimization. However, I am hypothesizing that this understanding will lessen the likelihood that one will engage in defensive behavior. I made this decision based on the fact that these behaviors are more consistent with preventing victimization that is consistent with the societal rape script that, likely, was not similar to the participant's experiences.

H9- Understanding power as a potential motivation for sexual violence will decrease the likelihood of engaging in defensive behaviors for those who have been previously exposed to sexual victimization.

H9a: Understanding power as a potential motivation for sexual violence will decrease the likelihood of considering engagement in defensive behaviors for those who have been previously exposed to sexual victimization.

In accordance with the rape myth framework opportunity is likely thought of as being present in public settings, alone, at night, etc. This is inconsistent with the most

common instances of sexual violence (Fisher et. al 2000). To continue with the logic I have used throughout, I am assuming that University students who have had past exposure to sexual victimization experienced a form of sexual violence more consistent with a date or acquaintance rape. This means that the opportunities they are thinking of may not be the same as the opportunities that those who have not had exposure to sexual violence associate with sexual victimization.

In this instance, I am also assuming that the past exposure to victimization is more salient than how they understand the motivation behind sexual violence. Past work supports this assumption because of the host of negative effects on primary victims (Elliot et. al 2004; Koss and Burkhardt 1989; Kilpatrick et. al 2006; Littleton et. al 2006; Perilloux et. al 2012) and even secondary victims (Branch and Richards 2013). Based on this, I am hypothesizing that females who have been exposed to sexual violence and who understand opportunity as a motivating factor behind rape or sexual assault will be less likely to engage in defensive behaviors.

H10- Understanding opportunity as a motivation for sexual violence will decrease the likelihood of engaging in defensive behaviors for those who have been previously exposed to sexual victimization.

H10a: Understanding opportunity as a motivation for sexual violence will decrease the likelihood of considering engagement in defensive behaviors for those who have been previously exposed to sexual victimization.

The final motivation I examine in this study is sex. Recent literature shows sexual pleasure is commonly understood by members of society as a motivation behind

sexual violence (Mitchell et. al 2009). Sex is a complex motivation for sexual violence in that it can be thought of in two distinct ways. One, sexual pleasure undergirds sexual violence because males are biologically driven to desire sex and that they will use any means necessary (i.e. violence) to achieve that goal (Bouffard and Bouffard 2010). Secondly, it can be understood in a way more consistent with an acquaintance rape or date rape scenario. This could be assuming sex is a “given” based on previous sexual activity or at the end of a date (Abbey et. al 1998; Lonsway et. al 1998; Muelenhard 1988; Ryan 2011). It is important to recognize each of these ways that sexual pleasure can be conceived of as a motivation for sexual violence.

For those who have been previously exposed to sexual violence I am hypothesizing that they are understanding sex as a motivation more consistent with their past experience. In other words, I am assuming that they are using their own, or their friends, past experience with sexual violence to guide their thinking on motivation. However, those that have not had this experience may still be operating under the understanding that sex is the motivation for sexual violence in a way much more consistent with a violent, stranger rape scenario. This leads me to conclude that understanding sex as a motivation for sexual violence will have different effects for those who have had previous exposure to sexual violence and those who have not.

Again, I am operating under the assumption that the past exposure to sexual victimization would, in this case, override the effect of the perceived motivation. In other words, even though understanding the motivation behind sexual violence may increase the likelihood to engage in, or consider engaging in defensive behaviors, in this instance I am hypothesizing that understanding sex as a motivation for sexual violence will work

differently for those who have had past exposure to sexual victimization. In this case, that for those who have had past exposure to sexual violence, seeing sex as the motivation will decrease their likelihood to engage in, or consider engaging in defensive behaviors.

H11-Those who have had exposure to sexual victimization and who understand sex as the motivation for sexual violence will be less likely to engage in defensive behaviors than those who have not been exposed to sexual violence.

H11a: Those who have had exposure to sexual violence and who understand sex as the motivation for sexual violence will be less likely to have considered engaging in defensive behaviors than those who have not been exposed to sexual violence.

The next section discusses the research design. Sample characteristics, data reduction and specific details for how the hypotheses are tested are discussed in this section.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

The data for this dissertation was collected on a University campus with approval from the University's Institutional Review Board. This particular University is a mid-Western University located in an urban setting. Enrollment varies between 22,000-26,000 undergraduates, making this a fairly sizeable University. There is ample housing in and around the University occupied by students, however the majority of the University students commute to and from campus.

The sample was comprised of students enrolled in Psychology courses at the University and was administered through the University sponsored Human Participation in Research platform. Students were able to fulfill a research requirement for their class and/or were awarded extra credit points for their participation in the survey. This survey was administered online and the participants took the survey from anywhere that they were able to access the internet.

The survey remained open for the length of the fall semester of 2012. In that time 246 people participated in the survey, 182 females. The pertinent demographic information is listed in Table 1. According to the enrollment data provided by the University, the racial breakdown is consistent with the population of this University as the student body is majority white (73.8%), comparable to the 75.8% represented in this sample. African Americans make up the next heavily populated ethnicity at 11.7%, and

are represented at 15.4% in this study, and Hispanics make up 2% of the student body and 1.6% of this study . Middle Eastern is not an ethnicity specifically recognized in the enrollment data provided by the University, however those who identified as any other ethnicity than listed make up 2.9% of the student population and those who identified as Middle Eastern made up 3.8% of this sample. Overall the racial representation is fairly consistent with the University student population.

Table 1- Demographics

	Frequency	Percentage
White	138	75.8%
African-American	28	15.4%
Middle Eastern	7	3.8%
Hispanic	3	1.6%
Lives off campus	81	44.5%
Lives w/Parents	59	32.4%
Lives in dorm	40	22%

Operationalization of Variables

This section briefly outlines each of the variables included in the study. I begin with the dependent variable, defensive behaviors, and go through each variable included in the model. Actual measurement tools are represented in Appendix A. The next section discusses the ways in which I handled the data in order to prepare for the analysis.

Dependent Variable- Defensive Behaviors

Defensive behaviors were measured in two separate ways for this study. I chose to incorporate both students who identified as actually engaging in defensive behaviors as well as those who considered engaging in such behaviors. Those who actively engaged in defensive behaviors reported either taking a self defense class or carrying a weapon. Those who reported having considered engaging in defensive behaviors answered that they would consider carrying a weapon on college campuses.

I made this decision for three reasons. One, defensive behaviors were measured by variables such as carrying a weapon and taking a self defense class. These variables are known to be the least effective tools against sexual violence (May et. al 2010; Nurius et. al 2010; Senn et.. al 2013; Sochting et. al 2004). They are also very intense forms of defensive behavior, and females are not likely to use these physical forms of defense against those to whom they are the most vulnerable (friends and acquaintances).

Secondly, the data was split fairly evenly between the three groups, those who chose to actually engage in defensive behaviors, those who consider engaging in defensive behaviors and those who have no interest in engaging in defensive behaviors (see Table 1). The similarities in group size implies that there are differences between these three groups that need to be further explored.

Finally, those who identify as having considered engaging in defensive behaviors are actually saying that they do see the value in such behaviors, but have not yet chosen to engage in these more physical forms of defense. This means that because they do see the value in these behaviors, we may be able to channel that energy and willingness to protect oneself into less intensive, more effective means of defensive behavior. These alternative means of defensive behavior are discussed in the final section of this piece.

Table 2- Variable Frequencies

	Frequency	Percentage
Satisfied w/ U precautions	68	37.4%
Unsatisfied w/ U precaution	33	18.1%
Unaware of U precautions	69	37.9%
Past exposure Victimization	123	67.6%
Engaging in Defensive Beh.	68	37.4%
Consider Eng. In Def Beh.	66	36.2%

Fear of crime/perceived risk of victimization

Fear of crime is assessed using two separate scales that gauge the extent to which participants feel afraid they would be victimized by a violent crime. The items used to measure fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization are previously established as reliable and valid measures (Warr & Stafford 1983). Specifically, subjects are asked to report on a scale of 0 (nonexistent) to 10 (very high) how scared they are that they will be raped. Perceived risk is measured in the same way, but the survey measure asks the participant to rank how likely they think it is that they will be raped. The means for fear and perceived risk of rape measurements are 5.5 and 4.0 respectively.

In order to conduct the analysis I collapsed each scale into high/low categories, where any score of 6 or higher was put into the high category and the remaining scores were in the low category. This categorization yielded 68 females (37.4%) reporting high levels of fear and 52 (28.6%) reporting high levels of perceived risk.

Perceived motivation/understood cause

The categories used to form this variable came directly out of past research done with offenders. The survey instrument broke this variable down into eight potential responses, and the participants were asked to check each response that they thought was the motivation behind what they considered to be a “typical”, or common rape. The question was focused on a “typical”, or common rape in order to tap into the assumptions the participants held regarding sexual violence as a whole and not specific cases they may have been exposed to in one way or another.

The eight responses participants had to choose from were as follows: ¹⁾ revenge against the victim, ²⁾ revenge against a third party, ³⁾ saw victim as easy target, ⁴⁾ the opportunity presented itself, ⁵⁾ to have sex, ⁶⁾ to demonstrate power over the victim, ⁷⁾ sense of male camaraderie, ⁸⁾ relief of tension and stress. These responses were derived from offenders responses to their sexual crimes (Scully and Marolla 1985:1986). These variables are discussed further in the data reduction section.

Exposure to sexual violence

This variable includes answers to two questions from the survey tool. The first is targeted at those respondents who self-identify as having been victims of sexual violence. The question asked if the respondent had ever experienced any form of “unwanted sexual contact”. If the respondent indicated yes, they were then asked to identify the type of unwanted sexual contact they had experienced. The following options were given: ¹⁾ verbal sexual harassment, ²⁾ unwanted touching, ³⁾ unwanted intercourse (including oral sex, anal sex, or intercourse involving any foreign object or finger). Only those who

indicated experiencing unwanted touching or unwanted intercourse were included in the past exposure variable.

The second measure included in this variable included those who indicated that they knew someone who had been a victim of rape. The survey questions asked if anyone they know had experienced any form of unwanted sexual contact. If they indicated yes, they were asked to choose the type of unwanted contact from the same three categories, verbal sexual harassment, unwanted touching, or unwanted intercourse. Those who only indicated verbal sexual harassment were then excluded from this category, as verbal sexual harassment is a qualitatively different experience than sexual violence.

In addition, I chose to eliminate those who indicated that they knew someone who had been a victim of some sort of unwanted touching, thus limiting this segment of the variable to only those who identified as knowing someone who had experienced a rape. I made this decision due to the high number of participants who indicated knowing someone who had been a victim of unwanted sexual contact (n=167), as well as sexual assault and rape being different experiences.

Control variables

I am controlling for residency at the time of participation in the survey for the model. This is theoretically important for the variables in each model, specifically fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization (Sloan, Fisher and Wilkins 1996). Participants are asked if they reside on campus in a dorm (n=40, 22%), or off campus in an apartment or house (n=140, 76.9%).

Participants were also polled about how satisfied they were with the precautions the University has taken to prevent sexual violence. I have included this as a control

because it may be related to their fear and perceived risk of victimization. This variable had three response choices satisfied with precautions (n= 68, 37.4%), unsatisfied with precautions (n=33, 18.1%), or they were unaware of any precautions the University has taken (n= 69, 37.9%). Race is also controlled for, with white (n=138, 75.8%) being the reference category and all other races (n=44, 22.8%) being included in the model⁶.

Data reduction

Based on the theoretical similarities in the motivation variable I ran a correlation matrix to determine if any of the variables were tapping into the same constructs (see Table 3). There were a number of significant correlations, however the coefficients associated with the majority of the correlations do not indicate a strong relationship.

There are two correlations that are statically significant and also have coefficients that indicate a moderate relationship. Those correlations are *revenge against the victim* and *revenge against a third party* (with a correlation of .545) and *easy target* and *opportunity* (with a correlation of .483). Both of these relationships are statistically significant, have moderately strong correlation coefficients and their relationship is theoretically logical. In order to ensure the most accurate analysis possible, I ran a factor analysis to check if these variables were, in fact, tapping into such similar constructs that they could/should be combined.

Table 3- Outcome Variable Correlations

	RVvictim	RV3 rd party	Easy target	Opp	Sex	Power	Male bonding	Relieve Stress
RVvictim	1	.545**	.158	.113	.134	.220**	.238**	.207**

⁶ The limited number of participants who identified as any race other than white necessitated the race variable be broken into white and non-white.

RV_3 rd party	.545**	1	.117	.085	.135	.139	.233**	.201**
Easytarget	.158	.117	1	.483**	.267**	.316**	.292**	.211**
Opp.	.113	.085	.483**	1	.384**	.268**	.315**	.302**
Sex	.134	.135	.267**	.384**	1	.060	.307**	.256**
Power	.220**	.139	.316**	.268**	.060	1	.243**	.141
Male bonding	.238**	.233**	.292**	.315**	.307**	.243**	1	.278**
Relieve stress	.207**	.201**	.211*	.302**	.256**	.141	.278**	1

** indicates significance at the .001 level (2 tailed)

Factor analysis

Factor analysis is typically used to create factors, which enable the researcher to empirically group survey items that can be statistically or conceptually linked together. The results of the factor analysis (see Table 4) show that each of the two moderately correlated variables should be combined into their own factors.

Table 4- Perceived Motivation Factor Analysis

	RVvic	RV3rd	Easytar	Opp	Sex	Power	MaleBond	Stress
E=2.693	.534	.493	.642	.673	.558	.498	.647	.559
E=1.34	.673	.705	-.342	-.447	-.270	-.020	-.026	-.017

Based on the results of the factor analysis I have combined the variables *easy target* and *opportunity* into one variable I have renamed “opportunity”. I have also combined the two variables that included some form of revenge (*revenge against the victim* and *revenge against a third party*) into a new variable I named “revenge”.

I have not combined any other variables as the results of the correlation and the factor analysis show they can stand on their own, as there are no meaningful relationships

Table 5- Motivation Variable Frequencies

	n	%
Power	141	77.5%
Opportunity	97	53.3%
Sex	84	46.2%
Male bonding	60	33%
Stress	40	22%
Revenge	32	17.6%

between them. The frequencies of this newly constructed variable are listed in Table 5.

