

**EXAMINING THE BLAMING OF RAPE VICTIMS AND PERPETRATORS:
RAPE MYTHS, BELIEF IN A JUST WORLD, GENDER ROLE BELIEFS,
AND APPLIED FINDINGS.**

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Leicester

by

Emma Sleath

School of Psychology

University of Leicester

2011

EXAMINING THE BLAMING OF RAPE VICTIMS AND PERPETRATORS: RAPE MYTHS, BELIEF IN A JUST WORLD, GENDER ROLE BELIEFS, AND APPLIED FINDINGS.

Interest in research on victim blaming has remained significant since it came to the fore in the 1970s. Victim blaming, of both male and female victims of rape, is central to this thesis in understanding the contribution to this of a number of motivational beliefs and stereotypes (i.e., rape myth acceptance, belief in a just world, and gender role traits/beliefs). As well as this, this thesis develops some understanding of rape perpetrator blaming, broadening the focus of research away from the victim. Most of all, this thesis seeks to increase the understanding of police attitudes concerning rape victims and the influence of specialist police training and experience in dealing with rape victims. In a series of studies, vignette scenarios were given to 558 students, 101 non-students, and 157 police officers to assess their blaming attitudes towards the rape victim (male and/or female) and perpetrator (male). These studies found a lack of consistent gender effects in blaming but a strong consistent relationship between rape myth acceptance and victim blaming. Belief in a just world and gender role traits/beliefs demonstrated little effect on rape victim and perpetrator blaming. In the police officers sample, job experience and receiving specialist training to deal with rape victims did not affect the levels of blaming engaged in. This thesis has important implications for policy and criminal justice systems and the findings are discussed in the context of these.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Ray Bull, for his support and advice provided throughout this thesis, as well as Dr. Cara Laney and Dr. Lorraine Sheridan (who acted as second supervisors during my PhD).

I would also like to thank Lisa Smith, Dr. Sue Harrington, and Dr. Claire Bloxsom for their continued belief that I would finish this PhD and the support that they provided through the highs and especially the lows of completing this thesis.

To my parents and brother, I thank them for their unending support in everything that I do in this life. Inheriting my Dad's never ending thirst for knowledge and my Mum's endless optimism guided me through this thesis. My family's quiet support is never something that I undervalue.

Finally, for Viren, I thank him for supporting me throughout this process. His belief that I would finish this PhD has kept me going. Through the good and the bad, he has stood by my side.

Contents

LIST OF TABLES	VIII
1 RAPE AND BLAMING	1
1.1 DEFINITION OF BLAME	2
1.2 FEMALE VICTIMS OF RAPE.....	4
1.2.1 <i>Characteristics of female rape.</i>	4
1.2.2 <i>Experimental research.</i>	5
1.2.3 <i>Summary.</i>	11
1.3 MALE VICTIMS OF RAPE	11
1.3.1 <i>Characteristics of male rape.</i>	12
1.3.2 <i>Experimental research.</i>	15
1.3.3 <i>Summary.</i>	19
1.4 PERPETRATOR BLAMING	19
1.5 SUMMARY OF RAPE AND BLAMING	21
2 RAPE MYTHS AND STEREOTYPES.....	22
2.1 FEMALE RAPE MYTHS AND STEREOTYPES	24
2.1.1 <i>Alcohol use.</i>	29
2.1.2 <i>Victim clothing.</i>	30
2.2 MALE RAPE MYTHS AND STEREOTYPES.....	30
2.2.1 <i>Association with homosexuality.</i>	31
2.2.2 <i>Masculinity.</i>	32
2.2.3 <i>Invulnerability to rape.</i>	33
2.2.4 <i>Coping.</i>	33
2.2.5 <i>Hierarchy of suffering.</i>	33
2.2.6 <i>Enjoyment of sex.</i>	34
2.3 SUMMARY OF RAPE MYTHS AND STEREOTYPES	34
3 BELIEF IN A JUST WORLD.....	37
3.1 FUNCTIONS OF BELIEF IN A JUST WORLD.....	37
3.2 THREATS TO A BELIEF IN A JUST WORLD.....	38
3.2.1 <i>Victims.</i>	38
3.2.2 <i>Perpetrators.</i>	43
3.2.3 <i>Summary.</i>	44
4 GENDER ROLE TRAITS AND TRADITIONAL GENDER ROLE BELIEFS	45
4.1 ASSOCIATION WITH VICTIM BLAMING.....	48
4.1.1 <i>Experimental research.</i>	50
4.2 ASSOCIATION WITH RAPE PERPETRATOR BLAMING	54
4.2.1 <i>Summary.</i>	55
5 RAPE AND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM	57
5.1 RESEARCH INVOLVING RAPE VICTIMS	57
5.2 ATTRITION WITHIN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM	61
5.3 RESEARCH WITHIN THE POLICE	65
5.4 RESEARCH WITHIN THE LEGAL SYSTEM	75
5.5 SUMMARY	81
6 METHODOLOGICAL REVIEW.....	83
6.1 MEASURES.....	83
6.1.1 <i>Victim and perpetrator blaming.</i>	83
6.1.2 <i>Rape myth acceptance.</i>	86
6.1.3 <i>Belief in a just world.</i>	90
6.1.4 <i>Gender role traits and gender role beliefs.</i>	92
6.2 VIGNETTE METHODOLOGY	97

