PERCEPTIONS OF MALE RAPE VICTIMS: EXAMINING RAPE MYTH

ACCEPTANCE AND VICTIM BLAMING ATTITUDES

AMONG A SAMPLE OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

By

Katelyn Paige Hancock

Christina M. Policastro
Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice
(Chair)

Tammy S. Garland
Professor of Criminal Justice
(Committee Member)

Courtney A. Crittenden
Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice
(Committee Member)

PERCEPTIONS OF MALE RAPE VICTIMS: EXAMINING RAPE MYTH

ACCEPTANCE AND VICTIM BLAMING ATTITUDES

AMONG A SAMPLE OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

By

Katelyn Paige Hancock

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the University of
Tennessee at Chattanooga in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree
of Master of Science in Criminal Justice

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee

May 2019

ABSTRACT

The extant literature indicates that women comprise the majority of sexual assault victims. Emerging research suggests that although men are less likely than women to be sexually victimized, a sizeable minority of men experience sexual assault in their lifetimes and a growing body of literature has begun to consider societal attitudes towards male rape victims. The current study adds to the literature by exploring undergraduate students' assignment of indirect blame and justification in sexual assault incidents involving male victims. More specifically, data based on vignettes where situational characteristics were manipulated are used to determine how various incident, offender, and victim-level characteristics influence student perceptions. It was found that this sample of students were more likely to agree with indirect blame measures rather than direct. Age, sex, past victimization, and two of the three subscales from Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson's (1992) male rape myth scale were significant within the logistic regression models.

Keywords: male rape; rape myths; indirect blame; victim blame; sexual assault; rape

DEDICATION

This master's thesis is dedicated to my constant support system, my family. I grew up in a tiny neighborhood that consisted of my entire direct family and close friends as my only neighbors. To save money, I lived with my parents while working on my undergraduate degree. Upon my acceptance into the master's program at UTC, I realized that for the first time in my life I would be leaving the place that I had always called home. When it was time to move my things an hour and a half away, my family helped me pack and move everything into my new apartment. Throughout my two years in Chattanooga, they have constantly sent me messages, letters, and groceries for encouragement. As stressful as earning my second degree has been, my family stuck by my side through it all. More specifically, this thesis is dedicated to my grandparents, who I call, granny and pa. Every time I returned home for a visit during the past two years, I came back to Chattanooga with a car full of groceries and a heart full of love. My granny sends me good morning and good night messages every day wishing me a good day or encouraging me. I will never be able to repay the kindness my grandparents have shown me, and I aspire to be a person that shows people the kindness that lives in them, every day. I am beyond thankful for my family and especially my grandparents for walking this journey with me.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would also like to give a special thanks to the amazing support system and mentors I have gained during my time at UTC. I was unsure of what direction I would be headed after I completed my master's degree, but every time I had a minor meltdown, they encouraged me to keep going. To Dr. Christina Policastro, you have been the absolute best mentor I could have ever asked for coming to a new city and program. I am so thankful for your mentorship and the numerous wonderful opportunities you introduced me to. I hope one day I can teach students in the exciting and passionate way that you do. Also, here's to you for sending me feedback for my thesis a million and three times. To Dr. Tammy Garland, thank you for answering my emails back in the middle of the night and all hours of the early morning, but I am still convinced you never sleep. I am beyond thankful for the encouragement you have continuously given me, especially in regard to pursuing a PhD. As a very small-town, first generation college student, I never imagined that I would be applying to PhD programs. I never imagined that I would be flying two times in the same month (for my first time), but you encouraged me to live life in one of those emails, once again. Thank you for admitting me to this program and directing me to an assistantship. To Dr. Karen McGuffee, thank you for always calming my nerves about teaching and making the best jokes. To Dr. Courtney Crittenden, thank you for teaching me theory from the best book, listening to my meltdowns, and introducing me to real Italian food (sorry, Olive Garden). To the entire department, you all rock and I am so proud to have spent time with you and learned from the very best.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Sexual victimization is defined as "any type of victimization involving unwanted sexual behavior perpetrated against an individual" (Daigle, 2013, p. 96). According to data from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), in 2016, there were 1.1 sexual victimizations per 1,000 persons (Morgan & Kena, 2018). Sexual victimization affects both men and women; however, the extant literature consistently shows that women have a greater risk of being sexually victimized compared to men (Allen, Ridgeway, & Swan, 2015; Davies & Rogers, 2006; Kassing, Beesley, & Frey, 2005; Morgan & Kena, 2018; Reling, Barton, Becker, & Valasik, 2018; Walker, Archer, & Davies, 2005; White & Yamawaki, 2009). Another source of information on the extent of sexual victimization is the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) developed by the Center for Disease Control (CDC) to collect national and state-level data on sexual violence, intimate partner violence (IPV), and stalking victimization in the United States (Black et al., 2011; Burgess, 2017). Data collected between 2010 and 2012 indicate that 1 in 3 women and nearly 1 in 6 men had experienced some form of sexual violence during their lifetime. This translates to nearly 23 million U.S. women and 1.7 million U.S. men being the victims of completed or attempted rape during some point in their lives (Morgan & Kena, 2018).

It is important to note that estimates of sexual violence reported in the literature are likely conservative due to underreporting, and the extent of underreporting may be quite high

when considering sexual assaults against male victims. According to NCVS data, only approximately 23% of sexual assaults or rapes were reported to authorities in 2016 (Morgan & Kena, 2018). Researchers suggest that men may be even less likely to report sexual assault compared to women. In fact, it has been reported that men are 1.5 times less likely than women to report a rape to authorities (Chapleau, Oswald, & Russell, 2008; Pino & Meier, 1999). Victims may not report their victimization to authorities for multiple reasons. A number of rationales for non-reporting have emerged in the literature. Studies indicate that victims may not report because they are in denial that a victimization occurred, they may not define what happened to them as a crime, they may view the assault as not being serious, and they may fear involvement in the criminal justice process/system. Further, victims may feel fearful, guilty, and ashamed (Morgan & Kena, 2018). The victim-offender relationship also plays a role in reporting behavior, and specific situational factors (e.g. alcohol and drug consumption) surrounding the incident may further influence reporting (Burgess, 2017).

Another significant factor that may influence a victim's decision to report is the anticipated responses other individuals may have to the victim's disclosure. Trauma affects every victim differently, leading to the misconception that some victims are not traumatized when they do not behave in a manner in which society deems appropriate for a victim of crime (Wasco, 2003). This misconception often leads society to question the validity of victims' claims, and upon reporting their victimization they are further scrutinized rather than assisted. Of further concern is the fact that a significant social stigma is associated with sexual assault and victimization in general, which is often perpetuated and reinforced by the media (Easteal, Holland, & Judd, 2015; Emmers-Sommer, Pauley, Hanzal, & Triplett, 2006; Franiuk, Seefelt, & Vandello, 2008; Franiuk, Seefelt, Cepress, & Vandello, 2008). This stigma extends to victims,

and ultimately, leads victims to experience a form of secondary victimization upon admitting they were victimized (Davies & Hudson, 2011).

All victims of sexual assault face stigma, but this stigma is different for men. Males are often held to a standard of masculinity (i.e., being the providers and protectors), and when they are sexually assaulted, their masculinity is then threatened (Pino & Meier, 1999). Women are often depicted as victims, whereas males are essentially supposed to be untouchable, unemotional defenders and protectors. Men are not only faced with the traumatic experience of a sexual assault, but also faced with the consequences of reconciling how the status of being a sexual assault victim aligns with societal ideals of masculinity. Often, these ideas suggest that male victims "let" or "allowed" the assault to happen because gender norms dictate that "real" men are capable of physically fending off attackers (Chapleau et al., 2008; Davies & Rogers, 2006; Kassing et al., 2005; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992). Thus, stigma for male victims of sexual assault is very different compared to the stigma surrounding their female counterparts.

Males who experience sexual victimization may be aware of the social stigma associated with sexual violence, as well as the lack of victims' services available to men. Some may even be afraid of homophobic treatment and fear that others will see them as "less of a man" for not being able to stop their offender. It has been suggested that these societally instilled fears contribute to extremely low reporting rates among male victims of sexual assault (Davies, Rogers, & Bates, 2008). This negative stigma, in turn, indirectly contributes to the paucity of literature regarding male rape victims as it leads males to be perceived as a smaller piece of the proverbial pie when it comes to victims of sexual assault. Moreover, this social stigma affects

public perceptions of male rape victims. Public perceptions have a significant impact on how society responds to victims of sexual violence and how victims view themselves.

Rape myths are an influential force that shape public perceptions of male rape victims. Rape myths are stereotypes, prejudicial or false beliefs, about rape victims, rapists, and/or the act of rape itself (Burt, 1980; Kassing & Prieto, 2003). Essentially, rape myths are a form of victim blaming as these myths serve to minimize and/or justify acts of sexual violence while simultaneously shifting blame to victims of sexual assault (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). Much of the existing literature has focused on how rape myths influence individual perceptions within the context of sexual assaults involving female victims and male offenders. A growing body of literature, however, has begun to consider rape myths within the context of male victimization (Burt, 1980; Kassing et al., 2005; Kassing & Prieto, 2003; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; Murphey, 2017; Russell & Hand, 2017; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992; Suarez & Gadalla, 2010). This literature suggests that those who accept male rape myths are more likely to attribute blame to male victims of sexual violence (King & Hanrahan, 2013; Reling et al., 2018; Russell & Hand, 2017; Suarez & Gadalla, 2010). Further, researchers have posited that, like traditional rape myths, the acceptance of myths surrounding the sexual assault of male victims can affect reporting behavior (Burt & DeMello, 2002; Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001; Davies, Rogers, & Bates, 2008; Wakelin & Long, 2003; Walker et al., 2005). Given the scant attention granted to male victims within the sexual victimization literature, it is pertinent that scholars continue to explore factors that influence blame attribution in sexual assault cases involving male victims. The current study aims to contribute to the growing body of knowledge on this topic by using vignettes to explore how individual characteristics, including male rape

myth acceptance, and situational factors affect assignment of blame in sexual assault cases that involve male victims.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Johnson, Mullick, and Mulford (2002) define victim blaming as situations in which people judge individual victims and assign blame to them due to their personal characteristics while disregarding environmental factors. Scholars have distinguished between behavioral blame and characterological blame when examining victimization incidents. Behavioral blame is the notion that the victim is responsible for his/her assault because of something the victim did (i.e., his/her conduct). Whereas characterological blame is the idea that the victim's character or the type of person h/she is caused the event to occur (Janoff-Bulman, 1979). The effects of victim blaming are far reaching, and many groups are affected by victim blaming such as the transgender community, domestic violence victims, sexual assault victims, women, men, and the poor (Buist & Stone, 2014; Felson & Palmore, 2018; Johnson et al., 2002; Kaplan, 2012; Meyer, 2016). The *Just World Hypothesis* provides a promising framework for understanding the existence of victim blaming attitudes in society. Lerner's hypothesis explains the pervasiveness of victim blaming by suggesting that we feel a need to understand why victimization occurs, and in particular societies, individuals adhere to the notion that victims of bad circumstances are somewhat responsible for their situation, or in other words, "individuals got what they deserved" (Hayes, Lorenz, & Bell, 2013; Kaplan, 2012). Because, as humans, we must make sense of why victims have a negative experience, thus the simplest rationalization is that bad things happen to "bad" people. We must rectify that victims did something wrong because it does not make sense

6

that bad things would happen to good people. Lerner and Miller (1978) also note that individuals can deserve a bad fate even if they are inherently good, because they engaged in careless or foolish acts, such as walking at night without a form of protection, wearing "provocative" clothing, drinking and driving, or being raped while intoxicated.