In order to provide more focused information, I chose to only incorporate the three most common motivations cited in the survey, these being power, opportunity and sex. These are three categories that are theoretically relevant and encompass the majority of the sample's opinions. In addition, these are the three most commonly used motivations in past work (Mitchell et. al 2009; Sizemore 2013). The next section discusses the ways in which I analyze the data in detail.

Analytical Plan

I have chosen to use logistic regression in order to test relationship between each above mentioned variables and constrained behavior. I have chosen this method because the outcome variable (engagement in defensive behavior) is dichotomous and cannot be used in regular Ordinary Least Squares Regression (Hoffman 2004). The reason that logistic regression is appropriate for research questions with dichotomous outcome variables, such as these, is that it incorporates different link functions. Link functions will enable me to link the dependent variable to some linear combination of the set of the explanatory variables (Hoffman 2004).

The link function that I will be using in this analysis is the logit link function. I have chosen this function because it works best with binary outcome variables. The

results can then be interpreted in the form of log odds or odds ratios, which are the most common ways to analyze this type of binary data (Hoffman 2004). Due to the format of the data collection tool, it will be more useful to utilize multiple binomial distributions than to use a multinomial distribution.

By using this method, I will not be directly modeling the dependent variable, but predicting the probability that the outcome variable will be chosen. In other words, I will be modeling the probability of a participant choosing to engage in defensive behavior given their levels of fear, perceived risk, their perception of sexual offense motivation, and their past exposure to sexual victimization.

Interaction tests

Moderation is defined by Baron and Kenney as “a variable that affects the direction and/or strength of a relationship between an independent variable and a dependent variable” (1986: 1174). This concept differs from mediation which incorporates causality (Baron and Kenney 1986). According to Baron and Kenny, “moderators variables specify when certain events will hold whereas mediators speak to how or why such events occur” (1986: 1176). Causality cannot be determined in this study. I cannot establish time order. For example, I cannot know if engagement I defensive behaviors may have prevented an act of sexual violence or mitigated one’s fear or perceived risk of victimization. I also cannot account for other factors that may influence the relationship between the chosen variables and engagement in defensive behavior. These factors may include gender identity, age, or levels of self-esteem.

The first way I test moderation effects is through using interaction terms. I examine if any of the independent variables interact with each other in significant ways.

These tests allow the data to show if there are differences for each level of independent variables. For example, if I hypothesize that high levels of fear and citing sex as a potential motivation for sexual violence will have more of an effect on the likelihood to engage in defensive behavior than someone with low levels of fear and who cites sex as a potential motivation, the interaction term will test this relationship.

As a supplement to the interaction effects I will also split the sample in multiple ways to look for differing relationships. I split the sample by each independent variable in order to provide a more focused look at the data. I have chosen to use this method rather than simply looking at interaction terms for the following reasons. First, using interaction terms does provide insight into relationships between specific variables, but it is limited to those variables in the interaction term. Other variables in the model, namely control variables, cannot be accounted for in this interaction term. Secondly, splitting the sample will allow for comparisons between models, indicating if one model is more appropriate for examining the differences between samples.

The next section provides the analysis along with relevant tables. Basic results are given in this chapter, and a more theoretical examination is provided in the upcoming Discussion chapter.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

This chapter reports the results of my analysis. For organizational purposes, I have ordered the analysis so they coincide with the order of the research questions. Because each research questions has two parts (actual engagement in defensive behaviors or having considered engaging in defensive behaviors), the two pieces of analysis are presented together in this chapter.

The analysis begins with a correlation of all variables to be included in the model which can be seen in Table 6. This correlation matrix provides information about the relationships between the variables. First of all, it shows that there are no instances of multicollinearity among the variables. There are only three noteworthy relationships, the first between fear and perceived risk (.619**), which could be expected because those constructs are similar in nature. Other variables do show significant correlational relationships, such as between fear and defensive behavior, fear and opportunity and perceived risk and sex, however these correlations are not strong. Further exploration is needed to determine if there are, indeed, relationships among these variables. This is done in the next stage of analysis which incorporates logistic regression.

Table 6- Correlation Matrix

	Act_D B	Con_D B	Fear	Risk	Powe r	Opp	Sex_ Pleas ure	Past _exp	Resi de	Race	Satisf action
Act_ DB	1	.052	-.19**	-.26**	-.140	-.027	-. .22**	- .083	.074	.028	-.116
Con_ DB	.052	1	.123	.039	.17*	.010	-.19*	- .039	.051	.129	-.003
Fear	-.19**	.123	1	.62**	.108	.214* *	.107	.071	.058	-.098	.025
Risk	-.26**	.039	.62**	1	.107	.143	.177*	.062	.046	-.147*	.035
Power	-.140	.171*	.108	.107	1	.339*	.130	- .036	- .029	-.12	-.01
Opp	-.027	.010	.21**	.143	.34*	1	.36**	.081	.030	-.11	.006
Sex_P leasur e	-.217**	-.187*	.107	.177*	.130	.359* *	1	- .018	- .021	-.137	-.019
Past_ exp	-.083	-.039	.071	.062	-.036	.081	-.018	1	.139	.035	.339
Resid e	.074	.051	.058	.046	-.029	.030	-.021	- .139	1	.024	-.044
Race	.028	.129	-.098	-.147*	-.126	-.114	-.137	.035	.098	1	.058
Satisf action	-.116	-.003	.025	.035	-.013	.006	-.019	.339	- .044	.058	1

victimization on the likelihood to engage in defensive behaviors. Model 1 has only the control variables, Model 2 incorporates fear and perceived risk, Model 3 adds in perceived motivation and Model 4 incorporates the last variable, past exposure to victimization.

Table 7- Logistic Regression on Engagement in Defensive Behaviors

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
	<i>Controls</i>	<i>Fear/PR</i>	<i>Motivation</i>	<i>Victimization</i>
N= 182	Odds Ratios			
<i>Controls</i>				
Race	1.109	.905	.781	1.109
Residence	1.462	1.637	1.557	1.462
Satisfaction	.762	.764	.758	.752
<i>Fear/PR</i>				
Fear		.882	.835	.882
Perceived Risk		.415*	.458*	.415*
<i>Motivation</i>				
Power			.478	.487
Opportunity			1.897	1.488
Sex_Pleasure			.380**	.386**
<i>Victimization</i>				
Past Exposure				1.488
-2 LL	148.46	145.90	142.08	141.76

In Table 7, Model 1 shows race, residency and satisfaction with University precautions are not significant predictors of engaging in defensive behavior, and they remain non-predictors throughout all four models. This means that none of these variables has an effect on the likelihood to engage in defensive behaviors. Model 2 incorporates fear and perceived risk. While fear has no statistically significant effect on engaging in defensive behavior, perceived risk does have an effect. Model 2 shows that for each one unit increase in perceived likelihood of victimization the odds of engaging in defensive behavior increase by .415 ($p < .05$), or about 1.5%.

Perceived risk maintains its significance when the perceived motivation variables are incorporated in Model 3, with a slight increase to .458 ($p < .05$). One other significant variable was found in this model, the sex motivation. Those who cited sex as a possible motivation for sexual violence had .380 ($p < .01$) higher odds of engaging in defensive behavior than those who did not. Both perceived risk and sex maintained their significance in Model 4 when past exposure to victimization was incorporated, with values of .415 ($p < .05$) and .386 ($p < .01$) respectively.

Table 8- Logistic Regression on Considering Engagement in Defensive Behaviors

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
N=182	Odds Ratios			
<i>Controls</i>				
Race	1.834	1.950	2.063	2.094
Off campus	1.297	1.254	1.225	1.275
Satisfaction	.981	.959	1.225	1.275
<i>Fear/Risk</i>				
Fear		1.516	1.481	1.489
Risk		.866	.969	.984
<i>Motivation</i>				
Power			3.364*	3.279*
Opportunity			.991	1.021
Sex_Pleasure			.380**	.397**
<i>Past Exposure</i>				
Past_exp_vic				.750
-2 LL	231.402	227.93	213.059	212.95

Table 8 shows the results of the logistic regression using considering engagement in defensive behaviors as the outcome variable. This model shows both similarities and differences to the previous model. Each of these will be discussed below.

Four separate models are analyzed looking at the relationship between the independent variables and the likelihood that someone would consider engaging (or potentially engage) in defensive behaviors. The first model incorporates the control variables, race, residency and satisfaction with University precautions against sexual violence. None of these variables have a significant effect on someone having potential to engage in defensive behaviors. However, it is worth noting that race (being non-white) did have a positive relationship with the potential to engage in defensive behavior category, and had a p value of just over .05 across the entirety of these models.

The second model incorporated fear and perceived risk (see Table 8). Contrary to what we saw in the first logistic regression model, neither fear or perceived risk had any significant relationship with thinking about engaging in defensive behaviors. Model 3 incorporated the perceived motivation and is where we began to see significant relationships between the two.

Similar to the model looking at engaging in defensive behaviors, understanding sex as the motivation behind sexual violence increased the odds of potentially engaging in defensive behavior by .372 ($p < .01$). While this is a significant relationship and does substantially increase the odds of potentially engaging in defensive behaviors, understanding power as a motivation behind sexual violence carries a much more formidable effect. Understanding power as the motivation behind sexual violence increases the odds of potentially engaging in defensive behavior by 3.279 ($p < .01$).

Understanding power as a motivation behind sexual violence is not a significant predictor of females who actually do engage in defensive behaviors, but it is a predictor of those who have only thought about doing so (see Table 8).

The fourth model looks at past exposure to victimization (see Table 8). Here, we see that having been exposed to victimization does not have a relationship with engaging in defensive behavior or even having the potential to engage in defensive behavior. The relationships and non-relationships are discussed in further detail in the next chapter.

Interaction Tests

I begin the interaction tests by looking at interaction effects within the variables. Again, I will discuss both actual engagement in defensive behaviors and consideration of engaging in defensive behaviors together. I begin by reporting the significant results and continue with a specific discussion of each relevant hypothesis.

The first significant effects in this section are the effects of past exposure to victimization on the likelihood to engage in defensive behaviors (see Table 9). First, we see that when past exposure to victimization is included in the model with fear, both the past exposure variable ($OR=6.351^*$) and the interaction between past exposure and fear ($OR=.446^*$) are significant. This can be interpreted as for those who have had past exposure to victimization, having high levels of fear increases the likelihood of engaging in defensive behavior ($.446 \times 6.351 = OR \text{ of } 2.83$). For every one unit increase in reported level of fear, the effect of past victimization is 2.83 times greater than for those who have not had past exposure to victimization.

This relationship is significant, but had a p value of .048, making the relationship barely significant. In fact, upon further analysis in the split models the relationship

Table 9- Logistic Regression with Interaction Effects looking at Likelihood to Engage in Defensive Behaviors

	SE	O.R.
Fear	.424	.542
Power	.889	.418
Fear*Power	.482	1.178
Risk	.573	.314*
Power	1.080	.353
Risk*Power	.658	1.355
Fear	.301	.703
Opp	.773	1.801
Fear*Opp	.408	.739
Risk	.399	.439*
Opp	.953	1.717
Risk*Opp	.568	.738
Fear	.266	.606
Sex_Pleasure	.797	.375
Fear*Sex_Pleasure	.412	1.057
Risk	.360	.595
Sex_Pleasure	.995	1.236
Risk*Sex_Pleasure	.595	.529
Fear	.358	1.035
Past_exp	.839	6.351*
Fear*Past_exp	.434	.446*
Risk	.487	1.184
Past_exp	1.051	24.591**
Risk*Past_exp	.610	.179**
Past_exp	.766	4.250
Power	.736	.643
Past_exp*Power	.102	.856
Past_exp	.509	.2956*
Opp	.578	2.218
Past_exp*Opp	.668	.261
Past_exp	.442	1.537
Sex_Pleasure	.590	.432
Pase_exp*Sex_Pleasure	.706	.632

between fear of rape, past exposure to victimization and actual engagement in defensive behaviors disappears entirely. There are no significant effects of past exposure to victimization when the model is split into high and low levels of fear (see Table 11), and there are no effects of fear when the model is split into those who have had past exposure to victimization and those who have not (see Table 17). The same is true for those who only considered engaging in defensive behaviors.

The next relationship is between perceived risk of rape and past exposure to victimization (see Table 9). Here we see that the variable for past exposure to sexual victimization is significant ($OR=24.591^{**}$) as well as the interaction between perceived risk and past exposure to victimization ($OR=.179^{**}$). This can be interpreted as for those who have had previous exposure to sexual victimization, having high levels of perceived risk increases the likelihood of engaging in defensive behaviors ($24.591 \times .179 = OR$ of 4.40). For every one unit increase in level of perceived risk, the effect of past exposure to victimization is 4.40 times greater than for those who have not had past exposure to victimization.

This relationship is further examined in the split models. When the models are split by levels of risk (high and low), the effect of past exposure is not statistically significant (see Table 11). However, when the model is split by those who have had past exposure to sexual victimization and those who have not, we can see that level of perceived risk has an effect for those who have had past exposure to victimization ($OR=2.74^{**}$). This means that for those who have had past exposure to victimization, every unit increase in perceived risk of victimization increases the odds of engaging in defensive behavior by 2.74.

The relationship between risk, past exposure to sexual victimization and engaging in defensive behaviors does not hold true when we shift the model to those who have considered engaging in defensive behaviors. There are no significant interaction terms and when the models are split by both levels of risk and by past exposure to victimization no relationships are found.

There are no other significant relationships noted in the interaction terms for either actually engaging in defensive behaviors or even considering engaging in defensive behaviors. In fact, the model examining those who had only considered engaging in defensive behaviors showed no significant interactions whatsoever. The remainder of the results section will focus on relationships between variables that came to light when the models were split.

Table 11 shows how relationships to engagement in defensive behavior differ based on level of fear. Here, we see that the only significant difference deals with understanding sex as a motivation for sexual violence. For those who report having high levels of fear, understanding sex as a motivation for sexual violence increases their likelihood of engaging in defensive behaviors. However, this is not true for those who report low levels of fear. In fact, none of the variables in this model are significant for the group who report low levels of fear.

Table 10- Logistic Regression with Interaction Terms on Likelihood to Consider Engaging in Defensive Behaviors

	Wald	O.R.
Fear	.074	1.144
Power	.351	1.860
Fear*Power	.096	1.883
Risk	.103	1.219
Power	1.106	3.314
Risk*Power	.047	.862
Fear	3.994	1.808*
Opp	1.054	2.288
Fear*Opp	.1484	.618
Risk	.127	1.110
Opp	.024	.903
Risk*Opp	.043	1.064
Fear	6.188	1.952
Sex_Pleasure	.168	1.405
Fear*Sex_Pleasure	2.560	.524
Risk	3.632	1.983
Sex_Pleasure	.679	2.251
Risk*Sex_Pleasure	3.193	.374
Fear	1.193	1.454
Past_exp	.010	.920
Fear*Past_exp	.030	1.045
Risk	.009	1.184
Past_exp	.189	.653
Risk*Past_exp	.068	1.156
Past_exp	1.952	.320
Power	.101	1.241
Past_exp*Power	1.754	3.268
Past_exp	1.316	.583
Opp	.601	.656
Past_exp*Opp	1.163	2.057
Past_exp	1.408	.595
Sex_Pleasure	5.450	.256*
Pase_exp*Sex_Pleasure	1.337	.632

Table 11-Logistic Regression- Likelihood to Engage in Defensive Behaviors Split by Levels of Fear

O.R. (N=68)	Low Fear (N=114)			High Fear		
	M1	M2	M3	M1	M2	M3
<i>Controls</i>						
Race	1.092	.940.	.939	1.263	.970	.963
Off_Campus	1.344	1.417	1.395	1.458	1.085	1.08
Satisfcation	2.239	1.957	1.981	1.217	1.553	.704
<i>Motivation</i>						
Power		.522	.539		.450	.541
Opp		1.259	1.214		3.599	3.39
Sex_Pleasure		.424	.421		.229*	.222*
<i>Past Exp.</i>						
Pre_exp			1.313			1.64
-2LL	149.6	143.5	143.2	81.72	75.65	74.82

The second model split by fear, Table 12, shows the likelihood to consider engaging in defensive behaviors. This model has different results than the previous model split by fear that focused on actual engagement in defensive behaviors. Here, we see that race is a significant predictor of considering engagement in defensive behaviors, but only for those who report low levels of fear. This is an interesting finding, and one that is discussed further in the future works section.

The other significant findings in this model involve perceived motivation. Understanding power as the motivation for sexual violence increases the likelihood of considering engaging in defensive behaviors. Of those who report high levels of fear,

those who understand power as a motivation behind sexual violence are 8.922 times more likely to consider engaging in defensive behaviors than those who do not see power as a motivating factor.

Table 12- Logistic Regression on Considering Engagement in Defensive Behaviors Split by Levels of Fear

O.R. (N=68)	Low Fear (N=114)			High Fear		
	M1	M2	M3	M1	M2	M3
<i>Controls</i>						
Race	2.594*	2.971*	2.997*	1.324	.873	.843
Off_Campus	.913	1.012	1.048	2.375	1.523	1.421
Satisfaction	.781	2.063	2.106	.324	.596	.604
<i>Motivation</i>						
Power		2.437	2.255		8.629*	8.922*
Opp		1.645	1.859		.520	.515
Sex_Pleasure		.517	.503		.223*	.222*
<i>Past Exp.</i>						
Pre_exp			.509			1.302
-2LL	133.292	127.623	125.413	89.355	75.386	75.220

The same directional relationship holds true for understanding sex as a motivation behind sexual violence. Of those who report high levels of fear, those who also see sex as a motivation for rape or sexual assault are .222 times more likely to consider engaging in defensive behaviors than those who do not see sex as a motivating factor. Opportunity is not a significant predictor for either actual engagement in defensive behaviors or considering engagement in defensive behaviors for either those who report high or low levels of fear.

The next significant relationship seen is between perceived risk and sex (see Table 13). Here, the effect of perceived risk on actual engagement in defensive behavior is intensified for those who cited sex as a potential motivation for sexual violence. This relationship is expected as both the sexual motivation and high levels of perceived risk were significant predictors of both actual engagement and considering engaging in defensive behaviors in the original regression models.

Table 13- Logistic Regression on Likelihood to Engage in Defensive Behaviors Split by Levels of Perceived Risk

O.R. (N=52)	Low Risk (N=130)			High Risk		
	M1	M2	M3	M1	M2	M3
<i>Controls</i>						
Race	1.17	1.09	1.14	.958	.468	.425
Off_Campus	.676	.754	.735	9.91*	5.99	6.61
Satisfaction	.873	.872	.873	.529	.562	.420
<i>Motivation</i>						
Power		1.16	1.17		.208	.149
Opp		1.15	1.13		4.56	4.45
Sex_Pleasure		.595	.596		.131*	.122*
<i>Past Exp.</i>						
Pre_exp			1.11			3.56
-2LL	149.6	143.5	143.2	81.72	75.65	74.82

Table 14- Logistic Regression on Considering Engagement in Defensive Behavior Split by Levels of Perceived Risk

O.R.	Low Risk (N=130)			High Risk (N=52)		
	M1	M2	M3	M1	M2	M3
<i>Controls</i>						
Race	1.656	1.645	1.660	2.502	3.487	3.325
Off_Campus	1.502	1.732	1.774	1.30	.614	.630
Satisfaction	1.008	1.062	1.071	1.145	1.838	1.678
<i>Motivation</i>						
Power		2.994	2.863		7.408*	8.367*
Opp		1.160	1.196		1.341	1.342
Sex_Pleasure		.494	.494		.135*	.122*
<i>Past Exp.</i>						
Pre_exp			.817			.602
-2LL	159.84	153.07	152.85	68.99	56.51	56.03

Table 14 shows the results of the logistic regression on considering engagement in defensive behaviors with the sample split by level of risk. Here, we see that those with low levels of risk have no significant predictors of considering engagement in defensive behaviors, similar to the results of actual engagement in defensive behaviors. This is also similar to the previous findings that there were no significant relationships found for those females who reported low levels of fear.

Table 14 also tells us that there are pronounced effects of understanding power as a motivation for sexual violence on considering engagement in defensive behaviors.

Those who report high levels of perceived risk of victimization are 8.367 times more likely to consider engaging in defensive behaviors than those who do not cite power as a motivation. Again, we see the same directional relationship with sex, where understanding sex as a motivation for sexual violence increases the likelihood for considering engagement in defensive behaviors, but only for those who report high levels of perceived risk.

Table 15- Logistic Regression on Likelihood to Engage in Defensive Behaviors Split by Perceived Motivation

	Power (N=141)			Opp. (N=97)			Sex (N=84)		
	M1	M2	M3	M1	M2	M3	M1	M2	M3
<i>Controls</i>									
Race	1.04	.870	.876	1.45	1.19	1.21	.164	.139	.147
Reside	.911	1.02	1.01	.757	.829	.828	.828	.838	.805
Satisfaction	1.054	1.17	1.18	1.09	1.16	1.02	1.32	.98	1.02
<i>Fear/Risk</i>									
Fear		.889	.886		.815	.823		1.41	1.41
Risk		.470	.468		.415	.414		.185*	.187*
<i>Past Exp.</i>									
Past Exp.			1.15			.854			1.31
-2 LL	177.2	169.7	169.6	123.2	115.2	115.1	88.94	79.79	79.59

The next way the model has been split focuses on different understood motivations for sexual violence (see Table 15). This table looks at those who report actual engagement in defensive behaviors. Here we see that only those who report sex as a motivation for rape and/or sexual assault are affected by any of these variables when it comes to their decision to engage in defensive behaviors. Of those who see sex as a

potential motivator for sexual violence, for every one unit increase in reported level of perceived risk the odds of these females engaging in defensive behaviors increases by .187. While this is a statistically significant relationship, the actual effect is not very strong.

Table 16- Logistic Regression on Considering Engagement in Defensive Behaviors Split by Perceived Motivation

	Power (N=141)			Opp. (N=97)			Sex (N=84)		
	M1	M2	M3	M1	M2	M3	M1	M2	M3
<i>Controls</i>									
Race	2.421*	2.403*	2.402*	3.341*	3.266*	3.249*	4.784*	5.149**	5.351**
Reside	1.407	1.350	1.354	.842	.836	.836	.501	.476	.441
U_pre	1.074	1.043	1.042	1.093	1.058	1.049	1.419	1.564	1.411
<i>Fear/PR</i>									
Fear		1.475	1.476		1.789	1.784		1.656	1.615
Risk		.832	.832		.435	.434		.443	.440
<i>Victim</i>									
Past_exp			.977			.601			1.662
-2 LL	183.04	180.75	180.75	120.35	117.30	117.29	86.03	84.27	83.59

Table 16 shows the likelihood of only considering engagement in defensive behaviors based on groupings by understood motivation. Here, there are no relationships at all between any of the hypothesized variables. Race, which has been a significant predictor in only models thus far is shown as very significant across this entire model. Being of a race other than white has a very strong relationship to considering engaging in defensive behaviors, but not actually engaging in defensive behaviors. This relationship is further explored in the discussion section as well as the directions for future research.

Throughout each iteration of model splitting, the main variable of interest in this section, past exposure to victimization, has not shown to be a significant predictor of

either engaging in or considering engaging in defensive behaviors. The upcoming section discusses the results when the models are split by those who report having been exposed to past sexual victimization and those who have not.

Table 17- Logistic Regression on Likelihood to Engage in Defensive Behaviors Split by Past Exposure to Sexual Victimization

O.R.	No Past Exp (N= 59)			Past Exp (N=123)		
	M1	M2	M3	M1	M2	M3
<i>Controls</i>						
Race	.345	.321	.397	1.38	1.55	1.21
Reside	1.12	1.13	.788	1.46	1.64	1.59
<i>Fear/PR</i>						
Fear		.872	.760		.815	.808
Risk		.111	1.33		.255**	.274**
<i>Motivation</i>						
Power			1.12			.354
Opp			1.12			1.40
Sex_Pleasure			1.97			2.13*

Table 17 shows that the level of perceived risk of sexual victimization affects those who have had previous exposure to sexual violence differently than those who have not. Here, we see that risk is a significant predictor of engaging in defensive behaviors for those who have had some sort of experience with sexual victimization, but risk is not a significant predictor for those who have not had such experience. The odds of

someone with past exposure to sexual victimization engaging in defensive behaviors are 2.74 times greater than for those who do not report high levels of perceived risk of victimization.

Also noted in Table 17 is the effect of understanding sex as a motivation for sexual violence. For those who have not had past exposure to victimization, understanding sex as a motivation has a positive relationship with engaging in defensive behavior. In other words, for those who have not had previous exposure to sexual victimization understanding sex as a potential motivation for sexual violence makes the odds of one engaging in defensive behavior 2.13 times the odds for someone who does not see sex as a motivation for sexual violence. This is the only motivation shown to have an effect on those who actually engage in defensive behaviors, but the effects change once we look at those who have only considered engaging in defensive behaviors.

Sex is shown to have a significant effect on considering engagement in defensive behaviors. For those who have not had previous exposure to victimization, those who understand sex as a motivation for sexual violence are 1.53 times more likely to engage in defensive behaviors than those who do not think sex is a motivation for sexual violence. This positive relationship holds true for both females who do engage in defensive behaviors and those who only consider engaging in such behaviors.

The effect of the power motivation is again noted for those who only consider engaging in defensive behaviors. Table 18 shows a significant effect of understanding power as a motivation for sexual violence on the likelihood to consider engaging in

Table 18- Logistic Regression on Likelihood to Consider Engaging in Defensive Behavior Split by Past Exposure to Sexual Victimization

O.R.	No_Pastexp (N=59)			Past_exp (N=123)		
	M1	M2	M3	M1	M2	M3
<i>Controls</i>						
Race	9.646**	20.980**	32.043**	1.066	1.169	1.224
Reside	2.150	2.245	1.956	1.163	1.010	1.078
U_pre	2.991	3.330	2.206	.730	.714	.824
<i>Fear/PR</i>						
Fear		2.879	2.820		1.437	1.386
Risk		.872	1.303		.875	.859
<i>Motivation</i>						
Power			1.641			4.364*
Opp			1.299			1.068
Sex_Pleasure			.153*			.469
-2LL	66.42	61.17	54.63	155.83	154.02	144.04

defensive behaviors, but not actual engagement in such behaviors, but only for those who have had some past exposure to sexual violence. For those who have had past exposure to sexual violence, understanding power as a motivation makes an individual 4.364 times more likely to consider engaging in defensive behaviors than those who do not understand power as a motivation for rape or sexual assault.

Table 18 shows an interesting development based on race. For those who have not had past exposure to sexual victimization, being non-white increases the odds of considering engaging in defensive behavior. This is not true for those who have reported having had past exposure to sexual violence. Being non-white is consistently associated with only considering engagement in defensive behaviors, not actual engagement. This relationship is discussed further in the policy initiative section as well as noted as a direction for future research.

The next section provides a discussion of the findings listed above. In line with the first section, each hypothesis is discussed as well as explanations for its support or non-support in this project.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This chapter provides an in depth discussion of the analysis shown in the last chapter. I first examine the meaning behind the relationships and non relationships found in the logistic regressions, hypotheses 1-6a, and then discuss the findings for hypotheses 7-11a.

Discussion of Logistic Regression Models

This section will overview each hypothesis and discuss its level of support based on this analysis. For organizational purposes I have chosen to discuss both actual engagement in defensive behaviors and consideration of engagement in defensive behaviors together in this section. The following section will include ways in which these finding can be directly implemented into sexual assault prevention policy.

H1 and H1a state that those with high levels of fear would be more likely to engage in defensive behavior or consider engaging in defensive behaviors, respectively. Neither one of these hypotheses are supported in this analysis. There are two possible reasons why high levels of fear of rape does not predict engaging in defensive behaviors or even considering engaging in defensive behaviors. One, the fact that females are not engaging in defensive behaviors may increase their level of fear. In other words, the fact

that they do not engage in defensive behaviors may contribute to females having high levels of fear. This relationship may, in fact, be reciprocal and this possibility is discussed further in the limitations section.

Secondly, these females may be thinking of sexual assault more in line with date and acquaintance rapes than with a stranger rape situation. Even though their levels of fear may be high, they may not be engaging in these specific defensive behaviors as they are not the behaviors they would engage in if they were trying to defend against a date or acquaintance rape. Carrying a weapon and taking a self defense class are more in line with protection against a common rape myth scenario rather than a date or acquaintance rape.