This theme is common throughout rape and sexual assault literature (Abrams et al., 2003; Bernard, Loughnan, Marchal, Godart, & Klein, 2015; Gravelin et al., 2019; Hayes, Lorenz, & Bell, 2013; van der Bruggen & Grubb, 2014). This allows society to blame victims for their own assault by justifying and rationalizing instances of sexual violence. The assumption is that because an assault or rape happens to an individual that s/he is inherently bad or that s/he was engaging in bad behavior(s) that contributed or led to the victimization (Lerner & Miller, 1978). This is directly applied to sexual assault and rape victims typically in the form of comments that they should not have been drinking, dressed provocatively, out late, or walking alone. Just World rationalizations coupled with the notion that men cannot be sexually assaulted or raped, serve to minimize the experiences of male sexual violence victims or outright excuse perpetrators in this specific context (Burgess, 2017; Lerner & Miller, 1978; Lerner & Simmons, 1966).

Notably, individuals may not always openly share attitudes that may be perceived as discriminatory or overtly blaming to those around them. In fact, studies have found that respondents often indirectly blame victims rather than engage in direct forms of blame (Felson & Palmore, 2018). Felson and Palmore (2018) measure direct blame by asking participants if they *blame* the victim, while they gauge indirect blame by asking participants if they felt the victim was *irresponsible* or *should have avoided the situation*. Essentially, measures of indirect blame avoid social desirability bias and remove the stigma from assigning some form of blame to a victim, which could be viewed negatively by researchers or society. Despite the prevalence of

7

indirect forms of blame, scholars have identified a number of pervasive attitudes and beliefs that serve to justify and minimize violence (Lonsway & Fitgerald, 1994; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). Interestingly, research suggests that individuals who hold general victim blaming attitudes are also more likely to blame victims of specific forms of crime (Johnson et al., 2002). When focusing on attributions of blame and justification in the context of sexual assault, individual perceptions are often influenced by what have been commonly referred to in the literature as rape myths.

Rape Myth Acceptance

Rape myths can be defined as stereotypes, prejudicial, or false beliefs, about rape victims, rapists, or the act of rape itself (Burt, 1980; Hockett, Saucier, & Badke, 2016; Kassing & Prieto, 2003; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; Reling, Barton, Becker, & Valasik, 2018). These myths serve to minimize and justify acts of sexual violence, while simultaneously shifting blame from the offender to the victim (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995; Suarez & Gadalla, 2010). Rape myths can be viewed through the lens of theory as well. Attribution theory, the way people determine and attribute blame to others in certain scenarios, is often used in conjunction with rape myth acceptance to better understand how individuals perceive events (Grubb & Turner, 2012). Attribution theory allows researchers another direct method to attempt to understand why individuals place blame on victims of crime. This theory contributes to the creation of rape myths in that individuals logically utilize information to process and explain why someone is sexually victimized; this process of reasoning provides individuals an outlet to avoid the harsh reality of sexual victimization, often expressed by rape myths (Anderson, Beattie, & Spencer, 2001; Grubb & Turner, 2012).

Examples of rape myths have been well documented within the literature and include justifications such as: "women who are under the influence of drugs or alcohol cannot be raped" (Hockett, Saucier, & Badke, 2016), "women just cry rape because they're mad or want to cover something up" (Burt, 1980), "she asked for it" – typically associated with dressing provocatively (Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerlad, 1999), "whores" cannot really be raped (Sprankle, Bloomquist, Butcher, Gleason, & Schaefer, 2018; Stubbs-Richardson, Rader, & Cosby, 2018), and "if she didn't fight back she wasn't really raped" (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). As indicated by the aforementioned rape myths, much of this literature has focused on rape or sexual assault incidents involving female victims and male offenders, which limits our understanding of societal perceptions towards male victims. As will be discussed in a subsequent section, a small body of literature has begun to address this apparent gap in the research. Despite its lack of direct insight into attitudes towards male victims, the extant literature on female rape myth acceptance does provide some guidance as to which individual- and incident-level characteristics may be influential in determining attributions of blame in incidents involving male victims. Thus, it is important to provide an overview of this large body of work.

Research has identified a number of characteristics related to rape myth acceptance. In particular, studies consistently show that men are more likely to endorse rape myths than their female counterparts (Grubb & Turner, 2012; Hockett, Saucier, & Badke, 2016; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995; Reling et al., 2018; Suarez & Gadalla, 2010; van der Bruggen & Grubb, 2014; Whatley, 1996). In comparison to sex differences, the findings related to age and race are sparse and continue to be inconsistent (see Burt, 1980; George & Martinez, 2002; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). Despite extremely limited research, Foley et al. (1995) found that white participants attributed less blame to white victims compared to their black counterparts.

Researchers have found that participant's victim blaming is influenced by manipulating offender and victim race within vignettes (George & Martinez, 2002). Researchers have also examined traditional gender role beliefs in conjunction with rape myth acceptance, finding that participants who uphold traditional gender role expectations are more likely to endorse rape myths (Burt, 1980; Johnson, Kuck, & Schander, 1997; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). Another individual factor often examined with rape myth acceptance is educational background. Researchers have found that individuals with higher levels of educational attainment are less likely to endorse rape myths (Burt, 1980; Kassing et al., 2005). Lonsway and Fitzgerald's (1994) meta-analysis, however, found conflicting results regarding education and male rape myth acceptance. More specifically, some of the studies they included found significant relationships between rape myth acceptance and education while others did not (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). In relation to education, Cook and Fox (2011) found that students who took a victimology course were less likely to attribute blame to victims compared to those who did not take a victimology course.

In addition to exploring the impact of demographic characteristics, it is also important to examine how different segments of the population endorse rape myths to provide a complete picture of the issue. College students are an important group to examine because they are at a high risk of experiencing sexual victimization (Daigle, 2013). Moreover, research indicates that college students are often less likely to formally report sexual victimization (80%) than nonstudents (67%) (Burgess, 2017). Student victims, however, often informally report their victimization to a friend or family member and those interactions may further impact the victim (Branch, Richards, & Dretsch, 2013; Fisher, Daigle, Cullen, & Turner, 2003b; Iles et al., 2018; Starzynski, Ullman, Fillipas, & Townsend, 2005). If the individual a victim discloses their victimization to endorses rape myths the victim could be further traumatized, or the victim may

also begin believing rape myths, negatively impacting their reaction to their own victimization (Figueiredo, Fries, & Ingram, 2004; Golding, Wilsnack, & Cooper, 2002).

Victims are not only faced with the recurring emotional trauma that is often associated with sexual victimization; they may also be so negatively affected by rape myths that they do not see their sexual victimization for what it is. For instance, Peterson and Muehlenhard (2004) utilized a sample of women whose sexual victimizations were classified as rape, finding that women who bought into certain rape myths ("if women don't fight back, it can't really be considered rape") were less likely to define their victimization as rape. Fisher and colleagues (2003) provide further evidence of this issue in their analysis of data from the National College Women Sexual Victimization Study, finding that approximately half of their sample who met the legal definition of rape did not recognize their rape as rape. When victims themselves do not acknowledge their own sexual assaults or rapes for what they truly are, the likelihood of a victim actually reporting their victimization is substantially low.

Students often engage in the party lifestyle that university life may perpetuate thus perceptions concerning the acceptability of alcohol consumption and the role of alcohol in sexual victimization may influence rape myth acceptance. Studies have estimated that 80% of college students drink alcohol (Blevins & Stephens, 2016) and other research indicated that approximately 50% of college student sexual victimizations involve alcohol (Hayes et al., 2016). Hayes and colleagues (2016) found that students who were heavy drinkers were more likely to endorse rape myths. This finding is interesting in light of societal tendencies to believe that individuals who are intoxicated cannot be raped, or because they were intoxicated the assault was consensual or just another "hook-up" (Hocket et al., 2016a; Reling et al., 2018).

Hook-up culture is another important factor that may perpetuate the use of rape myths within society, and on college campuses specifically. Hook-up culture is often referred to as a social setting that endorses sexual contact without a need for emotional ties or legitimate commitment (Reling et al., 2018). Reling and colleagues (2018) found that when students viewed "hookups" as harmless and as a means to elevate social status, students had higher levels of rape myth acceptance. Another important factor often associated with college students and alcohol is their affiliation with Greek life. Sorority and fraternity members have been found to hold higher rape myth acceptance compared to non-Greek affiliated individuals (Bannon, Brosi, & Foubert, 2013; Bleecker & Murnen, 2005; Canan, Jozkowski, & Crawford, 2018). Greek males also consistently show higher levels of rape myth acceptance when compared to their Greek female counterparts (Bannon, Brosi, & Foubert, 2013; Bleecker & Murnen, 2005; Canan, Jozkowski, & Crawford, 2018). Further, Bleecker and Murnen (2005) utilized data of degrading images of women found in fraternity members rooms in conjunction with a rape supportive attitudes scale to further examine levels of acceptance. They found that Greek male's rape supportive attitude scores were directly correlated with the level of degradation found in the images displayed in their rooms.

Coupled with individual-level characteristics, studies have also highlighted the importance of victim- and offender-level characteristics in the attribution of blame. In order to manipulate these characteristics, as well as other situational factors like alcohol consumption and victim/offender relationship, scholars often employ vignettes that depict various sexual victimization scenarios to participants. Respondents often attribute greater blame to male victims than female victims as discussed in subsequent sections. With regard to victim characteristics, George and Martinez (2002) found that participants attributed more blame to black rape victims

12

when a member of another race was the offender; this held true for white victims as well. Studies have also found that students attribute greater pleasure, more responsibility, and associate less trauma to homosexual victims of rape compared to heterosexual victims of rape (Mitchell et al., 1999; White & Yamawaki, 2009).

Another important situational characteristic is the relationship between the victim and offender. Studies indicate that students attribute more blame to victims in scenarios where the victim knew the offender, compared to scenarios in which the perpetrator was a stranger (Abrams et al., 2003; Sleath & Bull, 2010; van der Bruggen & Grubb, 2014; White & Yamawaki, 2009). Not only has relationship status been linked to a greater attribution of blame, but additional situational considerations, such as participation in drug and alcohol use, have been linked to an increase in victim blaming as these behaviors are often factored into a victims' culpability. Grubb and Turner (2012) conducted a review of literature surrounding RMA, gender role conformity, substance use, and victim blaming, finding that a sexual assault victim's alcohol consumption prior to the victimization was found to increase the level of blame participants assigned to the victim.

It is also important to consider perceptions surrounding rape myths among criminal justice professionals, especially law enforcement officers. As the current study focuses on college students, aside from friends or family, police are another source that may be called upon in the event of sexual victimization. Sleath and Bull (2012) found that higher levels of rape myth acceptance were associated with greater levels of victim blame. Consistent with general depictions of rape myth acceptance, male officers endorsed rape myths more than female officers (Page, 2007). Similarly, research based on college student samples, police officers were more likely to blame victims of acquaintance rape rather than stranger rape, and they were also more

13

likely to endorse rape myths if the victim was dressed provocatively or was drinking (Sleath & Bull, 2012). These findings are disconcerting and problematic for victims who have made the decision to report their victimization. Of further concern is Sleath and Bull's (2012) finding that special training related to working with rape victims had no significant effects on victim blaming. This supports prior research that no differences in rape myth acceptance were found in police after training compared to before (Lonsway, Welch, & Fitzgerald, 2001). Further, researchers have found that police interactions have a crucial influence on survivor's emotional well-being as well as their hopes for their case outcome (Greeson, Campbell, & Fehler-Cabral, 2016).

Male Rape Myth Acceptance: Perceptions of Male Victims

The majority of research surrounding rape myths focuses on female victims and male offenders; however, a small body of research has identified a number of myths surrounding rape incidents involving male victims. Male rape myths are prejudicial stereotypes or false beliefs surrounding the dynamics of male rape relating to the culpability of victims, the innocence of rapists, and the illegitimacy of rape as a serious crime (Chapleau et al., 2008; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; Murphey, 2017; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992). Rape myths that focus on the culpability of victims highlight how the victim was responsible for their victimization and include myths such as: "if a man doesn't fight off his attacker he could not have been raped" (Sleath & Bull, 2010). Rape myths pertaining to the innocence of rapists may sometimes blur the line between culpability of victims, but most often refer to excuses for the rapist, such as in cases of female on male rape. An example would be the idea that "when a man

is raped by a woman, he must have initiated the sexual act or enjoyed it" (Smith, Pine, & Hawley, 1988).

Male rape is often rationalized as being illegitimate and homophobic reactions are used as a justification. This is epitomized by the myth that "gay males can't really be raped" (White & Yamawaki, 2009). Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson (1992) found that the majority of their college participant sample disagreed with rape myths; however, there were certain situations in which they were more likely to endorse male rape myths. They found that when a perpetrator was a woman, participants were more likely to indicate that men could not be raped, experienced less trauma, and often were to blame for their victimization (Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992). Further, subjects were most likely to endorse myths that "men cannot be raped" and "men should be able to fight of their perpetrators." Interestingly, respondents were most likely to disagree with myths surrounding trauma, more specifically respondents disagreed with the notion that male rape victims are not upset or do not need counseling (Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992).

Traditional sex role expectations are often linked with rape myth acceptance (Burt, 1980), and this is also the case with male rape myth acceptance. In American society, traditional sex roles dictate that men are supposed to be the strong, providers of the family, while women are the submissive caretakers of the home and children. Consequently, when a male is not "strong" enough to fight off an attacker, they are often viewed as violating the norms defined by traditional sex role expectations. When the "man in charge" is sexually assaulted or raped, societal beliefs are challenged due to this behavior not aligning with the stereotypical depiction of males as aggressive, fighters. When faced with reporting, many males see this inability to defend themselves as a loss of manhood (Chapleau et al., 2008; Davies, Rogers, & Bates, 2008;

15

Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992; Walker, Davies, & Archer, 2005). Male rape is also depicted as a victimization that only affects homosexual men. When a heterosexual male is raped, they often fear that their disclosure will be met with homophobia and that their sexuality will be questioned (Davies & Rogers, 2006; Davies, Rogers, & Bates, 2008; Wakelin & Long, 2003). Studies indicate that male victims may fear that they will be viewed as homosexual if raped by another man, or "weird" for not wanting to have sex, if raped by a female (Ayala et al., 2018).

Another societal factor that inevitably influences perceptions of male rape victims is rooted in the definition of rape itself. Rape was traditionally defined as the carnal knowledge of a woman without her consent by a man to whom she was not married (Daigle, 2013). This traditional definition excludes males completely, and it was not until December of 2011, that the FBI adopted a new definition of rape, this new definition finally allowed males to be recognized as victims. Rape, by definition is now, "Penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without the consent of the victim" (Burgess, 2017, p. 396; Lowe & Rogers, 2017). Data collection reports, such as the UCR, now refer to the less encompassing, older definition of rape as "legacy rape" and the current definition of rape is referred to as "revised rape." Despite this step in the right direction, remnants of the old definition are still evident in current rape myths: "males cannot be raped," "only gay males can be raped," "females cannot rape males," "males only get raped in prison," "same sex rape will result in the male victim becoming homosexual," "gay or bisexual, males deserve the rape due to their deviant behavior," "if a male victim is physically aroused during the rape he obviously wanted the rape to take place," "males should be blamed for their rape because they could not fend off their attacker," "men are always ready for a sexual

interaction," and "males are not traumatized by being raped" (Ayala, Kotary, & Hetz, 2018; Chapleau et al., 2008; Davies, Rogers, & Bates, 2008; Murphey, 2017; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992). Using Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson's (1992) rape myth scale, researchers can group this seemingly large list into focusing on three predominate myths: "males cannot be raped," "males are to blame for their rape,"" and males do not experience trauma after being raped."

Societal factors are not the only factor that contribute to the perpetuation of male rape myths. Researchers have also examined individual characteristics associated with endorsing male rape myths. As mentioned previously, researchers continuously find that men are more likely to endorse male rape myths than women (Burt & DeMello, 2003; Chapleau et al., 2008; Davies & McCartney, 2003; Davies & Rogers, 2006; Davies, Rogers, & Bates, 2008; Mitchell, Hirschman, & Nagayama Hall, 1999; Russell & Hand, 2017; Sleath & Bull, 2010; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992; Whatley & Riggio, 1993). Further, Kassing, Beesley, and Frey (2005) identified that older individuals were more likely to endorse male rape myths compared to their younger counterparts.

Like the broader rape myth acceptance literature, scholars also have used vignettes to manipulate victim, offender, and situational characteristics to determine how contextual factors influence male rape myth acceptance. The victim's sexual orientation is most often manipulated in relation to examining male rape myths. Researchers consistently find that participants assign more blame to homosexual male victims for their own victimization than heterosexual male victims (Davies, Gilston, & Rogers, 2012; Davies & McCartney, 2003; Kassing et al., 2005; Mitchell et al., 1999). Further, homosexual male rape victims are often viewed as experiencing less trauma after the victimization (Mitchell et al., 1999). Further, perpetrators who sexually

victimize males are often blamed less than perpetrators who sexually victimize females (Anderson & Lyons, 2005).

As previously mentioned, behavior is often another victim-level characteristic examined in relation to female rape myths, due to the societally endorsed rape myth that women who are drinking or dressed "provocatively" are inevitably responsible for their own victimization (Russell & Hand, 2017; Whatley, 2005). Due to sex role expectations, however, "blameworthy" behavior within the context of male rape is typically characterized either by physiological responses (i.e., arousal) to the sexual victimization or an inability to fight off attackers. When males illicit a sexual response to their victimization, people tend to interpret that the victim enjoyed the victimization (Bullock & Beckson, 2011; Mitchell et al., 1999). Further, Bullock and Beckson (2011) studied medical aspects surrounding male sexual assault, finding that males sometimes experience erections or ejaculate during the assault. Misconceptions concerning males' physical response to sexual assault and equating this response to sexual pleasure has led some legal professionals to be reluctant to work with these victims (Bullock & Beckson, 2011; Fuchs, 2004). When looking at the victim's behavior in regard to defending themselves, male rape victims are often blamed significantly more than female victims when measuring behavioral blame, often attributed to societal stereotypes regarding a male's apparent ability to fight off attackers (Davies & Rogers, 2006; Howard, 1984a; Howard, 1984b; Perrott & Webber, 1996).

Offender characteristics also affect whether individuals will endorse male rape myths. The characteristic most often focused on is the sex of the offender. The literature suggests that individuals often believe that males who are sexually assaulted by females are: responsible for encouraging or initiating the act, should feel pleasure because they were assaulted by a woman, and experience less trauma because a woman was the offender (Davies, Archer, & Pollard, 2006;

Davies & Rogers, 2006; Sarrel & Masters, 1982; Smith et al., 1988; Wakelin & Long, 2003). This misrepresentation is also evident in the sentencing disparities between female teachers who take advantage of their male students versus male teachers who take advantage of their female students. Women tend to receive lenient sentences because of the perception that they are less dangerous, and that the male adolescent enjoyed the victimization (Cole et al., 2018). Aside from the sex of the offender, the literature is sparse in terms of offender characteristics and their relationship to male rape myth acceptance. Researchers have suggested that assertion of power, possibly in relation to how soldiers would conquer opponents, is often the ultimate goal in male rape rather than sexual gratification (Bullock & Beckson, 2011).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Rape myths are pervasive within society, often leading victims to experience further trauma by society, following their own victimization. A multitude of factors contribute to the perpetuation of rape myth acceptance. The following study seeks to provide clarity to the growing field focused on male rape by examining which factors influence male rape myth acceptance and which category of male rape myths are most prevalent for endorsement among a sample of college students.

1. To what extent do college students endorse male rape myths?

2. Do individual level and situational characteristics surrounding male rape influence indirect victim blaming?

3. Which category of male rape myths are most prevalent for endorsement?

4. Does participant past victimization influence male rape myth acceptance?

Data and Sample

Using a convenience sample taken from a southern, mid-sized, four-year university, undergraduate students were surveyed to assess male rape myth acceptance. Only individuals with complete data on all endogenous variables were included in analyses. The sample was drawn primarily from criminal justice courses; however, a number of courses surveyed were categorized as "general education" classes. Selected professors were asked to allow their

students to complete the pencil-paper survey at the end of class. Faculty and graduate assistants administered the surveys. Students were required to sign a consent form to be included in the study. Students were informed that their participation in the study was voluntary and responses would be confidential within the parameters established by law. The consent form also informed students that they had the right to withdrawal from the study without penalty, must be 18 years or older to participate, and provided information pertaining to the university's counseling center should the nature of the survey questions lead to any emotional distress. Upon completion, the study yielded a sample of 376 student participants.

The questionnaire was designed to measure participants' perceptions of male rape incidents and victims using three vignettes. Respondents were instructed to read and answer follow-up questions surrounding each vignette. Vignette 1 presented an acquaintance perpetrated sexual assault where alcohol consumption was involved. This scenario depicted a female rapist and male victim. Vignette 2 illustrated a victim date rape scenario involving a male rapist and male victim. The final vignette depicted male perpetrators and a male victim who was sexually assaulted with an object. Following each scenario, respondents were asked five questions regarding the victim's level of blame and culpability in the incident.

Further, the survey included items assessing participant demographics, prior sexual victimization, past drug/alcohol usage, and Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson's (1992) rape myth acceptance scale. Participants were also asked questions that assessed their feelings towards being a victim of rape or sexual assault, as well as whether they feel safe on campus. Finally, a series of items were included from Glick and Fiske's (1996) Ambivalent Sexism Inventory to assess participants' sex role attitudes.

Measures

21

Dependent Variable(s)

Indirect Blame

Participants' levels of victim blaming attitudes were assessed via four different variables. Each set of questions following the three vignettes had two questions to assess indirect blame (see Appendix A and B). The variables were measured with each vignette and in reference to the specific victim's name (i.e., Mark and Justin) followed by "{Mark's/Justin's} behavior contributed to what happened at the end of the scenario," and "{Mark/Justin} had control over the events that occurred in this scenario." After reading the vignettes, participants rated their level of agreement with each item via a four-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (4). Each variable was then transformed by recoding strongly agree and agree into "1" and disagree and strongly disagree into "0." Thus, items reflected whether or not participants felt the victim in each scenario was in *control of what happened* in the scenario (1= agree; 0=disagree) and if they felt the *victim's behavior contributed to what happened* in the scenario (1= agree; 0=disagree). The last vignette depicting a gang rape scenario was excluded due to extremely low levels of indirect blame. Only the two indirect blame questions from vignette one (i.e., acquaintance perpetrated sexual assault) and vignette two (i.e., date rape scenario) were included in the analyses.