While high levels of fear showed no significant relationship to engaging in defensive behaviors or even considering engagement in defensive behaviors, perceived risk was a significant predictor. The higher the perceived risk of rape the more likely one is to engage in defensive behaviors. This relationship holds true throughout the entire model, lending support to H2. This tells us that those who perceived themselves to be at higher risk of sexual violence are more willing to take precautionary measures, such as carrying a weapon or taking a self defense class. This finding may reflect increased agency on the part of these females. A second option is that they are misunderstanding the type of violence they are actually at risk for. In other words, they are preparing themselves to defend against sexual victimization, but they are focused on preventing the violent, stranger rape as opposed to the more commonly committed date or acquaintance rape.

Table 19- Hypotheses Chart

		Engagement	Consideration
H1&H1a	Fear increases defensive behaviors	Not supported	Not supported
H2 & H2a	Risk increases defensive behaviors	Supported	Not supported
H3 & H3a	Motive: Power increases defensive behaviors	Not supported	Supported
H4 & H4a	Motive: Opp. Increases defensive behaviors	Not supported	Not supported
H5 & H5a	Motive: Sex increases defensive behaviors	Supported	Supported
H6 & H6a	Past exposure decreases defensive behaviors	Not supported	Not supported
H7 & H7a	Fear*Past Exp. Increases defensive behaviors	Not supported	Not supported
H8 & H8a	Risk* Past exposure increases defensive behaviors	Supported	Not supported
H9 & H9a	Power*Past exposure decreases defensive behaviors	Not supported	<i>Not supported- Opposite direction</i>
H10 & H10 a	Opp* Past exposure decreases defensive behaviors	Not Supported	Not supported
H11 & H11a	Sex* Past exposure decreases defensive behaviors	Not supported	<i>Not supported- Opposite group</i>

High levels of perceived risk were able to predict engaging in defensive behaviors, but was not significant for the group that had only considered engaging in defensive behaviors, invalidating H2a. This is an interesting development as high levels of perceived risk affect those who actually engage in defensive behavior and those who only consider it very differently. It could be that high levels of risk is a motivation to engage in defensive behaviors for a certain type of female. Individual differences in self esteem and self concept have been found to play a role in the decision to engage in defensive behavior (Asencio et. al 2014), and this relationship should be investigated further. However, because having high levels of perceived risk is a predictor of actual engagement in defensive behaviors this knowledge can still be useful in terms of prevention policy creation, which discussed in the upcoming section.

H3 deals with understanding power as the motivation for sexual violence increasing the likelihood engage in defensive behaviors. There is no relationship between these variables, making H3 unsupported. The logic behind my hypotheses was that the recognition of a gendered power differential would make females more likely to arm themselves and claim power in the physical realm against the more physically and socially powerful males. One reason this variable may have had no effect is that while the above mentioned thought process is true for some women, others who may be aware of this gendered power differential may be more likely to assume this power differential is something that cannot be mitigated. If females assume this power differential is too big to overcome they will not bother to engage in defensive behaviors. If females are thinking in both of these frameworks they will work to cancel out the effect of the

variable, which is one theory as to why there was no relationship between these two variables.

Although there was no relationship between an understood power motivation and actually engaging in defensive behaviors there was a positive relationship between the power motivation and considering engaging in defensive behaviors. This finding supports H3a. One reason this relationship may exist is because females may recognize power as a motivation for sexual violence, but not feel like they can fight against that power. Therefore, they are not actively fighting against it (as evidenced by the fact that power as a motivation does not predict actual use of defensive behaviors), but they do recognize its importance in this regard.

Females who cite power as a motivation and only consider engaging in defensive behaviors may be reacting to, and also reinforcing, said power differential. If females recognize that power is distributed differently based on gender, they realize that they are on the marginalized end of that distribution. If they are operating in that mindset, the recognition of this power difference may make them consider engaging in defensive behaviors, but because they see themselves as at a disadvantage they may be less likely to act against the structural power difference by actually engaging in these defensive behaviors. While only one hypothesis in this section is supported, knowledge gleaned from both can be used for policy directives and will be discussed further in the upcoming section.

Opportunity is the next motivation examined in the model. I hypothesized that understanding opportunity as the motivation behind sexual violence would increase the likelihood of engaging in and considering engaging in defensive behaviors. Using a rape

myth framework to construct these hypotheses I assumed this would be a clear, direct and strong relationship. However, there was no support for either one of these hypotheses (H4 and H4a).

The finding that understanding opportunity as a motivation for sexual violence has no effect on defensive behaviors overall is puzzling. Given the stereotypical reliance on opportunity as a necessity of sexual violence (Burt 1980) one would assume that females use this logic when deciding whether or not to engage in defensive behaviors. I am especially concerned about this non-relationship due to the heightened accentuation University policies place on opportunity in their crime prevention strategies (Sloan and Fisher 2014).

One potential reason that there is no discernable relationship between opportunity and defensive behaviors could be that, similar to the non-relationship with power, females are thinking about sexual violence as something likely to be committed by a date or an acquaintance rather than a stranger. This would explain why they are not engaging in these intensive, physical defensive behaviors as a precaution against sexual violence. A second rational is that females who engage in defensive behaviors may consider their actions as limiting the opportunity for sexual violence. This action may limit how much they consider opportunity as a motivating factor for themselves to be at risk for sexual violence. This theory is examined further in the next phase of analysis when interactions between variables are examined.

The second significant relationship involves defensive behaviors and perceiving sex as the motivation for sexual violence. Those who perceive sex as a motivation for sexual violence are more likely to engage in defensive behaviors, supporting H5.

Understanding sex as a motivation behind sexual violence also increases the odds of considering engaging in defensive behavior, supporting H5a. This similarity infers some consistency across the type of female that would cite sex as a motivation for sexual violence, and shows that those who have this understanding at least think about engaging in defensive behaviors or actually do engage in them as shown by the support of H5.

These relationships tell us two things. One, that how one understands the motivation behind sexual violence does matter because it does have an impact on their behaviors. Two, that the sexual motivation is being associated with the type of sexual violence carrying a weapon or taking a self defense class would be most likely to stop. In other words, sex is being thought of as a motivation for rapes that are typical to the rape myth scenario. While it is unclear if sexual pleasure is seen as the motivation for alternative types of sexual violence, such as date rape and acquaintance rape, it is being associated with situations consistent with the rape myth scenario. In fact, perceiving sexual pleasure as a motivation for rape or sexual assault is a significant predictor of engaging in defensive behaviors.

The final variable incorporated in the model was past exposure to victimization. Here, we see that there is no relationship between having been exposed to sexual violence, engaging in defensive behaviors or even considering engaging in defensive behaviors. This makes H6 and H6a both unsupported. This is inconsistent with my hypotheses and may be due to the fact that females who have been exposed to sexual victimization in one way or another were not exposed to a scenario that would be most benefitted by using these particular behaviors, such as a stranger rape in a public place. This knowledge can still be useful in crafting prevention policies as we can encourage

females to engage in alternative behaviors that may be more effective at reducing their risk of revictimization.

Discussion of Interaction Tests

This section will go through each hypothesis and discuss it in terms of the results presented above. Comparisons between the three groups, those who engage in defensive behaviors, those who consider engaging in defensive behaviors, and those who express no interest in engaging in defensive are elaborated on here as well. Potential policy initiatives that can come from these findings are discussed in the next section.

H7 and H7a explained that, according to the rape myth framework, high levels of fear would intensify the relationship between past exposure to victimization and engaging in (or considering engaging in) defensive behaviors. This research offers no support for either one of these hypotheses. Even though this hypothesis was disproven, there is still valuable information to be gained from the findings. There are two main reasons why these relationships did not prove to be true.

One reason this relationship may not exist is that those who have had some experience with sexual violence may not have had an experience consistent with the societal rape script, as mentioned previously. This means that, likely, these females have been exposed to either a date or acquaintance rape. In these situations, fear is often accompanied by a host of other negative emotions, such as confusion, betrayal, anger at the perpetrator (Wiehe and Richards 1995). There is also more self-blame present in date or acquaintance rape experiences than stranger rape experiences (Koss et. al 1998). These feelings may have been transmitted to those with secondary exposure as well. The

combination of these other emotions and higher levels of self blame may mitigate the effect of fear for those who have been exposed to sexual violence in the past.

The second reason that there is a non-finding for the relationship between fear, past exposure to victimization and defensive behaviors is that the fear based response is mitigated for those who have been exposed to sexual violence previously. In other words, those who have either experienced rape or sexual assault themselves or know someone else who has find solace in the fact that either they have survived the experience or others have survived the experience, respectively. This knowledge may lessen the emotional, fear based response to sexual violence. Very recent work shows that, in fact, females view sexual violence as normal (Hlavka 2014). If females are viewing sexual violence as normal, then the effect of fear would be minimized. The low levels of fear reported in this particular study would support this explanation also (scale 1-10, mean 5.5).

The second three way effect examined is between perceived risk of sexual victimization, past exposure to sexual violence and engagement in defensive behaviors. H8 and H8a suggested that high levels of perceived risk would interact with past exposure to victimization in a way that would increase the relationship between the three. The first wave of analysis showed that perceived risk of sexual victimization was a significant predictor of engaging in defensive behaviors, but not considering engagement in defensive behaviors. When looked at in conjunction with past exposure to victimization, levels of perceived risk increase the likelihood of engaging in defensive behaviors for those who have had some sort of past exposure to sexual victimization.

This gives support to H8, but no relationship was found for those who only considered engaging in defensive behaviors, giving no support to H8a.

One reason for the relationship between past exposure to victimization, perceived risk of victimization and likelihood to engage in defensive behaviors is increased awareness of the likelihood of victimization. Past work has shown that those who have had no exposure to sexual violence rate themselves as lower risk for sexual victimization than their peers (Gidycz et. al 2006). In turn, those with past exposure to victimization are more likely to see themselves at high risk for victimization. This can be interpreted as those who have first or second hand experience with sexual victimization are more likely to take precautions to defend against it.

High levels of self blame may also play into this relationship. The assumption I have been operating under throughout this project is that those who have had previous exposure to sexual victimization are more likely to have experienced something similar to a date or acquaintance rape than a stranger rape. If this is true, then engaging in defensive behaviors may be seen as a way to mitigate self blame (Janoff-Bulman 1985), which we know is higher in date or acquaintance rape scenarios (Koss et. al 1998). Past work has shown that engagement in defensive behaviors after a victimization gives the victims a sense of control and reaffirms a positive self image (Burgess and Holstrom 1979). Females may be engaging in these behaviors because they see themselves at accentuated risk for victimization, but also to help overcome their past victimization.

H9 and H9a deal with the relationship between understanding power as a motivation for sexual violence and past exposure to victimization. The findings here show that understanding power as a motivation does not increase the likelihood of

engaging in defensive behaviors regardless of a participant having past exposure to victimization or not. This is consistent with the findings in the first wave of analysis that neither power nor past victimization predicted actual engagement in defensive behaviors, making H9 unsupported.

One reason that power may not act as an intervening variable for actual engagement in defensive behavior is that those who are engaging in these types of behaviors see themselves as holding more power as a function of their carrying of a weapon or having self defense training. This may be especially true for those with past exposure to rape or sexual assault. Members of this group often feel a loss of control (Perilloux, Duntley and Buss 2012; Ullman and Peter-Hagene 2014), which could be partially overcome by carrying weapons.

H9a, focused on those who only consider engagement in defensive behaviors, is partially supported. Understanding power as a motivation for sexual violence does interact with past exposure to victimization when we focus on the group that only considers engaging in defensive behaviors. This relationship does exist, but only in one specific way. When we split the model by how the participants perceive motivation, past exposure to victimization is not a predictor of considering to engage in defensive behavior. However, when the model is split by those who have had had past exposure to sexual victimization and those who have not, power is a significant predictor of considering engagement in defensive behaviors for only one group.

For those who have had past exposure to sexual victimization, understanding power as a motivation increases the likelihood for them to consider engaging in defensive behaviors. This is an interesting development as it does not predict actual engagement,

only that members of this group have thought about engaging in these defensive behaviors. This means that those who have had some sort of exposure to rape or sexual assault recognize that there is a power component involved in sexual violence, but do not engage in physical, defensive behaviors against it, although they have considered doing so.

The theory that this group of females acknowledges the power component in sexual violence and recognizes the benefit of engaging in physical defensive behaviors while not doing so is problematic if the overall goal is violence prevention. The reluctance to engage in such behaviors could speak to reduced levels of self esteem based on past exposure to victimization (Perilloux, Duntley and Buss 2012). Past work has shown that those with low levels of self worth are less likely to engage in physical, defensive behaviors (Asencio et. al 2014). This can be directly targeted in policy implications as will be discussed in the upcoming section.

The next hypotheses tested are H10 and H10a. These deal with relationships between perceived motivation as opportunity, past exposure to victimization and defensive behaviors. Surprisingly, there are no significant relationships to report, lending no support to either H10 or H10a. Operating under the rape myth framework, theoretically opportunity should have been one of the strongest predictors of these specific types of defensive behaviors. This is especially true for those who have had past exposure to victimization

As discussed previously, one reason why opportunity was not a significant predictor of any form of defensive behaviors may be because those with past exposure to victimization had experiences less consistent with the commonly accepted rape myth

typology and more consistent with a date or acquaintance rape. If this is the case, the type of defensive behaviors measured here would be ineffective in combating what this group considers an act of sexual violence. This logic, however, does not explain why those who understood opportunity as a motivator for sexual violence and who did not have past exposure were not significantly more likely to engage in, or even consider engaging in, defensive behaviors.

Based on the assumption that those with past exposure to sexual violence were exposed to a date or acquaintance rape scenario, those with this exposure may be construing opportunity differently than those who have not had this exposure. Those who have had this experience may be thinking of opportunity along the lines of being alone with a friend in an apartment or dorm room, while those operating under the rape myth framework may be thinking of opportunity as being alone in public spaces at night. This disparity in the construction of opportunity may account for why it was not a significant predictor in this study. Future work should provide insight into this area, and ways in which this can be accomplished are discussed in the final section of this paper.

The final set of hypotheses deals with past exposure to sexual victimization and understanding sex as a motivation for sexual violence. I hypothesized that the interactions between these variables would predict a lesser likelihood of engaging in defensive behaviors, and for even considering engagement in these behaviors. Neither one of these hypotheses were supported by this analysis.

One explanation for this non-finding is that, again, those who have been exposed to sexual violence were likely exposed to a date or acquaintance rape scenario where, even if sex is the perceived motivation, the behaviors of interest are least likely to be used

in that scenario. Even if those with experience with sexual violence thought sex was a potential motivation, they might not think a weapon would be the most effective way to stop the situation from escalating into a violent act.

Secondly, sex can be construed as a motivation for both scenarios consistent with the rape myth typology and a date or acquaintance rape scenario. It is impossible to tell how participants were thinking of a sexual motivation based on the data used in this research. If some participants were operating under the assumption that sexual motivations were consistent with a stranger rape scenario and others were conceptualizing the sexual motivation as consistent with a date or acquaintance rape, this would account for the non findings in this section. This flaw is further discussed in the limitations section.

Interestingly, of those who did not have past exposure to sexual victimization, those who understood sex as a motivation for rape or sexual assault were more likely to engage in defensive behaviors than those who did not see sex as a motivating factor. This is true for both those who engage in defensive behaviors and those who considered engagement in these behaviors. I did not hypothesize that not having exposure to sexual violence and understanding sex as a potential motivation would increase the likelihood of engaging in, or considering engaging in defensive behaviors. In fact, I based the final set of hypotheses on the understanding that past exposure to victimization should have more of an effect on likelihood to engage in, or consider engagement, in defensive behaviors.

One argument for why those without exposure to sexual violence were more affected by the sexual motivation could be that those who understand sex as a motivation for sexual violence and have no past exposure to sexual victimization based on their

engagement in defensive behaviors. In other words, the protective behaviors they are engaging in serve as a barrier from sexual victimization. This would explain why primary victims of sexual violence did not fit in this category, but it would fail to explain why secondary victims' likelihood to engage in defensive behaviors was not affected by understanding sex as a motivation.

Potential policy initiatives

If females are likely to engage in such drastic defense measures as carrying weapons or taking self defense classes, they may be more likely to engage in other defensive measures aimed at preventing acquaintance and/or date rape. If they are aware of their high risk for this type of victimization, Universities can encourage other forms of defensive behavior such as assertiveness training, continuum of force usage or destigmatizing discussion of sex and sexuality. This is an important shift as females are less likely to use weapons or physical violence against someone they know, even if the situation is escalating to an act of sexual violence (May et. al 2010; Nurius et. al 2010; Senn et. al 2013; Sochting et. al 2004).

In fact, the defensive behaviors females are most likely to engage with acquaintances are those known to be the least effective (Sochting, et. al 2004; Ullman 1997). It is the goal of this project to provide some understanding about the decision to engage in defensive behaviors. This knowledge can then be used to guide policy as we can tap into the constructs that increase the likelihood of engaging in defensive behavior and channel that attentiveness and energy into more effective measures aimed at preventing sexual victimization.

The use of these ineffectual defensive measures is problematic if the goal is prevention of sexual violence. However, if we know that high levels of perceived risk encourage females to engage in physical defensive measures (which the findings here support) it is logical to assume this relationship holds true with less physical or assertive defensive measures. Universities can continue to heighten risk perception, while encouraging alternative methods of defense. These may include how to clearly communicate sexual boundaries and safety needs, overcome emotional resistance to using physical defensive methods against an acquaintance, and escalating levels of resistance if the current effort is proving ineffective (May et. al 2010; Nurius et. al 2004; Senn et. al 2013; Sochting et. al 2004).

The perceived motivation behind sexual violence also plays a role in how prevention efforts are developed. Females who perceived sexual pleasure as the motivation behind sexual violence were more likely to engage in defensive behaviors. This can be interpreted in different ways. One way to interpret this is that they are subscribing to the social rhetoric that involves an experience similar to that of a rape myth, where sexual violence is initiated due to males inability to engage in consensual sex (Ryan 2011). Another way to interpret this is that they are understanding sexual violence in a manner more consistent with a date or acquaintance rape, where sex is often seen, by the male, as an expected conclusion to the interaction (Basow and Mineri 2011; Lloyd and Emory 2000).

It bodes well for prevention policies that sex is the motivation most likely to affect females' likelihood to engage in defensive behaviors as it traverses all categories of sexual violence: stranger rape, date rape and acquaintance rape. If prevention efforts can

keep a focus on sexual motivation, as opposed to opportunity, they are more likely to encourage females to engage in defensive behaviors. Sex was a predictor of both actually engaging in defensive behaviors and considering engaging in defensive behaviors. Although the next variable discussed, power, was only significant in predicting considering defensive behaviors, this knowledge can still be used in order to craft prevention policies and is discussed below.

Understanding power as a motivation for sexual violence does have an affect on females who think about engaging in defensive behaviors. If females are thinking about engaging in these more intense defensive behaviors, such as carrying a weapon or taking a self-defense class, they may be more likely to consider less physical means of defensive behavior as discussed above. Highlighting power as a motivation for sexual violence may encourage females to engage in alternative defensive behaviors. Perhaps power was not a significant predictor of actually engaging in defensive behavior because females felt a sense of power based on their physical defensive behaviors, mitigating the influence of power as it relates to sexual violence. Policies could incorporate this idea and highlight the role power plays in sexual violence, specifically date and acquaintance rapes, in order to encourage females to engage in less physical, more appropriate defensive behaviors.

Most Universities prevention efforts include encouraging behaviors that would fit with seeing rape or sexual assault as a crime of opportunity (Banyard 2014). These include engaging in physical, self protective measures or limiting opportunities for victimization such as walking alone at night or locking apartment/dorm room doors (Banyard 2014). This research shows that these type of suggestions reflect a disconnect

between the prevention policies and how students are understanding rape and sexual assault.

Strangely, understanding opportunity as the motivation behind sexual violence had no effect on the likelihood of college females to engage in defensive behaviors. If the goal is to encourage females to protect themselves, through these physical defensive measures or other less aggressive measures, then framing opportunity as the motivation behind sexual violence is may not be as effective as we thought. Since students' understanding opportunity as a motivation behind sexual violence has no negative effect on their likelihood to engage in defensive behaviors, there seems to be no harm in leaving this type of information in prevention focused programs. However, it should be supplemented with additional behaviors more geared towards date and acquaintance rape scenarios. Framing sexual violence as something motivated by power and sex will also be helpful in prevention efforts.

Past exposure to victimization was not a significant predictor of either actual engagement in or considering engagement in defensive behaviors. The high risks of college females for sexual victimization (Fisher et. al 2000) as well as the heightened risk of revictimization for those previously victimized (Campbell, Dworkin and Cabral 2009; Fisher Diagle and Cullen 2008; Gidycz et. al 1993) highlights the importance of focusing on how to prevent revictimization. One policy implication that this research supports is having multiple sexual assault prevention seminars throughout the typical five year college career.

Typically, these prevention programs are offered to students during an orientation period either prior to or during the first semester of college. This is an effective time as it

accentuates the heightened risk of victimization females are at for the next five years. Unfortunately, the data shows one in four college women are sexually victimized during their time in college (Fisher et. al 2000). This means that after their initial victimization, one in four women are at increased risk for revictimization while enrolled at a University. A second prevention strategy session that addresses revictimization may be beneficial to those who have experienced a rape or sexual assault. This second prevention strategy session may be more effective if offered during the second or third years.

In line with the second prevention strategy session, increased awareness of the resources offered by the University to respond to sexual violence is also suggested. It has been theorized that behavioral changes stemming from the initial act of victimization contribute to the accentuated risk of revictimization (Ruback, Clark and Warner 2014; Fisher et. al 2008; Griffin, Wardel and Reed 2013). These behavioral changes may include increased substance use (Griffin et. al 2013; Ruback et. al 2014) or risky social decisions (Testa, Hoffman and Livingston 2010; Griffin et. al 2013). If University resources are designed to target these behaviors in past victims and help them cope with their victimization in other ways this may lead to an increased use of defensive behaviors by past victims and a decrease in revictimization rates on campus.

It is important to focus specific policies and education efforts on those who have had past experience with sexual violence for two main reasons. First, females who have had been primary victims of sexual violence are at increased risk for revictimization (Campbell et. al 2009; Fisher et. al 2008; Gidycz et. al 1993). Policies aimed directly at preventing revictimization would help minimize revictimization rates on college

campuses. These may be offered to the student body as a whole, or even through resources such as campus police or counseling centers.

Secondly, those who indicated that they knew someone who had been a victim of sexual violence made up a significant number of the sample. This is not surprising given the high rates of victimization on college campuses (Fisher et. al 2000; Fisher et. al 2008 Koss 1987) and the fact that those most likely to receive disclosures of sexual victimization are peers of the victim (Filipas and Ullman 2001; Fisher et. al 2003; Pitts and Schwartz 1993; Ullman and Filipas 2001; Ullman and Peter-Hagene 2014). This means that understanding how the decision to engage in defensive behaviors is made for this population can provide us with valuable information that can be used to encourage alternative means of prevention for a large percentage of college aged females.

Similar to the original analysis, high levels of fear have no effect on likelihood to engage in defensive behaviors regardless of past exposure to victimization. High levels of perceived risk, however, still have an effect. Of those who have had some past exposure to victimization, high levels of perceived risk increase the likelihood of engaging in defensive behaviors. Educational programs should highlight the elevation of risk for college students in general, and specifically for those who have had previous experience with victimization. Risks of revictimization could be prevented in tandem with initial prevention efforts. Information about heightened risk of revictimization could also be presented by having a second prevention based education program focused on heightened risk of revictimization during the second or third year at a University.

Knowledge gained about how college females are understanding the motivation behind sexual violence is also useful in targeting educational efforts at prevention. This

is especially true for those who have had some past exposure to sexual victimization. Those who have experienced this first hand or experienced it vicariously through others' explanations may be more in tune to prevention efforts based on motivation as they have a concrete example from which to apply these potential motivations. Ways in which understanding how college females' use their perception of the motivation behind sexual violence to make the decision to engage in defensive behaviors are discussed in below.

Females who had reported past exposure to sexual victimization and who reported understanding power as a motivation behind sexual violence increased their likelihood to consider engaging in defensive behaviors. Underscoring the power component of sexual violence may encourage females to engage in more productive forms of defensive behavior, especially those who have had some past exposure to sexual victimization. Some of these more productive forms of defensive behavior include bystander interventions (Coker et. al 2011), or building healthy relationship skills (DeGue 2014).

Possible ways in which this can be done include highlighting the power that females possess in interactions where date or acquaintance rape could potentially be an outcome. Prevention efforts such as changing rape myth attitudes through education and gender role socialization have already proven to be effective (Anderson and Whitson 2005; Bachar and Koss 2001; Lonsway 1996). These type of prevention efforts could easily incorporate the power component of sexual violence into their curriculum, which would encourage females to consider engaging in physical defensive behaviors. Based on the fact that this group of females are already considering engaging in intense, physical defensive behaviors, if alternative behaviors are presented in tandem with these targeted prevention efforts females may be more likely to engage in them as well.

Sex is the final motivation shown to have some effect on female's likelihood to engage in defensive behaviors. I have already discussed how using sex as a motivation for sexual violence could be used in policies to encourage college females to engage in some sort of defensive behaviors. This section will focus on ways in which using sex as a motivation for sexual violence can encourage those who have not had past exposure to sexual victimization to take individual prevention efforts to remain in this non-victimized group.

Interestingly, understanding sex as a motivation for sexual violence encouraged college females to engage in defensive behavior as a whole. However, once this effect was more closely examined, seeing sex as the motivation for rape or sexual assault only encouraged those who did not have past exposure to sexual victimization to engage in defensive behaviors. This finding suggests two things.

One, that females who have had exposure to sexual violence are more likely perceive power as a motivating factor to engage in defensive behaviors than sex or opportunity. This means that prevention efforts focused on preventing revictimization can focus on encouraging females to increase their perceived level of power. This can be done through engagement in these physical forms of defensive behavior, such as self defense classes or carrying weapons (Yeater and O'Donohue 1999), or through encouraging utilization of University counseling services that can help mitigate self blame and increase self-esteem (Neville et. al 2004).

Two, that understanding sex as a motivating factor for sexual violence is effective for increasing use of defensive behaviors only in those who have not had past exposure to sexual violence. This means that the sexual motivation of rape and sexual assault is

much more useful in the prevention programs given during the first semester of college. If females have not yet been exposed in any way to sexual violence, highlighting the sexual motivation will help them engage in defensive behaviors (both physical and alternatives offered by the program) to help them prevent being victimized. If a second prevention program is offered with a focus on preventing sexual victimization as well as revictimization, other motivations should be incorporated into the curriculum.

This section has gone over specific policy implications for sexual violence prevention. The final chapter gives an overview of this specific work. The limitations to this particular study are also discussed, along with directions for future research.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

This piece examined what affects the decision to engage in or consider engaging in defensive behaviors for college females. Given the increased risk of sexual victimization on college campuses (Fisher et. al 2000; Fisher and May 2009), this is an important area of study. This work also brings to light a somewhat different area of focus on the relationship between sexual violence and college campuses, as it focuses on prevention efforts instead of reactionary measures.

This project has illuminated some ways in which college females can be encouraged to engage in defensive behaviors. Focusing on the heightened risk college females are at during their time on campus is one way to encourage them to engage in defensive behaviors. Risk for revictimization is also something that should be included in these educational efforts. The possibility of offering a second seminar highlighting prevention during the second or third year (mid-way through) of curriculum is suggested to address this concern.

Knowing how college females perceived the motivation behind sexual violence can also be useful in encouraging defensive behaviors. These findings showed that both power and sex as motivating factors behind sexual violence increase the likelihood to at least consider engaging in defensive behavior, if not actual engagement in defensive

behavior. If these motivations are highlighted in education efforts, the likelihood that females will engage in defensive behaviors, possibly preventing acts of sexual violence, will be increased.

The motivation of opportunity had no effect on the likelihood to engage in, or even consider engaging in defensive behaviors. This is problematic as some University based prevention promotes defensive behaviors that would fall in line with understanding opportunity as a motivation for sexual violence (Gidycz et. al 2006). These behaviors may include using a campus escort service (Day 1994), taking a self defense class (Gidycz et. al 2006), or not staying out late at night (Day 1994).

The fact that just over half of the females in this study (53.3%) cited understanding opportunity as a motivation for sexual violence implies that students are not consistently agreeing with opportunity as a motivation for rape or sexual assault. This, coupled with the fact that most prevention efforts are targeting methods of defense that are in line with diminishing opportunity for stranger rape, implies that there is a large disconnect between what type of sexual crimes are actually happening on campus, what students understand to be the types of sexual crimes they are at risk for, and the types of sexual crimes Universities are actively trying to prevent.