Independent Variables

Sex.

Participants were asked to report their biological sex. Original responses to this item were coded as follows: male (0), female (1), transgender (2), and other (3). If respondents chose other, they were then directed to a second, open-ended question, coded as a string response. Due to a low number of individuals who reported being in categories other than male/female, sex was recoded into a dichotomy with females coded as "1" and males coded as "0." Other sex categories were excluded from the current analyses.

Race.

Race was measured by asking participants to choose which race they identify with. The following categories were provided: White (0), Black/African American (1), Asian (2), Native American /Alaskan Native (3), and other (4). Similar to sex, the majority of respondents identified as "White," thus race was dichotomized into non-White (1) and White (0).

Age.

Respondents' age was defined as how old they were, in years, when they filled out the survey. Age was measured as a continuous variable, asking respondents to write what age they were, in years, at the time of their participation in the survey.

Sexual Orientation.

Respondents were asked to identify their sexual orientation. The following answer choices were provided: Heterosexual (0), Bisexual (1), Homosexual (2), Pansexual (3), Asexual (4), and other (5). If respondents reported other as their sexual orientation, it was coded as a string response, and they were instructed to write in their sexual orientation. The vast majority of

respondents identified as heterosexual, therefore, sexual orientation was recoded into a dichotomous variable with respondents coded as heterosexual (0) and LGBTQ/other (1).

Political Affiliation.

Respondents were asked to indicate their political affiliation and provided with the following categories to choose from: Republican (0), Democrat (1), Independent (2), and other (3). Participants who chose "other" were then directed to write in their political party. For ease of interpretation, political affiliation was recoded into a dichotomy with Republican coded as "1" and other as "0." Due to the sample being in a southern state and a low number of responses in the categories beyond republican and independent, we collapsed this variable into republican versus other.

Greek Affiliation.

Respondents were asked if they currently belonged to a fraternity or sorority. The variable was dichotomous with yes coded as "1" and no coded as "0."

Religion.

Participants were asked to report their religious affiliation and asked to choose from the following: Protestant (0), Catholic (1), Jewish (2), Muslim (3), Agnostic/atheist (4), and other (5). Religion was recoded into a dichotomy with Christian/Catholic coded as "0" and other as "1."

Male Rape Cannot Happen Scale.

Using Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson's (1992) rape myth scale, the myth that "male rape cannot happen" was created based on the items: "It is impossible for a man to rape a man," "It is impossible for a woman to rape a man," "Even a big, strong man can be raped by another man," and "Even a big, strong man can be raped by a woman." The original Likert Scale coding ranged from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (4). These four items were summed to create the "male rape cannot happen" scale. Higher scores indicated higher levels of endorsement for this specific rape myth (Cronbach's alpha = .602). Despite the low alpha, this subscale is based on previous scales and is conceptually an already established scale.

Blame Scale.

Similarly, Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson's (1992) measures were used to create a scale reflecting the degree to which participants blame male rape victims for their own sexual assault. The following items were used to create the scale: "Most men who are raped by a man are somewhat to blame for not being more careful," "Most men who are raped by a woman are somewhat to blame for not being more careful," "Most men who are raped by a man are somewhat to blame for not escaping or fighting off the man," and "Most men who are raped by a woman are somewhat to blame for not escaping or fighting off the woman." The original Likert Scale coding was strongly agree (1), agree (2), disagree (3), and strongly disagree (4). These four items were summed to create the "male victim blame" scale. Higher scores indicated higher levels of endorsement for this specific rape myth (Cronbach's alpha = .923).

Trauma Scale.

Items from Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson's (1992) rape myth scale reflecting the idea that males do not experience trauma after being raped were used to create a

"trauma scale." The following items were used to create a summative index reflecting the trauma myth: "Most men who are raped by a man are very upset by the incident," Most men who are raped by a woman are very upset by the incident," Most men who are raped by a man do need counseling after the incident," and "Most men who are raped by a woman do not need counseling after the incident." Original items were coded as strongly agree (1), agree (2), disagree (3), and strongly disagree (4). These four items were summed to create the "male victim trauma scale." Higher scores on the summative index indicated higher levels of endorsement for this specific rape myth (Cronbach's alpha = .731).

Past Drug Use.

Past drug usage was defined as engaging in illegal drug usage within the past 12 months. Participants were asked if in the past 12 months, they had engaged in illegal drug use. The variable was dichotomous, with no coded as (0) and yes coded as (1).

Past Victimization.

Past victimization was defined as any *attempted* or completed unwanted sexual contact whether it be accomplished by mental or physical force. Past victimization was gauged by four dichotomous questions assessing participants' past victimization. The first item asked participants: "Have you ever had sexual intercourse (i.e., vaginal, oral, or anal sex) when you did not want to because someone, male or female, threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you?" The second question asked: "Has anyone, male or female, ever attempted to make you have vaginal, oral, or anal sex against your will?" The third asked question: "Has anyone, male or female, ever made you have sexual

intercourse when you did not want to by using continuous verbal pressure, threatening to end your relationship, threatening to exclude you from a group, and/or threatening to damage your reputation or spread rumors about you?" The final question asked: "Excluding unwanted vaginal, oral, and/or anal sex, have you ever had any unwanted sexual contact such as kissing, petting, or fondling with someone because you felt threatened or some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) was used?" Respondents were asked to respond to each question with yes, coded as (1) or no, coded as (0). Each victimization question was recoded into a dichotomous item reflecting any past attempted/completed victimization as (1) and no past sexual assault victimization as (0).

Past Participation or Completion of Victim Related Courses.

This variable was created to assess whether respondents had some exposure to criminal justice issues and/or victim related concepts in their course work. Participants were asked if they had taken any of the following courses: Victimology; Race, Gender, & Crime; Race, Class, Gender, and Crime; Violence Against Women; Family Violence. This variable was also dichotomous, respondents either reported yes (1) or no (0).

Benevolent Sexism.

Benevolent sexism was defined as "a set of interrelated attitudes toward women that are sexist in terms of viewing women stereotypically and in restricted roles, but that are subjectively positive in feeling tone" (Glick & Fiske, 1996, p. 491). Benevolent sexism was measured via 11 questions from Glick and Fiske's (1996) Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. The following questions are examples of items included in the scale: "In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be

rescued before men," "People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex," and "Men are complete without women." Original items were coded as strongly agree (1), agree (2), disagree (3), and strongly disagree (4). Items from the sexism inventory were reverse coded and summed to create a benevolent sexism scale. The variable was coded, so that higher scores indicated higher levels of benevolent sexism (Cronbach's alpha = .814).

Hostile Sexism.

Hostile sexism was defined as "the typical antipathy that is commonly assumed to characterize sexist prejudices" (Abrams, Viki, Masser, & Bohner, 2003, p. 112). Hostile sexism was measured via 11 questions from Glick and Fiske's (1996) Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. The following three items are examples of items used in the creation of the scale: "Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them," "Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash," and "There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances." The original Likert Scale coding ranged from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (4). Items from the sexism inventory were reverse coded and summed to create a hostile sexism scale analyzed as a continuous variable. The variable was coded so that higher scores indicated higher levels of hostile sexism (Cronbach's alpha = .881).

Analytic Plan

Analyses for the current study were carried out in stages. First, univariate analyses were utilized to explore trends within the data. More specifically, descriptive statistics and frequencies were estimated. Univariate statistics provided a basic format to view every variable's

characteristics separately and allowed the researcher to determine which statistical models would best fit the data. The percentage estimates provided by these univariate analyses were crucial to determining how many participants were in each category for the demographic variables of sex, race, sexual orientation, political affiliation, Greek affiliation, religion, past drug use, and past victimization(s), and past participation or completion of the following courses: Victimology; Race, Gender, and Crime; Race, Class, Gender, and Crime; or Violence Against Women; Family Violence. The ranges provided with univariate analyses also allowed the researcher to assess the sample's lowest and highest age, as well as provide an average age for the sample. These basic analyses provided a general assessment for the last independent variables formed from Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson's (1992) scale. They were also a substantial measure for showing basic indirect blame level ranges and averages for the dependent variables of victim contribution and control of their victimization assessed by each contribution and control question within the three vignettes (Felson & Palmore, 2018).

Next, bivariate analyses were conducted to further examine relationships within the data. More specifically, an independent samples t-test and Chi-Square analyses (i.e., cross-tabulations) were performed to account for both continuous variables and dichotomous variables. The independent samples t-test allowed the researcher to examine the relationships between the dichotomous dependent indirect blame variables and the continuous variables of age, benevolent sexism, hostile sexism, as well as the three summed scale variables from Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson's (1992) rape myth scale. However, the remaining variables were dichotomous, so the assumptions required for an independent samples t-test to be performed could not be applied to the remaining independent variables. Thus, Chi-Square analyses via the use of cross-tabulations were performed for the four dependent dichotomous indirect blame

variables and the remaining dichotomous independent variables of sex, race, sexual orientation, political affiliation, Greek affiliation, religion, past course competition, past drug use, and past victimization(s). The bivariate analyses provided a fairly simple way to determine the significance, strength, variation, and directionality of the associations among variables. However, the aforementioned analyses do not determine causality, nor do they determine that these relationships are meaningful.

Finally, multivariate logistic regression analyses were performed. More specifically, four logistic regression models were estimated for each vignette's indirect blame variables to assess their relationship with the independent variables. An OLS regression model was not estimated due to the data violating its two basic assumptions: a scale dependent variable and linearity. Logistic regression was the best fit for the data and was able to handle the four dichotomous outcome variables (Chambliss & Schutt, 2016).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In the preliminary analyses, characteristics of the sample were examined. Results from

the univariate analyses are presented in Table 1. As shown in the table, the majority of the

sample was female (64.1%). The average age of the sample was approximately 19 years old. The

majority of the sample was White (83.2%). Sex and race were representative of the sex and

ethnic background profile of the university as illustrated by the university's 2018-2019 online

fact summary sheet. Most respondents identified as being heterosexual (94.4%), and the majority

of respondents reported other (57.7%) when prompted for their political affiliation. More

specifically, only 41.2% of the sample reported being a Republican. The sample was also largely

Christian/Catholic (79.8%). Despite Greek affiliation being widely recognized on college

campuses, only 22.3% of the sample reported belonging to a fraternity or sorority, similar to

prior four-year university samples (Canan et al., 2018). Participant past experiences were also

examined, with 34% reporting past illegal drug use, and only 11.2% of the sample reported

participating or completing a crime/victim related course. Of interest, 27.1% of the sample

reported an attempted or completed sexual assault victimization.

By examining characteristics within the three subscales provided by Struckman-Johnson

and Struckman-Johnson's (1992) male rape myth scale, results showed relatively average scores.

The myth that "male rape cannot happen" had a mean score of 6.38 (s = 2.59). The second

variable, "males are to blame for their own victimization," had a mean score of 5.81 (s = 2.53).