Beyond preventing actual sexual victimization on college campuses, those who are fearful of sexual violence on college campuses experience a different learning environment than those who do not (Woolnough 2009). By lowering fear and channeling the defensive behaviors females' are engaging in, Universities can improve more than the safety of their student body, they can better improve the whole campus environment as well.

It is my hope that research continuing in this light will draw attention to things that can be done to prevent sexual violence from occurring on college campuses. I also encourage future researchers to pursue this prevention focused area and contribute to expanding our knowledge in it. There is room for theoretical development here, as theories tasked with explaining sexual violence have not been updated in quite some time. In fact, most of the theories we have dealing with sexual violence focus on the least common type, stranger rape.

We can, and should, be drawing on work focused on other social groups and how they prevent acts of sexual violence. The practices of sex workers comes to mind, as they often have plans of action to ensure the sexual well being and safety of themselves and their colleagues (Shannon and Csete 2010). These social networks can be mirrored, with some tweaking, and put into use by sororities, friendship networks, roommates etc. on college campuses. By thinking outside of the box in this way we can potentially decrease the rates of sexual violence on college campuses.

College students, both male and female, deserve to have a safe environment in which to earn their education. They also deserve to have work done which focuses on explaining and preventing one common crime they are at high risk of being victimized by or committing. Continued efforts in this area all contribute to the safety and well being of students and can also contribute to the knowledge base in this area.

Limitations

Every study has limitations and this one is no exception. While there are notable limitations in this study, there is also knowledge to be gained. This knowledge can be used as a starting point for future studies focused on encouraging defensive behaviors in

college females. In this section, I will discuss the three main limitations which are the sample, variable construction and possible reciprocal relationships.

The sample used in this study is a convenience sample and it is relatively small. This means that generalizability is not advised as the findings may be specific to the geographical area or the sample may not have been representative enough. However, there is enough information here to show preliminary findings about what affects defensive behaviors in college females and this information can be used to guide future work done in this area.

The second limitation deals with variable construction, specifically the motivation variable. Participants were asked what they thought the motivation behind a common sexual assault was. Even though rape myth acceptance is high in society (Burt 1980; Giocapassi and Dull 1986; Gilmartin-Zena 1987; Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994) there is no assurance that they are all thinking about a stranger rape as the common form of sexual assault or that they are all thinking about this common rape the same way. Incorporating this variable into research is a relatively new idea, so future studies can improve upon this variable construction in the future. Future work should limit participants to one choice of perceived motivation and continue to use categories explained by actual offenders. However, the scope of offenders could be broadened and include college males who have perpetrated acts of sexual violence, as their motivations may be more for prevention efforts on college campuses.

Also, the variable that involves previous exposure to victimization includes both primary and secondary victims of sexual violence. While past work does show that secondary exposure to sexual violence provokes changes in behaviors and understandings

(Grubb and Taylor 2013), the inclusion of secondary survivors may contribute to the non significance of this variable throughout most of this study. Future work should include both primary and secondary victimization categories to examine if there are differences in engaging in defensive behaviors between these groups.

Hidden victimization (Koss 1985) may also play a part in why this variable did not act as a predictor for engaging in defensive behaviors. The concept of hidden victimization says that although females may have experienced a form of sexual violence they may not consider the experience as such (Koss 1985). Often times, this is defined by the victim as, simply, a bad sexual experience (Koss 1985). If females who have, by definition, been a victim of sexual violence yet not identified as such in the survey this may have contributed to the nonsignificance of this variable.

The third limitation involves reciprocal relationships. Recent work has shown that there may be a reciprocal relationship between fear and/or perceived risk and defensive behaviors (Rader et. al 2007). In other words, we don't know if having high levels of fear increases the engagement in defensive behaviors or if increased engagement in defensive behaviors increases levels of fear and/or perceived risk. While these variables were not correlated in this particular study, it is logical to assume that there may be some reciprocating effects between them. Future studies can incorporate a longitudinal study design in order to address causality in this relationship.

Future Work

As previously mentioned, limited research has looked at defensive behaviors as outcome as opposed to a predictor. Future work should continue to examine what affects the decision to engage in this type of behavior, as it has been shown to differ by

individual (Asencio et. al 2014). Additionally, future work should include potential reciprocating effects between defensive behaviors and theoretically relevant variables such as fear and perceived risk.

Future work should also look at gender differences. This sample was limited to females only. The results may well be different if males were incorporated into the analysis. More macro level constructs such as gender ideology and gender identity should also be considered. Recent work has shown that a lot of the gender differences in fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization can be more attributed to gender roles than to gender itself (Kahn et. al 2011), The same has been shown to be true for perceived motivation for sexual violence (Angelone et. al 2012). The incorporation of gender roles is an important addition to past research and effort should be channeled in this direction.

The racial differences brought to light in this research should be expanded on as well. Here, we saw that being non-white was a significant predictor of considering engaging in defensive behaviors. This is an interesting finding given that this is the group who recognizes the protective significance of engaging in these behaviors, but yet does not do so themselves. Levels of self-efficacy, perceived power differentials in society or differences of alternative defensive behavior use are all potential reasons this relationship could exist. Future work should examine if there are indeed racial differences in this regard. Attention should also be given to the fact that this was a female only sample, so intersections between race and gender should also be examined.

REFERENCES

- Abbey, Antonia. 2002. "Alcohol Related Sexual Assault: A Common Problem among College Students." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*. 14: 188-131.
- Abbey, Antonia., Pam McAuslen and Lisa Thomson Ross. 1998. "Sexual Assault Perpetration by College Men: The Role of Alcohol, Misperception of Sexual Intent, and Sexual Beliefs and Experiences." *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*. 17(2): 167-195.
- Abbey, Antonia., Christopher Saenz and Phillip O. Buck 2005. "The Cumulative Effect Of Acute Alcohol Consumption: Individual Differences and Situational Perceptions on Sexual Decision Making." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 66: 82-90.
- Ahrens, Courtney E. and Rebecca Campbell. 2000. "Assisting Rape Victims as they Recover from Rape: The Impact of Friends". *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 15(9): 959-986.
- Allen, W. David. 2007. "The Reporting and Underreporting of Rape." *Southern Economic Journal*. 73(3): 623-641.
- Anderson, Irina. 2007. "What is a Typical Rape? Effects of Victim and Participant Gender in Female and Male Rape Perceptions." *British Journal of Social Psychology*. 46: 225-245.
- Anderson, Irina and Victoria Swainson. 2001. "Perceived Motivation for Rape: Gender Difference in Belief about Female and Male Rape." *Current Research in Social Psychology* 6(8): 107-122.
- Anderson, Linda A. and Susan C. Whiston. 2005. "Sexual Assault Education Programs: A Meta-Analytic Examination of their Effectiveness." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 29(4): 374-388.
- Angelone, David J., Damon Mitchell and Lauren Lucente. 2012. "Predicting Perceptions of Date Rape: An Examination of Perpetrator Motivation, Relationship Length, and Gender Role Belief." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 27(13): 2582-2602.

- Archer, John and Elaine A. Vaughn. 2003. "Evolutionary Theories of Rape." *Psychology, Evolution and Gender*. 3:95-101.
- Armstrong, Elizabeth A., Laura Hamilton and Brian Sweeney. 2006. "Sexual Assault On Campus: A Multi-Level, Integrative Approach to Party Rape." *Social Problems*. 53(4): 483-499.
- Asencio, Emily., Monica Merrill and Michael Steiner. 2014. "Self Esteem, Fear of Crime and the Decision to Protect Oneself from Victimization." *Sociological Forum*.
- Asoved, Allison and Patricia J. Long. 2006. "Co-Occurrence of Rape Myth Acceptance, Sexism, Racism, Homophobia, Ageism and Religious Intolerance." *Sex Roles*. 55(7-8): 481-492.
- Bachar, Karen and Mary P. Koss. 2001. "From Prevalence to Prevention: Closing the Gap Between What We Know about Rape and What We Do." Pp. 117-142 in *Sourcebook on Violence Against Women*, edited by C.M. Renzetti, J.L. Edelson and R.K. Burden. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Banyard, Victoria. 2014. "Improving College Campus-Based Prevention of Violence Against Women: A Strategic Plan for Research Built on Multipronged Practices and Policies." *Trauma, Violence, Abuse*.
Doi: 10.1177/1524838014521027
- Barbarett, Rosemary., Bonnie S. Fisher., Helen Taylor and Graham Farrell. 2003. *University Student Safety*.
- Barnett, Nona J. and Hubert S. Field. 1977. "Sex Differences in University Students Towards Rape." *Journal of College Student Personnel*. 18(2): 83-96.
- Basow, Susan A. and Alexandra Minieri. 2011. "'You Owe Me': Effect of Date Cost, Who Pays, Participant Gender, and Rape Myth Beliefs on Perceptions of Rape." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 26(3): 479-497.
- Berzofsky, Marcus., Christopher Krebs., Lynn Langton., Michael Planty and Hope Smiley-McDonald. 2013. *Female Victims of Sexual Violence* (NCJ Report # 240655) Washington, D.C. Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Bohner, Gerd., Friederike Eyssel., Afroditi Pina, Frank Siebler and G. Tendayi Viki. 2009. "Rape Myth Acceptance: Cognitive, Affective and Behavioral Effects of Beliefs that Blame the Victim and Exonerate the Perpetrator". Pp. 17-45 in *Rape: Challenging Contemporary Thinking*. Edited by M.A.H. Horvath and J. Brown. Collompton: Willan Publishing.

- Bouffard, Leana A. and Jeffrey A. Bouffard. 2010. "Understanding Men's Perceptions of Risks and Rewards in a Date Rape Scenario." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 20 (10): 1-21.
- Branch, Kathryn A. and Tara N. Richards. 2013. "The Effect of receiving a Rape Disclosure: College Friend's Stories". *Violence Against Women*. 19(5):658-670
- Brecklin, Leann R. 2004. "Self Defense and Assertiveness Training: Women's Victimization History and Psychological characteristics." *Violence Against Women*. 10(5): 479-497.
- Brecklin, Leann R. and David R. Ford. 2001. "A Meta-Analysis of Rape Education Programs." *Violence and Victims*. 16(3): 303-321.
- Breitenbecher, Kimberly Hanson. 2000. "Sexual Assault on College Campuses: is an Ounce of Prevention Enough?" *Applied and Preventive Psychology*. 9:23-52.
- Brownmiller, Susan. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2007. "Criminal Victimization, 2006". (NCJ 219413) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2012. "Criminal Victimization, 2012." (NCJ 243389). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Burgess, Ann Wolbert and Lynda Lytle Holmstrom. 1979. "Rape: Sexual Disruption And Recovery." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. 49(4): 648-657.
- Burke, Peter J. and Judy Tully. 1977. "The Measurement of Role Identity". *Social Forces*. 55(4): 881-897.
- Burt, Martha. 1980. "Cultural Myths and Supports for Rape" *Journal of Personality And Social Psychology*. 38(2): 217-230.
- Burt, Martha 1983. "Justifying Personal Violence: A Comparison of Rapists and the General Public." *Victimology: An International Journal*. 11:212-230
- Buzash, George E. 1989. "The 'Rough Sex' Defense". *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 80(2):557-584.
- Campbell, Rebecca, Emily Dworkin and Giannina Cabral. 2009. "An Ecological Model Of the Impact of Sexual Assault on Women's Mental Health." *Trauma, Violence, And Abuse*. 19(3): 225-246.

- Carmody, Dianne Cyr and Lekeshia Washington. 2001. "Rape Myth Acceptance Among College Women: The Impact of Race and Prior Victimization". *Journal Of Interpersonal Violence*. 16(5): 424-436.
- Clark, Diane M. and Marjorie H. Carroll. 2008. "Acquaintance Rape Scripts of Women and Men: Similarities and Differences". *Sex Roles*. 58(9-10):616-625
- Classen, Catherine C., Oxana Gronskeya Palesh and Rashi Aggarwal. 2005. "Sexual Revictimization: A Review of the Literature." *Trauma, Violence and Abuse* 6(2):103-129.
- Coker, Ann L., Patricia G. Cook-Craig., Corrine N. Williams., Bonnie S. Fisher., Emily R. Clear., Lisandra S. Garcia and Lea M. Hegge. 2011. "Evaluation of Green Dot: An Active Bystander Intervention to Reduce Sexual Violence on College Campuses." *Violence Against Women* 17(6): 777-796.
- Cook, Sarah L., Christine A. Gidycz., Mary P. Koss and Megan Murphy. 2011. "Emerging Issues in the Measurement of Rape Victimization." *Violence Against Women*. 17(2): 210-218.
- Cowan, Gloria. 2000. "Beliefs About the Causes of Four Types of Rape." *Sex Roles* 42(9/10): 807-823.
- Cowan, Gloria and Wendy J. Quinton. 1997. "Cognitive Style and Attitudinal Coordinates of the Perceived Causes of Rape Scale." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 21(2): 227-245.
- Dalbert, Claudia. 2009. "Belief in a Just World." Pp. 288-297 in *Handbook of Individual Differences in Social Behavior*. Edited by M.R. Leary and R.H. Hoyle. New York: Guilford Publications.
- Davies, Michelle., Paul Pollard and John Archer. 2000. "Influence of Victim Gender and Sexual Orientation on Judgments of Victim in a Depicted Stranger Rape." *Violence and Victims* 16(6):607-619.
- Day, Kristen. 1994. "Conceptualizing Women's Fear of Sexual Assault on College Campuses: A Review of Causes and Recommendations for Change." *Environment and Behavior*. 26(6): 742-765.
- DeGue, Sarah. 2014. "Preventing Sexual Violence on College Campuses: Lessons from Research and Practice." *Prepared for White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault*.
- DeKeseredy, William S. and Martin D. Schwartz. 1993. "Male Peer Support and Woman Abuse: An Expansion of DeKeseredy's Model." *Sociological Spectrum*. 13(4): 393-413.