31

The third myth, that males do not experience trauma following a rape, had a mean score of 5.83 (s = 1.98). Benevolent sexism and hostile sexism were also examined, with benevolent sexism having a mean score of 25.8 (s = 5.44), and hostile sexism having a mean score of 24.73 (s = 6.15). Participant's scores on the benevolent sexism scale ranged from 7 to 41, and participant's scores on the hostile sexism scale ranged from 6 to 44, with higher scores indicating higher levels of sexism attitudes

Characteristics of the four indirect blame variables were also examined. For the variable assessing Justin's control over the situation, 16.5% of respondents agreed Justin had control over what happened in the scenario. Exploring his contribution to the circumstances, 18.9% of respondents agreed that Justin's behavior contributed to what happened at the end of the vignette. Shifting attention to Mark's level of indirect blame, 21% of participants agreed Mark had control over the events that happened in his vignette. Lastly, 19.9% of the respondents assigned indirect blame citing that Mark's behavior contributed to his victimization.

Table 1 College Student Sample Characteristics

	n	%
Sex		
Male	133	35.4%
Female	241	64.1%
Race		
White	313	83.2%
Non-White	59	15.7%
Sexual Orientation		
Heterosexual	355	94.4%
Other	20	5.3%
Political Affiliation		
Republican	155	41.2%
Other	217	57.7%
Greek Affiliation		
Yes	84	22.3%
No	291	77.4%
Religion		
Christian/Catholic	300	79.8%
Other	71	18.9%
Past Drug Use		
Yes	128	34%
No	248	66%
Past Victimization		
Yes	102	27.1%
No	274	72.9%
Past Victim/Crime Course		
Yes	42	11.2%
No	334	88.8%
Justin had Control		
Yes	62	16.5%
No	314	83.5
Justin Contributed		
Yes	71	18.9%
No	303	80.6%
Mark had Control		
Yes	79	21.0%
No	293	77.9%
Mark Contributed		
Yes	75	19.9%
No	297	79.0%

Table 1 continued

	$\overline{x}$	s	Range
Age	19.66	2.97	18-49
Male Rape Cannot Happen	6.38	2.59	3-12
Blame Scale	5.81	2.53	3-16
Trauma Scale	5.83	1.98	2-12
Benevolent Sexism	25.8	5.44	7-41
Hostile Sexism	24.73	6.15	6-44

Next, analyses were conducted to examine bivariate relationships among the variables. For clarity, the significant results of the Chi-Square tests are presented in text. Several relationships were significant at the bivariate level. Cross-tabulation analyses revealed a significant bivariate association between participant race and the dependent variable assessing whether Justin had control of what happened to him ($\chi^2 = 7.885$; p = .011). More specifically, a lower percentage of White participants (14.1%) placed indirect blame on Justin compared to non-Whites (28.8%). A significant relationship was also found between participant race and the indirect blame dependent variable assessing whether Mark contributed to his own victimization ($\chi^2 = 4.816$; p = .034). Again, it appears that a larger percentage of non-Whites (31.0%) attributed indirect blame to Mark than Whites (18.4%). Participant sex and the variable assessing whether Justin had control of his victimization were also significantly associated at the bivariate level ($\chi^2 = 12.052$; p = .001). A larger percentage of males (25.6%) assigned indirect blame to Justin compared to females (11.6%). Cross-tabulation analysis also showed that participant sex and the dependent variable examining participant's views of Mark contributing to his own victimization ($\chi^2 = 22.885$; p = 0.000) were significantly associated. Once again, males (33.8%) reported higher levels of indirect blame on the variable that Mark's behavior contributed to his victimization

compared to their female counterparts (12.9%). None of the other dichotomous independent variables and the outcome measures were significantly associated at the bivariate level.

As shown in Table 2 and Table 2.1, independent sample t-tests were also performed. Several of the continuous independent variables and the outcome variables focusing on Justin's control over the situation and his contribution to the incident were significantly associated. Age, benevolent sexism, hostile sexism, and all three male rape myth subscales were significantly associated with the item assessing participants' perceptions of Justin having control in the situation. On average, individuals who agreed Justin was in control of the situation were older than those who did not agree that Justin was in control of the situation. Additionally, on average, individuals who agreed Justin was in control of the situation scored higher on the benevolent sexism scale, as well as the hostile sexism scale compared to those who did not agree Justin was in control. Similarly, respondents who agreed Justin was in control scored higher, on average, on all three myth scales compared to those who did not agree he was in control.

Benevolent sexism, hostile sexism, and two of the three male rape myth subscales were significantly associated with the item assessing participants' perceptions of Justin contributing to his situation. On average, participants who agreed Justin's behavior contributed to the situation scored higher on the benevolent sexism scale, as well as the hostile sexism scale compared to those who did not agree Justin contributed. Similarly, participants who agreed Justin contributed scored higher, on average, on the myth scales that male rape cannot happen and that males are to blame for their own victimization compared to those who did not agree he contributed to his situation.

Benevolent sexism, hostile sexism, and two of the three male rape myth subscales were significantly associated with the item assessing respondents' perceptions of Mark having control

of his situation. On average, participants who agreed Mark had control of his situation scored higher on the benevolent sexism scale, as well as the hostile sexism scale compared to those who did not agree Mark was in control. Similarly, participants who agreed Mark had control scored higher, on average, on the myth scales that males are to blame and that males do not experience trauma after sexual assault compared to those who did not agree he had control of his situation.

Finally, benevolent sexism, hostile sexism, and all three male rape myth subscales were significantly associated with the item assessing individuals' perceptions of Mark contributing to his situation. On average, individuals who agreed Mark contributed to his situation scored higher on the benevolent sexism scale, as well as the hostile sexism scale compared to those who did not agree Mark contributed to his situation. Similarly, respondents who agreed Mark contributed to his situation scored higher, on average, on all three myth scales compared to those who did not agree he contributed to his situation.

Table 2 Independent Samples t-test for Continuous Variables

	Justin had Control		Justin Contributed	
	No	Yes	No	Yes
	$\overline{x}$ (s)	$\overline{x}$ (s)	$\overline{x}$ (s)	$\overline{x}$ (s)
Age	19.51 (2.88)	20.4 (3.33)	19.61 (2.98)	19.66 (2.4)
Total n	*312*	*62*	*301*	*71*
	t = -2.172*		*t = -.134*	
Male Rape Cannot Happen	6.24 (2.55)	7.08 (2.66)	6.16 (2.54)	7.32 (2.6)
Total n	*312*	*62*	*301*	*71*
	t = -2.359*		*t = -3.469***	
Blame Scale	5.49 (2.37)	7.42 (2.68)	5.51 (2.37)	6.99 (2.81)
Total n	*312*	*62*	*301*	*71*
	t = -5.731***		*t = -4.1****	
Trauma Scale	5.66 (1.95)	6.69 (1.91)	5.76 (1.97)	6.21 (2)
Total n	*312*	*62*	*301*	*71*
	t = -3.807***		*t = -1.74*	
Benevolent Sexism	25.30 (5.47)	28.41 (4.48)	25.49 (5.5)	27.12 (5.07)
Total n	*307*	*59*	*296*	*68*
	t = -4.101***		*t = -2.227**	
Hostile Sexism	24.24 (6.22)	27.25 (5.08)	24.21 (6.2)	26.82 (5.49)
Total n	*307*	*59*	*296*	*68*
	t = -4.016***		*t = -3.452***	

* < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 2.1 Independent Samples t-test for Continuous Variables

	Mark had Control		Mark Contributed	
	No	Yes	No	Yes
	$\overline{x}$ (s)	$\overline{x}$ (s)	$\overline{x}$ (s)	$\overline{x}$ (s)
Age	19.49 (2.79)	20.12 (3.17)	19.65 (3.01)	19.51 (2.26)
Total n	292	78	296	74
	t = -1.701		*t = .370*	
Male Rape Cannot Happen	6.26 (2.59)	6.81 (2.57)	6.1 (2.52)	7.49 (2.61)
Total n	293	78	297	74
	t = -1.663		*t = -4.212****	
Blame Scale	5.52 (2.33)	6.88 (2.91)	5.43 (2.3)	7.28 (2.84)
Total n	293	78	297	74
	t = -3.84***		*t = -5.192****	
Trauma Scale	5.72 (1.97)	6.22 (1.93)	5.69 (1.93)	6.38 (2.05)
Total n	293	78	297	74
	t = -1.98*		*t = -2.714**	
Benevolent Sexism	25.34 (5.37)	27.32 (5.47)	25.36 (5.48)	27.39 (5.02)
Total n	285	77	291	71
	t = -2.87*		*t = -2.848**	
Hostile Sexism	24.29 (6.23)	26.05 (5.59)	24.01 (6.2)	27.35 (5.05)
Total n	285	77	291	71
	t = -2.252*		*t = -4.773****	

* < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Multivariate analyses were then performed between all independent variables and the four dependent variables. More specifically, four logistic regression models were estimated, as

shown in Table 3 and Table 3.1. In Model 1, age and the blame scale were significantly associated with the "Justin in control" item. For every one unit increase in age, the odds of a participant indicating they felt Justin had control of the situation are multiplied by 1.14, holding all else constant. That is, older individuals appear more likely to place indirect blame on Justin by viewing him as having control in the situation. The blame myth subscale from Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson's (1992) male rape myth scale was also significant in Model 1. For every one unit increase in blame, the odds of a participant indicating they felt Justin had control of the situation are multiplied by 1.16. This suggests that participants who indicated higher levels of male victim blame are more inclined to view Justin as having control in the situation.

In Model 2 predicting perceptions of Justin's contribution to the incident, two of Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson's (1992) myth subscales were significantly associated with the outcome at the multivariate level. More specifically, for every one unit increase on the scale assessing the myth that "male rape cannot happen," the odds agreeing that Justin's behavior contributed to his own victimization are multiplied by 1.15. Further, for every one unit increase in the blame scale (i.e., male rape victims are to blame for being raped), the odds of agreeing that Justin's behavior contributed to his victimization are multiplied by 1.18.

In Model 3, past victimization was significantly associated with perceptions of Mark having control in the situation. The odds of an individual who reported a past attempted/completed sexual assault agreeing that Mark had control were 1.97 times the odds of a respondent who did not report an attempted/completed sexual assault. Moreover, the blame scale was significantly associated with the Mark control outcome variable. For every one unit increase

in blame, the odds of agreeing Mark had control over his own victimization are multiplied by 1.19.

In Model 4, participant sex was significantly associated with perceptions of Mark's contribution to the incident. The odds of females indicating Mark's behavior contributed to the incident are .46 times the odds of males. That is, the odds of females assigning indirect blame via Mark's behavior are lower than the odds of males. Also in Model 4, two of Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson's (1992) myth subscales were significantly associated with the final outcome variable at the multivariate level. For every one unit increase on the myth scale assessing the notion that "male rape cannot happen," the odds of agreeing that Mark's behavior contributed to his own victimization are multiplied by 1.19. Further, for every one unit increase on the male victim blame scale, the odds of agreeing that Mark's behavior contributed to his victimization are multiplied by 1.19.

Table 3 Logistic Regression Predicting Vignette 1 Indirect Blame

	Model 1 (n = 352) Justin Control		Model 2 (n = 350) Justin Contributed	
	b(SE)	OR	b(SE)	OR
Demographic Variables				
Race (1 = non-White)	0.851 (0.460)	2.342	-0.363 (0.467)	0.695
Sex (1 = female)	-0.426 (0.358)	0.653	-0.153 (0.334)	0.858
Sexual Orientation (0 = heterosexual)	0.727 (0.869)	2.069	-0.842 (0.738)	2.322
Age	0.130 (0.043)	1.138**	0.029 (0.046)	1.029
Political Affiliation (1 = Republican)	0.208 (0.383)	1.231	-0.047 (0.342)	0.954
Religion (0 = Christian/Catholic)	-0.858 (0.238)	0.424	-0.595 (0.494)	0.552
Control Variables				
Greek Affiliation (1 = yes)	-0.127 (0.401)	0.881	-0.011 (0.364)	0.989
Illegal Drug use (1 = yes)	0.111 (0.358)	0.900	-0.381 (0.336)	0.683
Past Courses (1 = yes)	-0.105(0.483)	1.396	-0.836(0.570)	0.433
Past Victimization (1 = yes)	0.521 (0.365)	1.683	0.399 (0.332)	1.490
Key Independent Variables				
Male Rape Can't Happen	0.000 (0.067)	1.000	0.143 (0.060)	1.153*
Blame Scale	0.148 (0.064)	1.159*	0.162 (0.062)	1.176**
Trauma Scale	0.103 (0.091)	1.109	-0.077 (0.087)	0.926
Benevolent Sexism	0.067 (0.039)	1.070	0.032 (0.034)	1.033
Hostile Sexism	0.036 (0.034)	1.036	0.027 (0.031)	0.009
Nagelkerke Pseudo- r^2	0.223		0.152	
-2 Log-Likelihood	265.372		307.075	

* < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 3.1 Logistic Regression Predicting Vignette 2 Indirect Blame

	Model 3 (n = 350) Mark Control		Model 4 (n = 350) Mark Contributed	
	b(SE)	OR	b(SE)	OR
Demographic Variables				
Race (1 = non-White)	0.715 (0.411)	2.043	0.483 (0.440)	1.621
Sex (1 = female)	-0.222 (0.324)	0.801	-0.779 (0.329)	0.459*
Sexual Orientation (0 = heterosexual)	-0.254 (0.817)	0.776	-1.108 (1.132)	0.330
Age	0.081 (0.042)	1.085	-0.003 (0.052)	0.997
Political Affiliation (1 = Republican)	0.136 (0.335)	1.146	-0.376 (0.359)	0.687
Religion (0 = Christian/Catholic)	-0.035 (0.413)	0.966	0.155 (0.437)	1.168
Control Variables				
Greek Affiliation (1 = yes)	0.322 (0.340)	1.379	0.044 (0.395)	1.045
Illegal Drug use (1 = yes)	0.164 (0.310)	1.179	-0.268(0.341)	0.765
Past Courses (1 = yes)	0.020 (0.427)	1.020	-0.383(0.513)	0.682
Past Victimization (1 = yes)	0.677 (0.310)	1.969*	0.160 (0.353)	1.174
Key Independent Variables				
Male Rape Can't Happen	0.032 (0.058)	1.033	0.177 (0.061)	1.194**
Blame Scale	0.175 (0.059)	1.191**	0.177 (0.062)	1.194**
Trauma Scale	-0.026 (0.083)	0.974	-0.079 (0.087)	0.924
Benevolent Sexism	0.028 (0.032)	1.028	0.003 (0.034)	1.003
Hostile Sexism	0.014 (0.030)	1.014	0.055 (0.031)	1.057
Nagelkerke Pseudo- r^2	0.136		0.238	
-2 Log-Likelihood	331.389		293.289	

* < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Discussion

The current study examined instances of indirect victim blaming in relation to a multitude of different dependent variables, including demographics, exposure, and several scale variables assessing victim blame within the context of male sexual assault. Previous research has determined that male rape myth acceptance is often strongly associated with other individual characteristics and perceptions (Burt, 1980; Burt & DeMello, 2003; Chapleau et al., 2008; Kassing et al., 2005; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992).

Respondents from this college sample did, to some extent, endorse male rape myths. Initially, the research considered assessing measures of direct blame, which outright asked participants if each victim was to "blame" for his victimization. Upon examination of the data, however, very few individuals placed direct blame on male victims of sexual assault. Only 3.2% of respondents assigned blame to Justin, and only 4% of participants assigned blame to Mark. In comparison, a greater percentage of participants agreed with items assessing more indirect forms of blame. Approximately 1 in in 5 participants agreed Mark had control of the situation in which he was victimized. A smaller but still sizeable 16.5% of participants agreed Justin had control of the situation in which he was sexually assaulted. This supports Felson and Palmore's (2018) existing research on direct and indirect blame. Their results also indicated that respondents were

more likely to assign indirect blame rather than direct, which may be explained by individuals operating under social desirability bias (Felson & Palmore, 2018). More specifically, respondents may assign a negative connotation to the word *blame,* and despite the questionnaire being anonymous wish to present themselves in a socially desirable manner. However, when presented with wording that is indirect, such as a victim being *in control* or *contributing* to their situation, respondents interpret a more socially acceptable response. By agreeing to this wording, respondents avoid associating direct, intentional wrongdoing to the victim (Felson & Palmore, 2018).

Lerner and Miller's (1978) *Just World Hypothesis* may shed some additional light on the current research findings. Respondents' tendencies to indirectly blame male victims may be explained as their way of justifying the situation rather than harshly placing blame. Participants may view the world as a just place and bad things (sexual assault or rape) do not just happen to "good" people, so from this viewpoint the victim did something to *contribute* to their victimization. Using indirect blame as a metaphorical cushion, it could be that participants rationalize that the victim was somewhat to blame for their "circumstances," by using justifications such as that "they engaged in careless or foolish acts," that lead to their own victimization (Hayes et al., 2013; Kaplan, 2012; Lerner & Miller, 1978). Relating directly to the current study, respondents, who assigned indirect blame to Justin, may have used this hypothesis to rationalize the victimization (i.e., Justin agreed to drink and hang out with Victoria, so he was in control of his situation and/or contributed to what happened to him). Similarly, participants who assigned indirect blame to Mark, may have also justified his victimization (i.e., Mark agreed to move to the backseat and kiss Rob, so he was in control of his situation and/or ultimately contributed to what happened to him).

Moreover, the findings of the current study revealed significant associations between two of the three rape myth subscales and indirect victim blaming. The males are to blame myth, from Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson's (1992) rape myth scale, was significantly related to all four indirect blame variables. The myth subscale tapping into the notion that "male rape cannot happen" was also significantly related to two of the dependent, indirect blame variables (i.e., Justin contributed to his situation and Mark contributed to his situation). This relationship may be explained by the notion that those who endorse rape myths such as "males are to blame for their own rape" and "male rape cannot happen" are already more inclined to assign blame to victims. An explanation may also be found in that those who hold the belief that male rape cannot happen, already have a negative mindset towards male victims of rape, which may lead to placing indirect blame on male victims of sexual assault.

Notably, relationships between the benevolent and hostile sexism scales were not significant at the multivariate level. However, a significant relationship between all four dependent indirect blame variables and benevolent and hostile sexism did exist at the bivariate level. Participants that endorsed indirect victim blaming had higher sexism scores than participants who did not endorse indirect victim blaming. An explanation for this finding may be found in that, individuals that uphold traditional sex role expectations (i.e., men are strong and providers, while women are submissive housewives) may not rationally be able to view males as sexual assault victims because this vulnerability goes against traditional sex roles. This link between ambivalent sexism and male rape myth acceptance within the current study has been further supported within the literature (Burt, 1980; Chapleau, Oswald, & Russell, 2007; Davies, Gilston, & Rogers, 2012).

Additionally, several individual and situational level characteristics were significantly associated with indirect victim blaming. Supporting previous research, older respondents were more likely to assign blame to the victim (Kassing et al., 2005). This was found when assessing the association between age and the variable examining whether Justin had control of the situation. As expected from the extant literature, males also tended to assign blame to male victims of sexual assault more often than females when examining the variable that Mark contributed to his situation (Burt & DeMello, 2003; Chapleau et al., 2008; Davies & McCartney, 2003; Davies & Rogers, 2006; Davies, Rogers, & Bates, 2008; Mitchell, Hirschman, & Nagayama Hall, 1999; Russell & Hand, 2017; Sleath & Bull, 2010; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992; Whatley & Riggio, 1993). Interestingly, respondents who reported an attempted/completed past sexual assault were more likely to assign blame to Mark having control of his situation compared to those who did not indicate an attempted/completed past sexual assault. Initially, the researcher speculated that individuals who had experienced an attempted/completed sexual assault would place less blame on the victims, due to their ability to sympathize with the victims of the vignette. Despite this contradictory finding, an explanation may exist in that individuals who have experienced an attempted or completed past sexual assault may blame themselves for their own victimization. Thus, extending their self-blame to the vignette victims. The extant literature surrounding this proposition is sparse, but researchers have found that self-blame following a sexual assault has been correlated to perpetuating PTSD symptoms (Kline et al., 2018; Peter-Hagene & Ullman, 2018). This correlation could explain respondents with a past victimization "lashing out" or projecting their own blame onto other victims as a reaction to the trauma from their own victimization. Furthermore, by indirectly

46

blaming someone else they may be able to feel as if they are relating to someone like them, another victim.

Conclusion

The current study had several significant findings and is a valuable contribution to the growing field of research examining male sexual assault and male rape myth endorsement. This study suggests that individuals are more likely to place indirect blame rather than direct blame on male victims of sexual assault. Additionally, it also demonstrates that the endorsement of Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson's (1992) male rape myth subscale, that males are to blame for their own sexual assault, is associated with indirect victim blaming. Though the extant literature surrounding male sexual assault and rape myth endorsement is growing, the present findings illustrate a continuing need for further research on the issue. Furthermore, due to the unexpected finding that past attempted/completed sexual assault variable increased the odds of indirect blame in one instance (i.e., Mark had control of his situation), research surrounding respondent past victimization and male rape myth acceptance should be further explored.

Though the present study adds to the extant literature, limitations also existed and should be acknowledged. The convenience sampling method, though most accessible, is a limitation in itself. Moreover, the sample only consisted of students from one midsized, southern, four-year university, which may not be generalizable to smaller or larger colleges, as well as to the general population. Another limitation exists in the use of dichotomous dependent variables, ultimately narrowing the scope of what analyses could be estimated and did not allow for a more nuanced measure of degrees of victim blame. There is also the issue of social desirability bias. Respondents may have picked up on the goal of the questionnaire and answered questions in a

47

way that portrayed them in a more positive light rather than reporting their actual perceptions. As is the case with perception research, there is no way of knowing if what respondents indicated accurately reflects their true perceptions of male sexual assault victims. Future researchers might extend the current research employing larger samples, as well as sample diverse groups of people rather than just college students. It might also be useful to examine victims specifically as a target population to assess respondents' tendencies to self-blame and how that is associated with victim blaming attitudes in this context.

Despite these limitations, several policy implications may also be drawn from the current study. With the knowledge that indirect victim blaming may be more prevalent than direct blame, classes and society at large could focus on highlighting these behaviors to dispel myths that surround and perpetuate indirect forms of victim blaming. Concerning the unexpected results about past victimization and blame, implementing therapy that focuses on healing self-blame may yield successful results. Due to the findings that sex roles were significantly associated with increased odds of indirect blame, societal sex role expectations may also be important for policy implications due to the stigma that surrounds male victims of rape. This stigma may lead many male victims of sexual assault to feel like they cannot report, or if they do report that they will not be provided with resources to truly assist them. Implementing greater male sexual assault victim specific resources may help decrease the existing stigma and rape myth endorsing environment.