- Diagle, Leah E., Bonnie S. Fisher and Francis T. Cullen. 2008. "The Violent and Sexual Victimization of College Women: Is Repeat Victimization a Problem?" *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 23(9): 1296-1313.
- Dietz, Sheila R., Madeline Littman and Brenda J. Bentley. 1984. "Attribution of Responsibility for Rape: The Influence of Observer Empathy, Victim Resistance, And Victim Attractiveness". *Sex Roles* (3-4):261-280.
- Earnshaw, Valerie A., Eileen V. Pitpitan and Stephanie R. Chaudoir. 2011. "Intended Responses to Rape as a Function of Attitudes, Attributions of Fault, and Emotions." *Sex Roles*. 64: 382-393.
- Elliott, Diana M., Doris S. Mok and John Briere. 2004. "Adult Sexual Assault: Prevalence, Symptomology and Sex Differences in the General Population." *Journal of Traumatic Stress*. 17(3): 203-211.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. 2012. "Crime in the United States, 2012". Criminal Justice Information Services Division.
- Felson, Richard B. and Paul-Phillipe Pare. 2005. "The Reporting of Domestic Violence And Sexual Assault by Non-Strangers to the Police." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67(3):597-610.
- Ferraro, Kenneth. 1995. "Women's Fear of Victimization: Shadow of Sexual Assault?" *Social Forces*. 75(2): 667-690.
- Ferraro, Kenneth and Randy LaGrange. 1987. "The Measurement of Fear of Crime." *Criminology* 57:70-101.
- Field, Hubert S. 1978. "Attitudes Towards Rape: A Comparative Analysis of Police, Rapists, Crisis Counselors and Citizens." *Journal of Personality And Social Psychology*. 36:156-159.
- Filipas, Henrietta and Sarah E. Ullman 2001. "Social Reactions to Sexual Assault Victims from Various Support Sources." *Violence and Victims*. 16: 673-692.
- Fisher, Bonnie S., Francis T. Cullen and Michael G. Turner. 2000. "The Sexual Victimization of College Women". *National Institute of Justice Report*.
- Fisher, Bonnie. Francis T. Cullen and Michael Turner. 2003. "Reporting Sexual Victimization to the Police and Others: Results from a National Level Study of College Women." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 30(1): 6-38.

- Fisher, Bonnie S., Leah E. Diagle and Francis T. Cullen. 2008. "Rape Against Women: What Can Research Offer to Guide the Development of Prevention Programs and Risk Reduction Interventions?" *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 24(2): 163-177.
- Fisher, Bonnie S. and David May. 2009. "College Student's Crime Related Fears on Campus: Are Fear Provoking Cues Gendered?" *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 25(3): 300-321.
- Fisher, Bonnie S. and John J. Sloan. 2003. "Unraveling the Fear of Victimization among College Women: Is the 'Shadow of Sexual Assault' Hypothesis Supported?" *Justice Quarterly*. 20(3): 633-659.
- Frese, Bettina., Miguel Moya and Jesús L. Megías. "Social Perceptions of Rape: How Rape Myth Acceptance Modulates the Influence of Situational Factors." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 19(2): 143-161.
- Frohmann, Lisa, 1991. "Discrediting Victims' Allegations of Sexual Assault: Prosecutorial Accounts of Case Rejection." *Social Problems*. 213-226.
- Garofalo, James. 1979. "Victimization and Fear of Crime." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 16:80-97.
- Giacopassi, David J. and R. Thomas Dull. 1986. "Gender and Racial Differences in The Acceptance of Rape Myths within a College Population." *Sex Roles*. 15(1-2): 63-75.
- Gidycz, Christine A., Christie Nelson Coble, Lance Latham and Melissa J. Layman. 2006. "Sexual Assault Experience in Adulthood and Prior Revictimization Experiences." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 17(2): 151-168.
- Gidycz, Christine A., John R. McNamara and Katie M. Edwards. 2006. "Women's Risk Perception and Sexual Victimization: A Review of the Literature." *Aggression and Violent Behavior*. 11: 441-456.
- Gidycz, Christine A., Cindy L. Rich., Lindsay Orchowski., Carrie King and Audrey Miller. 2006. "The Evaluation of a Sexual Assault Self-Defense and Risk Reduction Program for College Women: A Prospective Study." *Psychology Of Women Quarterly*. 30: 176-186
- Gilmartin-Zena, Pat. 1987. "Attitudes Towards Rape: Student Characteristics as Predictors." *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology*. 15: 175-182.

- Geiger, Brenda., Michael Fisher and Yovav Eshet. 2004. "Date-Rape-Supporting And Victim-Blaming Attitudes among High School Students in a Multiethnic Society in Israel." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 19(4):420-426.
- Grubb, Amy Rose and Julie Harrower. 2009. "Understanding the Attribution of Blame in Cases of Rape. An Analysis of Participant Gender, Type of Rape and Perceived Similarity to the Victim." *Journal of Sexual Aggression*. 15: 63-81.
- Grubb, Amy Rose and Emily Turner. 2012. "Attribution of Blame in Rape Cases: A Review of the Impact of Rape Myth Acceptance, Gender Role Conformity And Substance Use on Victim Blaming." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 17:443-452.
- Hale, Chris. 1996. "Fear of Crime: A Review of the Literature." *International Review Of Victimology*. 4(2): 79-150.
- Helinski, Carly M. 2010. "The Role of Victim-Offender Relationships in Predicting Fear of Rape Among College Women." *Criminal Justice Studies*. 23(2):147-162
- Hickman, Susan E. and Charlene L. Muehlenlard. 1997. "College Women's Fear sand Precautionary Behaviors Relating to Acquaintance Rape and Stranger Rape." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 21: 527-547
- Hlavka, Heather. Pre-published Feb. 2104. "Normalizing Sexual Violence: Young Women Account for Harassment and Abuse." *Gender and Society*. DOI: 10.1177/0891243214526468
- Hockett, Jericho M., Donald A. Saucier., Bethany H. Hoffman., Sara J. Smith and Adam W. Craig. 2009. "Oppression Through Acceptance?: Predicting Rape Myth Acceptance and Attitudes Towards Rape Victims." *Violence Against Women*. 15: 877-897.
- Hayes, Andrew. 2009. "Beyond Baron and Kenney: Statistical Mediation Analysis in The New Millennium." *Communication Monographs* 76(4): 408-420.
- Hoffman, John P. 2003. *Generalized Linear Models*. Pearson.
- Janoff-Bulman, Ronnie. 1979. "Characterological versus Behavioral Self-Blame: Inquiries into Depression and Rape." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37(10):1798-1809.
- Janoff-Bulman, Ronnie. 1985. "The Aftermath of Victimization: Rebuilding Shattered Assumptions." *Trauma and it's Wake*. 1: 15-35.

- Kahn, Arnold S., Kimberly A. Rodgers., Charley Martin., Kiah Malick., Jamie Claytor., Maria Gandolfo., Rebecca Seay., Jacklyn R. McMillan and Ellen Webne. 2011. "Gender Versus Gender Role in Attributions of Blame for a Sexual Assault." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 41(2): 239-251.
- Kilpatrick, Dean G., Ron Acierno., Benjamin Saunders., Heidi S. Resnick., Connie Best And Paula P. Schnurr. 2000. "Risk Factors for Adolescent Substance Abuse And Dependence: Data from a National Sample." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 68: 19-27.
- Kilpatrick., Dean G., Benjamin E. Saunders., Angelynne Amick-McMullan., Connie L. Best., Lois J. Veronen and Heidi S. Resnick. 1989. "Victim and Crime Factors Associated with the Development of Crime Related Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder." *Behavior Therapy*. 20(2): 199-214.
- Kimmel ,Michael S. 2004. *The Gendered Society* (2nd edition). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Koss, Mary P. 1985. "Hidden Rape Victim: Personality, Attitudinal and Situational Characteristics." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 9(2): 193-212.
- Koss, Mary P. 1992. "The Under detection of Rape: Methodological Choices Influence Incidence Estimates." *Journal of Social Issues* 48:61-75.
- Koss, Mary P. 2005. "Empirically Enhanced Reflections on Twenty Years of Rape Research." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 20:100-107.
- Koss, Mary P. and Barry R. Burkhardt. 1989. "A Conceptual Analysis of Rape Victimization: Long-term Effects and Implications for Treatment." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 13: 27-40.
- Koss, Mary P., Thomas E. Dinero., Cynthia A. Seibel and Susan L. Cox. 1988. "Stranger and Acquaintance Rape: Are There Differences in the Victim's Experience?" *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 12: 1-24.
- Koss, Mary P., Christine A. Gidycz and Natalie Wisniewski. 1987. "The Scope of Rape: Incidence and Prevalence of Sexual Victimization in a National Sample Of Higher Education Students." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 55(2): 162-189.
- Koss. Mary P., Koss, Paul G. and W. Joy Woodruff. 1991. "Deleterious Effects of Criminal Victimization on Women's Health and Medical Utilization." *Archives Of Internal Medicine*. 151: 342-347.

- Krebs, Christopher P., Christine H. Lindquist., Tara D. Warner., Bonnie S. Fisher and Sandra L. Martin. 2007. *The Campus Sexual Assault Study* (DoJ Report # 221153) Washington, D.C., Department of Justice.
- L'Armand, Kathleen and Albert Pepitone. 1982. "Judgements of Rape a Study of Victim-Rapist Relationship and Victim Sexual History." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 8:134-139.
- LaGrange, Randy L. and Kenneth F. Ferrarro. 1989. "Assessing Age and Gender Differences in Perceived Risk and Fear of Crime." *Criminology* 27(4): 697-719.
- Lerner, Melvin J. 1980. *The Belief in a Just World: A Fundamental Delusion*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Littleton, Heather., Danny Axsom., Carmen Radecki Breitkopf and Abby Berenson. 2006. "Rape Acknowledgement and Post-Assault Experiences: How Acknowledgement Status Relates to Disclosure, Coping, Worldview and Reactions Received from Others." *Violence and Victims*. 21(6): 761-778.
- Littleton, Heather., Holly Tabernik., Erika J. Canales and Tamika Backstrom. 2009. "Risky Situation or Harmless Fun: A Qualitative Examination of College Women's Bad Hook-up and Rape Scripts." *Sex Roles*. 60(11-12): 793-804.
- Lloyd, Sally A. and Beth C. Emery. 2000. "The Context and Dynamics of Intimate Aggression Against Women." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. 17(4-5): 503-521.
- Locke, Benjamin D. and James R. Mahalik. 2005. "Examining Masculinity Norms, Problem Drinking, and Athletic Involvement as Predictors of Sexual Aggression In College Men." *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 52: 279-283.
- Lonsway, Kimberly A. 1996. "Preventing Acquaintance Rape through Education: What Do We Know?" *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 20(2): 229-265.
- Lonsway, Kimberly A. and Louise F. Fitzgerald. 1994. "Rape Myths: In Review." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 18:133-164.
- Lonsway, Kimberly A., Elena L. Klaw., Dianne R. Berg., Craig R. Waldo., Chevon Kothari., Christopher J. Mazurek and Kurt E. Hegemen. 1998. "Beyond 'No Means No': Outcomes of an Intensive Program to Train Peer Facilitators For Campus Acquaintance Rape Education." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 13: 73-92.
- Luginbuhl, James and Courtney Mullin. 1981. "Rape and Responsibility: How and How Much is the Victim to Blame?". *Sex Roles*. 7(5): 547-559.

- Mann, Ruth E. and Clive R. Hollin. 2007. "Sexual Offender's Explanations for their Offending". *Journal of Sexual Aggression*. 13:3-9.
- May, David C. 2001. "The Effect of Fear of Sexual Victimization on Adolescent Fear of Crime." *Sociological Spectrum*. 21(2): 141-174.
- May, David., Nicole E. Rader and Sarah Goodrum. 2010. "A Gendered Assessment of the 'Threat of Victimization'". *Criminal Justice Review*. 35(2): 159-182.
- McMahon, Sarah. 2010. "Rape Myth Beliefs and Bystander Attitudes among Incoming College Students." *Journal of American College Health*. 59(1):3-11.
- Mitchell, Damon., D.J. Angelone, Brittany Kohlberger and Richard Hirschman. 2009. "Effects of Offender Motivation, Victim Gender, and Participant Gender on Perceptions of Rape Victims and Offenders." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 24(9): 1564-1578
- Muehlenhard, Charlene L. 1988. "'Nice Women' Don't Say Yes and 'Real Men' Don't Say No: How Miscommunication and the Double Standard can Cause Sexual Problems." *Women and Therapy*. 7: 95-108.
- Muehlenhard, Charlene and Jennifer S. McNaughton. 1989. "Women's Beliefs About Women who 'Lead Men On'". *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*. 7: 65-79.
- Naugle, Amy E. 2000. "Identifying Behavioral Risk Factors for Repeated Victimization Using Video Taped Stimulus Materials." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 61: 1091.
- Neville, Helen A., Mary J. Heppner., Euna Oh., Lisa B. Spainerman and Mary Clark. 2004. "General and Culturally Specific Factors Influencing Black and White Rape Survivors' Self Esteem." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 28:83-94.
- Norris, Jeanette., Paula S. Nurius and Linda A. Dineff. 1996. "Through Her Eyes: Factors Affecting Perceptions of and Resistance to Acquaintance Sexual Aggression Threat." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 20: 123-145.
- Nurius, Paula S., Jeanette Norris., Diane S. Young., Thomas L. Gaham., Jan Gaylord. 2000. "Interpreting and Defensively Responding to Threat: Examining Appraisals and Coping with Acquaintance Sexual Aggression." *Violence and Victims*. 15(2): 187-208.

- Peralta, Robert L., Lori A. Tittle and Jennifer L. Steele. 2010. "At the Intersection of Interpersonal Violence, Masculinity and Alcohol Use: The Experience of Hetero-Sexual Male Perpetrators of Interpersonal Violence." *Violence Against Women* 16(4): 387-409.
- Perilloux, Carin., Joshua D. Duntley and David M. Buss. 2012. "The Costs of Rape." *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. " 41: 1099-1106.
- Perloff, Linda P. 1983. "Perceptions of Vulnerability to Victimization." *Journal of Social Issues*. 39(2): 41-61.
- Pitts, Victoria and Martin D. Schwartz. 1993. "Promoting Self-Blame in Hidden Rape Cases." *Humanity and Society*. 17(4): 383-398.
- Pollard, Paul. 1992. "Judgments about Victims and Attackers in Depicted Rapes: A Review." *British Journal of Social Psychology*. 31(4): 307-326.
- Post, Lori A., Nancy Mezey., Christopher Maxwell and Wilma Novales Wilbert. 1998. "The Rape Tax: Tangible and Intangible Costs of Sexual Violence." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 17: 773-782.
- Quackenbush, Robert. 1989. "A Comparison of Androgynous, Masculine Sex-Typed, And Undifferentiated Males on Dimensions of Attitudes Towards Rape." *Journal of Research and Personality*. 23(3): 318-342.
- Rader, Nicole., David May and Sarah Goodrum. 2007. "Empirical Assessment of the Threat of Victimization: Considering Fear of Crime, Perceived Risk, Avoidance And Defensive Behaviors." *Sociological Spectrum*. 27(5): 475-505.
- Ray, Larry. 2011. *Violence and Society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Reid, Leslie Williams and Meriam Konrad. 2004. "Assessing the Gender Gap in Fear: The Interactive Effects of Gender and Perceived Risk on Fear of Crime." *Sociological Spectrum* 24(4): 399-425.
- Remer, Rory and Robert A. Ferguson. 1995. "Becoming a Secondary Survivor of Sexual Assault." *Journal of Counseling and Development*. 73(4): 407-413.
- Rich, Robert F. and Robert J. Sampson. 1990. "Public Perceptions of Criminal Justice Policy: Does Victimization Make a Difference?" *Violence & Victims* 5(2): 109-118.
- Ruback, Barry R., Valerie A. Clark and Cody Warner. 2014. "Why are Crime Victims at At Risk of Being Victimized Again: Substance Use, Depression and Offending as Mediators of the Victimization-Revictimization Link." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 29: 157-185.

- Ryan, Kathryn M. 2011. "The Relationship between Rape Myths and Sexual Scripts: The Social Construction of Rape." *Sex Roles*. 65:772-784.
- Sanday, Peggy R. 1981. "The Socio-Cultural Context of Rape: A Cross-Cultural Study." *Journal of Social Issues*. 37: 5-27.
- Sanday, Peggy. 2003. "Rape-free vs. Rape-prone: How Culture Makes a Difference. Pp. 337-362 in *Evolution, Gender and Rape* edited by C.B. Travis. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Sanday, Peggy R. 2007. *Fraternity Gang Rape: Sex, Brotherhood and Privilege on Campus* 2nd ed. New York: New York University Press.
- Schafer, Joseph A., Beth M. Huebner and Timothy S. Bynum. 2006. "Fear of Crime and Criminal Victimization: Gender Based Contrasts." *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 34(3): 285-301.
- Scheingold, Stuart A. 2011. *The Politics of Law and Order: Street Crime and Public Policy*. New Orleans: Quid Pro Books.
- Schewe, Paul and William O'Donohue. 1993. "Rape Prevention: Methodological Problems and New Directions." *Clinical Psychology Review*. 13(7): 667-682.
- Schwartz, Martin D. and Victoria L. Pitts. 1995. "Exploring a Feminist Routine Activities Approach to Explaining Sexual Assault." *Justice Quarterly*. 12: 9-31.
- Scully, Diana and Joseph Marolla. 1984. "Convicted Rapists' Vocabulary of Motive: Excuses and Justifications". *Social Problems* 31(5):530-544.
- Scully, Diana and Joseph Marolla. 1985. "'Riding the Bull at Gilly's': Convicted Rapists Describe the Rewards of Rape." *Social Problems* 32(3): 251-263.
- Selby, James W., Lawrence G. Calhoun and Arnie Cann. 1979. "Effect of Perceived Motivation on Assignment of Blame and Punishment to Rapists by Female Respondents." *Journal of Community Psychology* 979(7): 357-359.
- Senn, Charlene Y. Misha Eliasziw., Paula C. Barata., Wilfreda E. Thurston., Ian R. Newby-Clark., H. Lorraine Radtke. And Karen L. Hobden. 2013. "Sexual Assault Resistance Education for University Women: Study Protocol for a Randomized Control Trial". *Biomed Central: Women's Health*. 13: 25-38.
- Shannon, Kate and Joann Csete. 2010. "Violence, Condom Negotiation and HIV/STI Risk among Sex Workers." *JAMA* 34(5): 573-574.

- Shaver, Kelly G. 1970. "Defensive Attribution: Effects of Severity and Relevance on Responsibility Assigned for an Accident." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 14(2): 101-117.
- Sizemore, O.J. 2013. "The Role of Perpetrator Motivation in Two Crime Scene Scenarios". *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 28:80-91.
- Skogan, Wesley G. and Michael G. Maxfield. 1981. *Coping with Crime: Individual and Neighborhood Reactions*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sloan, John J. and Bonnie S. Fisher. 2014. "Campus Crime." *The Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice*.
- Sloan, John J., Bonnie S. Fisher and Deborah L. Wilkins. 1996. "Reducing Perceived Risk and Fear of Victimization on Campus: A Panel Study of Faculty Members, Staff and Students." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 12: 81-107.
- Smith, M. Dwayne. 1987. "Changes in the Victimization of Women: Is There a 'New Female Victim'?" *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 24(4): 291-301.
- Snedker, Karen A. 2012. "Explaining the Gender Gap in Fear of Crime: Assessments Of Risk and Vulnerability Among New York City Residents." *Feminist Criminology*. 7(2):75-111.
- Snyder, Jeffrey K., Daniel M.T. Fessler., Leonid Tiokhin., David A. Frederick., Sok Woo Lee., Carlos David Navarette. 2011. "Trade-Offs in a Dangerous World: Women's Fear of Crime Predicts Preferences for Aggressive and Formidable Mates." *Evolution and Human Behavior*. 32: 127-137.
- Sochting, Ingrid., Nichole Fairbrother and Wililam J. Koch. 2004. "Sexual Assault of Women: Prevention Efforts and Risk Factors." *Violence Against Women*. 10: 73-93.
- Starzynski, Laura L., Sarah E. Ullman., Henrietta Filipas and Stephanie Townsend. 2005. "Correlates of Women's Sexual Assault Disclosure to Informal and Formal Support Sources." *Violence and Victims*. 20(4): 417-432.
- Stormo, Karla J., Alan R. Lange and Werner G. K. Stritzke. 2006. "Attributions About Acquaintance Rape: The Role of Alcohol and Individual Differences." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 27(4): 279-305
- Strömwall, Leif A., Helen Alfredsson and Sara Landström. 2012. "Rape Victim and Perpetrator Blame and the Just World Hypothesis: The Influence of Victim Age and Gender." *Journal of Sexual Aggression*. 1: 1-11.

- Struckman-Johnson, Cindy. 1991. "Male Victims of Acquaintance Rape." Pp. 192-213 in *Acquaintance Rape: The Hidden Crime*, edited by A. Parrot and L. Bechhofer. New York: Wiley.
- Suarez, Eliana and Tahany Gadalla. 2010. "Stop Blaming the Victim: Meta-Analysis On Rape Myths." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 25(11): 2010-2035.
- Sutton, Robbie M. and Stephen Farrell. 2005. "Gender, Socially Desirable Responding and the Fear of Crime: Are Women Really More Anxious About Crime." *British Journal of Criminology* 45: 212-224.
- Taylor, Ralph B. and Margaret Hale. 1986. "Testing Alternative Methods of Fear of Crime." *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 77:151-189.
- Testa, Maria. Joseph H. Hoffman and Jennifer A. Livingston. 2010. "Alcohol and Sexual Risk Behaviors as Mediators of the Sexual Victimization-Revictimization Relationship." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 78(2): 249-265.
- Thompson, Martie P., Thomas R. Simon., Linda E. Saltzman and James A. Mercy. 1999. Epidemiology of Injuries among Women after Physical Assault: The Role of Protective Behavior." *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 150(3): 235-244.
- Tjaden, Patricia and Nancy Thoennes. 2000. "Full Report of the Prevalence, Incidence And Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey". *National Institute of Justice Research Report*.
- Ullman, Sarah E. 1997. "Review and Critique of Empirical Studies of Rape Avoidance." *Criminal Justice Behavior*. 24(2): 177-204.
- Ullman, Sarah E. 2007. "A Ten-Year Update of 'A Review and Critique of Empirical Studies of Rape Avoidance'". *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 34(3): 411-429.
- Ullman, Sarah E. and Henrietta Filipas. 2001. "Correlates of Formal and Informal Support Seeking in Sexual Assault Victims." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 16(10): 1028-1047.
- Ullman, Sarah E. and Leanne R. Brecklin. 2002. "Sexual Assault History and Health-Related Outcomes in the National Comorbidity Survey." *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*. 32: 117-130.
- Ullman, Sarah E. and Henrietta Filipas. 2001. "Predictors of PTSD Symptom Severity and Social Reactions in Sexual Assault Victims." *Journal of Trauma And Stress*. 14(2): 369-389.

- Ullman, Sarah E. and Liana Peter-Hagene. 2014. "Social Reactions to Sexual Assault Disclosure, Coping, Perceived Control and PTSD Symptoms in Sexual Assault Victims." *Journal of Community Psychology*. 42(4): 495-508.
- Ward, Colleen. 1995. *Attitudes Towards Rape: Feminist and Social Psychological Perspective*. London: Sage.
- Ward, Tony. 1995. "A Descriptive Model of the Defense Chain for Child Molesters." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 10: 452-472.
- Warr, Mark. 1984. "Why are Women and the Elderly More Afraid?" *Social Science Quarterly*. 65:681-702.
- Warr, Mark and Mark Stafford. 1983. "Fear of Victimization: A Look at the Proximate Causes." *Social Forces* 61(4):1033-1043.
- Weiner, Richard L., Audrey T. Feldman Weiner and Thomas T. Grisso. 1989. "Empathy and Biased Assimilation of Testimonies in Cases of Alleged Rape." *Law and Human Behavior*. 13(4): 343-355.
- Whatley, Mark A. 1996. "Victim Characteristics Influencing Attributions of Responsibility to Rape Victims: A Meta-Analysis." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 1(2):81-95.
- White House Council on Women and Girls. 2014. "Rape and Sexual Assault: A Renewed Call to Action." Washington, D.C.
- Wiehe, Vernon R. and Ann L. Richards 1995. *Intimate Betrayal: Understanding and Responding to the Trauma of Acquaintance Rape*. Sage Publications.
- Wilcox, Pamela., Carol E. Jordan and Adam J. Pritchard. 2007. "A Multi-Dimensional Examination of Campus Safety Victimization and Perceptions of Danger, Worry About Crime and Precautionary Behavior Among College Women In the Post-Clery Era." *Crime and Delinquency* 53(2): 219-254.
- Woolnough, April. 2009. "Fear of Crime on Campus: Gender Differences in Self-Protective Behaviors at an Urban University." *Security Journal*. 22: 40-55.
- Wolkowitz, Owen M., Elissa S. Epel., Vitcor I. Reus and Synthia H. Mellon. 2010. "Depression Gets Old Fast: Do Stress and Depression Accelerate Cell Aging?" *Depression and Anxiety*. 27(4): 327-338.
- Workman, Jane E. and Elizabeth W. Freeburg. 1999. "An Examination of Date-Rape, Victim Dress and Perceiver Variables Within the Context of Attribution Theory." *Sex Roles* 41 (3-4):261-277.

- Yamawaki, Niwako., Ryan Darby and Adriane Queiroz. 2007. "The Moderating Role Of Ambivalent Sexism: The Influence of Power Status on Perception of Rape Victim and Rapist." *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 147: 41-56.
- Yeater Elizabeth A. and William O'Donohue. 1999. "Sexual Assault Prevention Programs: Current Issues, Future Directions and the Potential Efficacy of Interventions with Women." *Clinical Psychology Review*. 19(7): 739-771.
- Yescavage, Karen. 1999. "Teaching Women a Lesson: Sexually Aggressive and Sexually Nonaggressive Men's Perceptions of Acquaintance and Date Rape." *Violence Against Women* 5(7):796-812.
- Zurbriggen, Eileen and Megan R. Yost. 2004. "Power, Desire and Pleasure in Sexual Fantasies." *Journal of Sex Research*. 41: 288-300.

APPENDIX
SURVEY TOOL

Demographics

1. Race

- a. White
- b. African-American
- c. Middle Eastern
- d. Hispanic
- e. Other

2. Where do you live?

- a. on campus in a dorm
- b. at home with your parent(s)
- c. off campus in an apartment/house
- d. in a fraternity or sorority
- e. other

3. Do you feel the University has taken sufficient precautions to protect its students from unwanted sexual contact of any kind?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. I do not feel I am aware of the cautions that have been taken

Fear/Perceived Risk

4. Using the scale below, please indicate how frightened you are of the following being raped, where 0 is not frightened at all, 5 is moderately frightened and 10 is extremely frightened.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

5. Using the scale below, please indicate how likely you think it is that you will be raped, where 0 is not at all likely, 5 is moderately likely and 10 is extremely likely.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Offender Motivation

6. If you had to describe a “typical” sexual assault, which of the following do you think best explains the behavior of the offender (check all that apply)?

- a. Revenge against victim
- b. Revenge against third party
- c. Saw victim as easy target
- d. Opportunity presented itself
- e. To have sex
- f. To demonstrate power over the victim
- g. Sense of male camaraderie
- h. Relief of tension or stress

Past Exposure to Sexual Victimization

7. Have you ever experienced unwanted sexual contact?

- a. Yes
- b. No

8. Please indicate the type of unwanted sexual contact you experienced.

- a. Verbal sexual harassment
- b. Unwanted Touching
- c. Unwanted intercourse (including oral sex, anal sex, or intercourse involving any reign object or finger)

9. Has anyone you know experienced unwanted sexual contact?

- a. Yes
- b. No

10. Please indicate the type of unwanted sexual contact they experienced.

- a. Verbal sexual harassment
- b. Unwanted Touching
- c. Unwanted intercourse (including oral sex, anal sex, or intercourse involving any reign object or finger)

Engaging in Defensive Behaviors

11. Have you ever participated in a self defense training class?

- a. Yes
- b. No

12. Do you carry any protection with you on a regular basis such as pepper spray or a weapon?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Considering Engaging in Defensive Behaviors

13. If you were not aware that you could apply for a CCW, is this something you would consider now that you know it is available to you? (*CCW is a permit to legally carry a concealed firearm)

- a. Yes
- b. No

14. Would you consider carrying a handgun on campus?

- a. If I had a CCW* and it was allowed
- b. If I had a CCW, even if it were not allowed
- c. With or without a CCW
- d. No