REFERENCES

Abrams, D., Viki, G. T., Masser, B., & Bohner, G. (2003). Perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape proclivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(1), 111-125. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.111

Allen, C. T., Ridgeway, R., & Swan, S. C. (2015). College students' beliefs regarding help seeking for male and female sexual assault survivors: Even less support for male survivors. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 24*(1), 102-115. doi:10.1080/10926771.2015.982237

Anderson, I., Beattie, G., & Spencer, C. (2001). Can blaming victims of rape be logical? Attribution theory and discourse analytic perspectives. *Human Relations, 54*(4), 445-467. doi:10.1177/0018726701544003

Anderson, I., & Lyons, A. (2005). The effect of victims' social support on attributions of blame in female and male rape. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35*(7), 1400-1417. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02176.x

Ayala, E. E., Kotary, B., & Hetz, M. (2018). Blame attributions of victims and perpetrators: Effects of victim gender, perpetrator gender, and relationship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33*(1), 94-116. doi:10.1177/0886260515599160

Bannon, R. S., Brosi, M. W., & Foubert, J. D. (2013). Sorority women's and fraternity men's rape myth acceptance and bystander intervention attitudes. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 50*(1), 72-87. doi:10.1515/jsarp-2013-0005

Bernard, P., Loughnan, S., Marchal, C., Godart, A., & Klein, O. (2015). The exonerating effect of sexual objectification: Sexual objectification decreases rapist blame in a stranger rape context. *Sex Roles, 72*(11), 499-508. doi:10.1007/s11199-015-0482-0

Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report. Atlanta, GA: *National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.*

Bleecker, E., & Murnen, S. (2005). Fraternity membership, the display of degrading sexual images of women, and rape myth acceptance. *Sex Roles, 53*(7), 487-493. doi:10.1007/s11199-005-7136-6

Blevins, C. E., & Stephens, R. S. (2016). The impact of motives-related feedback on drinking to cope among college students. *Addictive Behaviors, 58*(C), 68-73. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2016.02.024

Branch, K. A., Richards, T. N., & Dretsch, E. C. (2013). An exploratory analysis of college students' response and reporting behavior regarding intimate partner violence victimization and perpetration among their friends. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*(18), 3386-3399. doi:10.1177/0886260513504494

Buist, C., & Stone, C. (2014). Transgender victims and offenders: Failures of the United States criminal justice system and the necessity of queer criminology. *Critical Criminology, 22*(1), 35-47. doi:10.1007/s10612-013-9224-1

Bullock, C. M., & Beckson, M. (2011). Male victims of sexual assault: Phenomenology, psychology, physiology. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry the Law Online, 39*(2), 197-205.

Burgess, A. W. (2017). *Victimology: Theories and Applications* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning.

Burt, D. L., & Demello, L. R. (2002). Attribution of rape blame as a function of victim gender and sexuality, and perceived similarity to the victim. *Journal of homosexuality, 43*(2), 39.

Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(2), 217-230. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.38.2.217

Canan, S., Jozkowski, K., & Crawford, B. (2018). Sexual assault supportive attitudes: Rape myth acceptance and token resistance in Greek and non-Greek college students from two university samples in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33*(22), 3502-3530. doi:10.1177/0886260516636064

Chambliss, D., & Schutt, R. (2018). *Making sense of the social world: Methods of investigation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Chapleau, K. M., Oswald, D. L., & Russell, B. L. (2007). How ambivalent sexism toward women and men support rape myth acceptance. *Sex Roles, 57*(1-2), 131-136.

Chapleau, K. M., Oswald, D. L., & Russell, B. L. (2008). Male rape myths: The role of gender, violence, and sexism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23*(5), 600-615. doi:10.1177/0886260507313529

Cole, G. F., Smith, C. E., & Dejong, C. (2018). *Criminal Justice in America* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Cook, C. L., & Fox, K. A. (2011). Fear of property crime: examining the effects of victimization, vicarious victimization, and perceived risk. *Violence and victims, 26*(5), 684. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.26.5.684

Daigle, L. E. (2013). *Victimology: The essentials*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Davies, M., Gilston, J., & Rogers, P. (2012). Examining the relationship between male rape myth acceptance, female rape myth acceptance, victim blame, homophobia, gender roles, and ambivalent sexism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(14), 2807-2823. doi:10.1177/0886260512438281

Davies, M., & Hudson, J. (2011). Judgments toward male and transgendered victims in a depicted stranger rape. *Journal of homosexuality, 58*(2), 237-247. doi:10.1080/00918369.2011.540179

Davies, M., & McCartney, S. (2003). Effects of gender and sexuality on judgements of victim blame and rape myth acceptance in a depicted male rape. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 13*(5), 391-398. doi:10.1002/casp.741

Davies, M., Pollard, P., & Archer, J. (2006). Effects of perpetrator gender and victim sexuality on blame toward male victims of sexual assault. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 146*(3), 275-291. doi:10.3200/SOCP.146.3.275-291

Davies, M., & Rogers, P. (2006). Perceptions of male victims in depicted sexual assaults: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 11*(4), 367-377. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2006.01.002

Davies, M., Rogers, P., & Bates, J.-A. (2008). Blame toward male rape victims in a hypothetical sexual assault as a function of victim sexuality and degree of resistance. *Journal of homosexuality, 55*(3), 533-544. doi:10.1080/00918360802345339

Easteal, P., Holland, K., & Judd, K. (2015). Enduring themes and silences in media portrayals of violence against women. *Women's Studies International Forum, 48*(C), 103-113. doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2014.10.015

Emmers-Sommer, T., Pauley, P., Hanzal, A., & Triplett, L. (2006). Love, suspense, sex, and violence: Men's and women's film predilections, exposure to sexually violent media, and their relationship to rape myth acceptance. *Sex Roles, 55*(5), 311-320. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9085-0

Felson, R. B., & Palmore, C. (2018). Biases in blaming victims of rape and other crime. *Psychology of Violence, 8*(3), 390-399. doi:10.1037/vio0000168

Figueiredo, M. I., Fries, E., & Ingram, K. M. (2004). The role of disclosure patterns and unsupportive social interactions in the well-being of breast cancer patients. *Psycho-Oncology, 13*(2), 96-105. doi:10.1002/pon.717

Fisher, B., Daigle, L., Cullen, F., & Turner, M. (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. doi:10.1177/0093854802239161

Fisher, B. S., Daigle, L. E., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2003b). Acknowledging sexual victimization as rape: Results from a national-level study. *Justice Quarterly, 20*(3), 535-574. doi:10.1080/07418820300095611

Foley, L., Evancic, C., Karnik, K., King, J., & Parks, A. (1995). Date rape: "Effects of race of assailant and victim and gender of subjects on perceptions". *The Journal of Black Psychology, 21*(1), 6.

Franiuk, R., Seefelt, J., & Vandello, J. (2008). Prevalence of rape myths in headlines and their effects on attitudes toward rape. *Sex Roles, 58*(11), 790-801. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9372-4

Franiuk, R., Seefelt, J. L., Cepress, S. L., & Vandello, J. A. (2008). Prevalence and effects of rape myths in print journalism: The Kobe Bryant case. *Violence Against Women, 14*(3), 287-309. doi:10.1177/1077801207313971

George, W. H., & Martinez, L. J. (2002). Victim blaming in rape: Effects of victim and perpetrator race, type of rape, and participant racism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*(2), 110-119. doi:10.1111/1471-6402.00049

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 491-512. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491

Golding, J., Wilsnack, S., & Cooper, M. (2002). Sexual assault history and social upport: Six general population studies. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 15*(3), 187-197. doi:10.1023/A:1015247110020

Gravelin, C., Biernat, M., & Baldwin, M. (2019). The impact of power and powerlessness on blaming the victim of sexual assault. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 22*(1), 98. doi:10.1177/1368430217706741

Greeson, M. R., Campbell, R., & Fehler-Cabral, G. (2016). "Nobody deserves this": Adolescent sexual assault victims' perceptions of disbelief and victim blame from police. *Journal of Community Psychology, 44*(1), 90-110. doi:10.1002/jcop.21744

Grubb, A., & Turner, E. (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*(5), 443–452. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2012.06.002

Hayes, R., Lorenz, K., & Bell, K. (2013). Victim blaming others: Rape myth acceptance and the Just World Belief. *Feminist Criminology, 8*(3), 202. doi:10.1177/1557085113484788

Hayes, R. M., Abbott, R. L., & Cook, S. (2016). It's her fault: Student acceptance of rape myths on two college campuses. *Violence Against Women, 22*(13), 1540-1555. doi:10.1177/1077801216630147

Hockett, J. M., Saucier, D. A., & Badke, C. (2016). Rape myths, rape scripts, and common rape experiences of college women: Differences in perceptions of women who have been raped. *Violence Against Women, 22*(3), 307-323. doi:10.1177/1077801215599844

Howard, J. A. (1984a). The" normal" victim: The effects of gender stereotypes on reactions to victims. *Social psychology quarterly, 47*(3), 270-281. doi:10.2307/3033824

Howard, J. A. (1984b). Societal influences on attribution: Blaming some victims more than others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*(3), 494-505. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.47.3.494

Iles, I. A., Waks, L., Atwell Seate, A., Hundal, S., & Irions, A. (2018). The unintended consequences of rape disclosure: The effects of disclosure content, listener gender, and year in college on listener's reactions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 1-27. doi: 0886260518781799.

Janoff-Bulman, R. (1979). Characterological versus behavioral self-blame: Inquiries into depression and rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*(10), 1798-1809. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.37.10.1798

Johnson, B., Kuck, D., & Schander, P. (1997). Rape myth acceptance and sociodemographic characteristics: A multidimensional analysis. *Sex Roles, 36*(11), 693-707. doi:10.1023/A:1025671021697

Johnson, L. M., Mullick, R., & Mulford, C. L. (2002). General versus specific victim blaming. *Journal of Social Psychology, 142*(2), 249-263.

Kaplan, H. (2012). Belief in a just world, religiosity and victim blaming. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion, 34*(3), 397–409. doi:10.1163/15736121-12341246

Kassing, L., Beesley, D., & Frey, L. (2005). Gender role conflict, homophobia, age, and education as predictors of male rape myth acceptance. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 27*(4), 311-328. doi:10.17744/mehc.27.4.9wfm24f52kqgav37

Kassing, L. R., & Prieto, L. R. (2003). The rape myth and blame-based beliefs of counselors-in-training toward male victims of rape. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 81*(4), 455-461.

King, L. L., & Hanrahan, K. J. (2013). University student beliefs about sexual violence in prison: rape myth acceptance, punitiveness, and empathy. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 21*(2), 1-15. doi:10.1080/13552600.2013.820851

Kline, N. K., Berke, D. S., Rhodes, C. A., Steenkamp, M. M., & Litz, B. T. (2018). Self-blame and PTSD following sexual assault: a longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0886260518770652.

Lerner, M. J., & Miller, D. T. (1978). Just world research and the attribution process: Looking

back and ahead. *Psychological Bulletin, 85*(5), 1030-1051. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.85.5.1030

Lerner, M. J., & Simmons, C. (1966). Observer's reaction to the" innocent victim": Compassion or rejection? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4*(2), 203.

Lonsway, K., & Fitzgerald, L. (1994). Rape myths: In review. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18*, 133.

Lonsway, K., & Fitzgerald, L. (1995). Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: a theoretical and empirical reexamination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*(4), 704-711.

Lonsway, K., Welch, S., & Fitzgerald, L. (2001). Police training in sexual assault response: process, outcomes, and elements of change. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 28*(6), 695-730. doi:10.1177/009385480102800602

Lowe, M., & Rogers, P. (2017). The scope of male rape: A selective review of research, policy and practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 35*, 38-43. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2017.06.007

Meyer, S. (2016). Still blaming the victim of intimate partner violence? Women's narratives of victim desistance and redemption when seeking support. *Theoretical Criminology, 20*(1), 75-90. doi:10.1177/1362480615585399

Mitchell, D., Hirschman, R., & Nagayama Hall, G. (1999). Attributions of victim responsibility, pleasure, and trauma in male rape. *The Journal of Sex Research, 36*(4), 369-373.

Morgan, R. E., & Kena, G. (2018). Criminal Victimization, 2016: Revised. *Bureau of Justice Statistics*.

Murphey, K. (2017). The perpetuation of male rape myths in fantasy fiction: Anne Rice, Anne Bishop, and E.L. James. *Pennsylvania Literary Journal, 9*(3), 40-128.

Page, A. (2007). Behind the blue line: Investigating police officers' attitudes toward rape. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 22*(1), 22-32. doi:10.1007/s11896-007-9002-7

Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 33*(1), 27-68.

Perrott, S. B., & Webber, N. (1996). Attitudes toward male and female victims of sexual assault: Implications for services to the male victim. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 8*(4), 19-38.

Peter-Hagene, L. C., & Ullman, S. E. (2018). Longitudinal effects of sexual assault victims' drinking and self-blame on posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Interpersonal*

Violence, 33(1), 83-93.

Peterson, Z., & Muehlenhard, C. (2004). Was it rape? The function of women's rape myth acceptance and definitions of sex in labeling their own experiences. *Sex Roles, 51*(3), 129-144. doi:10.1023/B:SERS.0000037758.95376.00

Pino, N., & Meier, R. (1999). Gender differences in rape reporting. *Sex Roles, 40*(11), 979-990. doi:10.1023/A:1018837524712

Reling, T., Barton, M., Becker, S., & Valasik, M. (2018). Rape myths and hookup culture: An exploratory study of U.S. college students' perceptions. *Sex Roles, 78*(7), 501-514. doi:10.1007/s11199-017-0813-4

Russell, K. J., & Hand, C. J. (2017). Rape myth acceptance, victim blame attribution and Just World Beliefs: A rapid evidence assessment. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 37*, 153-160. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2017.10.008

Sarrel, P. M., & Masters, W. H. (1982). Sexual molestation of men by women. *Archives of sexual behavior, 11*(2), 117. doi:10.1007/BF01541979

Sleath, E., & Bull, R. (2010). Male rape victim and perpetrator blaming. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(6), 969-988. doi:10.1177/0886260509340534

Sleath, E., & Bull, R. (2012). Comparing rape victim and perpetrator blaming in a police officer sample: differences between police officers with and without special training. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 39*(5), 646-665. doi:10.1177/0093854811434696

Smith, R., Pine, C., & Hawley, M. (1988). Social cognitions about adult male victims of female sexual assault. *Journal of Sex Research, 24*, 101-112.

Sprankle, E., Bloomquist, K., Butcher, C., Gleason, N., & Schaefer, Z. (2018). The role of sex work stigma in victim blaming and empathy of sexual assault survivors. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 15*(3), 242-248. doi:10.1007/s13178-017-0282-0

Starzynski, L. L., Ullman, S. E., Filipas, H. H., & Townsend, S. M. (2005). Correlates of women's sexual assault disclosure to informal and formal support sources. *Violence and victims, 20*(4), 417.

Struckman-Johnson, C., & Struckman-Johnson, D. (1992). Acceptance of male rape myths among college men and women. *Sex Roles, 27*(3), 85-85. doi:10.1007/BF00290011

Stubbs-Richardson, M., Rader, N. E., & Cosby, A. G. (2018). Tweeting rape culture: Examining portrayals of victim blaming in discussions of sexual assault cases on Twitter. *Feminism & Psychology, 28*(1), 90-108. doi:10.1177/0959353517715874

Suarez, E., & Gadalla, T. M. (2010). Stop blaming the victim: A meta-analysis on rape myths. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(11), 2010-2035. doi:10.1177/0886260509354503

van Der Bruggen, M., & Grubb, A. (2014). A review of the literature relating to rape victim blaming: An analysis of the impact of observer and victim characteristics on attribution of blame in rape cases. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 19*(5), 523-531. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2014.07.008

Wakelin, A., & Long, K. (2003). Effects of victim gender and sexuality on attributions of blame to rape victims. *Sex Roles, 49*(9), 477-487. doi:10.1023/A:1025876522024

Walker, J., Archer, J., & Davies, M. (2005). Effects of rape on men: A descriptive analysis. *Archives of sexual behavior, 34*(1), 69-80. doi:10.1007/s10508-005-1001-0

Wasco, S. M. (2003). Conceptualizing the harm done by rape: Applications of trauma theory to experiences of sexual assault. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 4*(4), 309-322. doi:10.1177/1524838003256560

Whatley, M. A. (1996). Victim characteristics influencing attributions of responsibility to rape victims: A meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 1*(2), 81-95. doi:10.1016/1359-1789(95)00011-9

Whatley, M. A. (2005). The effect of participant sex, victim dress, and traditional attitudes on causal judgments for marital rape victims. *Journal of Family Violence, 20*(3), 191-200.

Whatley, M. A., & Riggio, R. E. (1993). Gender differences in attributions of blame for male rape victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 8*(4), 502-511. doi:10.1177/088626093008004005

White, S., & Yamawaki, N. (2009). The moderating influence of homophobia and gender-role traditionality on perceptions of male rape victims. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(5), 1116-1136. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00474.x

APPENDIX A

VIGNETTE 1: JUSTIN AND VICTORIA

Instructions: *Read the following scenario then answer each of the statements to indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement using the scale provided.*

Justin, a junior in college, attended a party on Thursday night where he ran into a classmate named Victoria. They had taken several classes together, but had never really spent time together outside of the classroom. They talked some throughout the evening. Victoria noticed that Justin had drunk quite a bit of alcohol, so she offered him a ride home. She had always been attracted to Justin and thought it would also give her the opportunity to talk with him some more.

Justin accepted Victoria's offer to drive him home. When they got to Justin's house, Victoria walked him to his door and tried to give him a kiss goodnight. Justin indicated that he did not want to kiss Victoria, but told her she was more than welcome to come in and hang out. Victoria accepted, so she and Justin had a few more drinks and watched some TV on his couch before Justin passed out. After being passed out for about 20 minutes, Justin woke up to Victoria performing oral sex on him. Justin indicated that he was uncomfortable and told her to stop. Victoria responded by asking, "What, you don't like it? Are you gay?" Victoria continued to engage in oral sex with Justin, despite his request to stop.

Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements by circling the number that best represents your opinion.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
V22. Justin had control over the events that occurred in this scenario.	1	2	3	4
V23. Justin's behavior contributed to what happened at the end of the scenario.	1	2	3	4
V24. Justin was to blame for the event that occurred at the end of the scenario.	1	2	3	4
V25. Overall, Justin was most responsible for the event that occurred at the end of the scenario.	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX B

VIGNETTE 2: MARK AND ROB

Instructions: *Read the following scenario then answer each of the statements to indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement using the scale provided.*

   Mark, a freshman in college, and Rob, a senior in college, first met when Mark started training for the soccer team during the summer before his first, fall semester. Rob is and the captain of the soccer team and had pursued Mark fairly aggressively asking Mark repeatedly to "give him a chance and let him take him out for a good time." Mark finally agreed to go on a first date with Rob at a fun, local nightclub. Mark felt it was the least he could do as Rob had been very nice to him by helping him improve his grades so that he wouldn't be kicked off of the team.

   At the club, Rob bought Mark two drinks and the two danced for about an hour. It was getting pretty late and the two had soccer practice the next day, so Rob asked Mark if he was ready to go home. Once they got to Rob's car, Rob asked Mark if he wanted to get in the back seat and make out. Mark was afraid that someone would see, but said "sure" anyway. The two began kissing, touching, and stroking each other. Mark told Rob he was enjoying making out with him, but was ready to go home. Rob said ok, but then began to initiate sex. Mark repeated that he was ready to go home and for Rob to stop. Rob then held Mark down as he penetrated him.

Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements by circling the number that best represents your opinion.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
V26. Mark had control over the events that occurred in this scenario.	1	2	3	4
V27. Mark's behavior contributed to what happened at the end of the scenario.	1	2	3	4
V28. Mark was to blame for the event that occurred at the end of the scenario.	1	2	3	4
V29. Overall, Mark was most responsible for the event that occurred at the end of the scenario.	1	2	3	4
V30. Mark was obligated to engage in sexual activity with Rob.	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX C

VIGNETTE 3: STEPHEN AND FRATERNITY

Instructions: *Read the following scenario then answer each of the statements to indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement using the scale provided.*

Stephen is a freshman and decided he wanted to join a fraternity during his first semester. He is very excited about being involved with the fraternity because his older brother was involved in Greek life while in college and had told Stephen about all of his great experiences in the fraternity. The rush process was a bit intense, but Stephen felt it was all worth it. At the final big party of the semester, the fraternity brothers extend "bids" (offers to join the fraternity) to the individuals they want to join the fraternity.

Stephen attended the final party with a couple of other guys who were rushing the fraternity. As they entered the party, they were escorted to the basement by several of the head fraternity brothers. In the basement, everyone was drinking and talking loudly. Stephen guessed that his is where they would be offered their bids. Stephen had been in the basement for about 15 minutes and had drunk a couple of beers when one of the active fraternity members announced that the rushes would perform one last initiation before receiving their bids. Immediately, two of the fraternity members grabbed Stephen, put a funnel in his mouth and began to pour Vodka down the funnel. Stephen managed to spit out the funnel and yelled that he wanted this to stop. Upon hearing his protest, another fraternity brother came behind Stephen and pulled down Stephen's pants. The fraternity member then shoved the handle of a fraternity paddle into Stephen's rectum while yelling, "This is what happens when you don't follow orders."
Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements by circling the number that best represents your opinion.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
V31. Stephen had control over the events that occurred in this scenario.	1	2	3	4
V32. Stephen's behavior contributed to what happened at the end of the scenario.	1	2	3	4
V33. Stephen was to blame for the event that occurred at the end of the scenario.	1	2	3	4
V34. Overall, Stephen was most responsible for the event that occurred at the end of the scenario.	1	2	3	4
V35. Stephen was obligated to allow his fraternity brother to do this to him in order to prove his dedication to the fraternity.	1	2	3	4

VITA

      Katelyn Hancock was born in Cookeville, Tennessee in 1995. Biologically, she is an only child. She stayed in the same school system her entire life, graduating from Upperman High School in Baxter, Tennessee in 2013. After graduation, she enrolled at Tennessee Technological University with a major in Psychology. She worked three jobs, overcame personal hurdles, and managed to graduate in May of 2017, on time, and with a 4.0 GPA. She was awarded a Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology along with the W.A. Howard Award for a perfect 4.0 undergraduate GPA. She completed an undergraduate thesis focused on first-generation and continuing-generation college students' sense of community levels. This was a rewarding endeavor due to being a first-generation college student herself. Katelyn then decided to pursue a Master of Science in Criminal Justice degree at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga in August of 2017. She was awarded a graduate assistantship that has changed her life. She wishes to continue to strive for success, gain further opportunities, and never lose her desire to learn. Katelyn plans to continue her education by entering a PhD program within the field of Criminology and Criminal Justice.