6.3	ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE VS. TRADITIONAL PAPER BASED SURVEYS	98
7	RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY	100
7.1	RESEARCH QUESTIONS	100
7.2	METHODOLOGY	106
7.2.1	<i>Design.....</i>	<i>106</i>
7.2.2	<i>Materials.</i>	<i>107</i>
7.2.3	<i>Participants.</i>	<i>117</i>
7.2.4	<i>Procedure.</i>	<i>121</i>
7.2.5	<i>Data analyses.</i>	<i>123</i>
8	STUDY ONE: VICTIM BLAMING: THE EFFECT OF BELIEF IN A JUST WORLD, RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE, AND GENDER ROLE TRAITS.	129
8.1	ABSTRACT	129
8.2	INTRODUCTION	129
8.3	METHOD 132	
8.3.1	<i>Design.....</i>	<i>132</i>
8.3.2	<i>Participants.</i>	<i>133</i>
8.3.3	<i>Materials.</i>	<i>133</i>
8.3.4	<i>Procedure.</i>	<i>133</i>
8.4	RESULTS 133	
8.4.1	<i>Level of acceptance of rape myths.</i>	<i>134</i>
8.4.2	<i>Analysis of victim blaming scale.</i>	<i>136</i>
8.4.3	<i>Gender differences and type of rape.</i>	<i>140</i>
8.4.4	<i>Relationship between victim blaming and (i) female rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world.</i>	<i>141</i>
8.4.5	<i>Relationship between victim blaming and subfactors of female rape myth acceptance.</i>	<i>141</i>
8.4.6	<i>Examining the influence of gender role traits on victim blaming.</i>	<i>142</i>
8.5	DISCUSSION	143
9	STUDY TWO: VICTIM BLAMING AMONGST A LAW STUDENT SAMPLE.....	147
9.1	ABSTRACT	147
9.2	INTRODUCTION	147
9.3	METHOD 151	
9.3.1	<i>Design.....</i>	<i>151</i>
9.3.2	<i>Participants.</i>	<i>152</i>
9.3.3	<i>Materials.</i>	<i>152</i>
9.3.4	<i>Procedure.</i>	<i>152</i>
9.4	RESULTS 152	
9.4.1	<i>Level of acceptance of rape myths.</i>	<i>153</i>
9.4.2	<i>Gender differences and the influence of type of rape and level of rape myths.</i>	<i>155</i>
9.4.3	<i>Relationship between victim blaming and (i) female rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world.</i>	<i>156</i>
9.4.4	<i>Relationship between victim blaming and subfactors of female rape myth acceptance.</i>	<i>157</i>
9.4.5	<i>Examining the influence of gender role traits on victim blaming and rape myth acceptance.</i>	<i>157</i>
9.5	DISCUSSION	158
10	STUDY THREE: EXAMINING THE ROLE OF EXPERIENCE AND SPECIALIST RAPE TRAINING AMONGST POLICE OFFICERS	163
10.1	ABSTRACT	163
10.2	INTRODUCTION	163
10.3	METHOD 168	
10.3.1	<i>Design.....</i>	<i>168</i>
10.3.2	<i>Participants.</i>	<i>168</i>
10.3.3	<i>Materials.</i>	<i>169</i>
10.3.4	<i>Procedure.</i>	<i>169</i>

10.4	RESULTS	169
10.4.1	Level of acceptance of rape myths.	170
10.4.2	Analysis of rape victim and perpetrator blaming scale.	172
10.4.3	The influence of gender, type of rape, and level of rape myths on victim and perpetrator blaming.	177
10.4.4	Relationship between victim blaming and (i) female rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world.	179
10.4.5	Relationship between victim blaming and subfactors of female rape myth acceptance.	180
10.4.6	Relationship between perpetrator blaming and (i) female rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world.	181
10.4.7	Examining the influence of gender role traits on victim and perpetrator blaming.	181
10.4.8	Relationship between victim and perpetrator blaming and (i) years of service as a police officer and (ii) months in a specialist role.	182
10.4.9	The influence of specialist training on (i) victim blaming and (ii) perpetrator blaming.	183
10.5	DISCUSSION	185
11	STUDY FOUR: MALE RAPE VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR BLAMING	191
11.1	ABSTRACT	191
11.2	INTRODUCTION	191
11.3	METHOD	197
11.3.1	Design.	198
11.3.2	Participants.	198
11.3.3	Materials.	198
11.4	RESULTS	199
11.4.1	Acceptance of Male Rape Myths.	199
11.4.2	Analysis of victim and perpetrator blaming scale.	201
11.4.3	The influence of gender, type of rape, and level of rape myths on victim and perpetrator blaming.	204
11.4.4	Relationship between victim blaming and (i) female rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world.	206
11.4.5	Relationship between perpetrator blaming and (i) female rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world.	207
11.5	DISCUSSION	208
12	STUDY FIVE: DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW MEASURE OF ACCEPTANCE OF MALE RAPE MYTHS	212
12.1	ABSTRACT	212
12.2	INTRODUCTION	212
12.3	METHOD	215
12.3.1	Design.	215
12.3.2	Participants.	215
12.3.3	Materials.	215
12.3.4	Procedure.	216
12.4	RESULTS	216
12.4.1	Analysis of the male rape myth items.	216
12.5	DISCUSSION	225
13	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	227
13.1	STUDY ONE	227
13.1.1	Hypotheses.	227
13.1.2	Findings.	227
13.2	STUDY TWO	228
13.2.1	Hypotheses.	228
13.2.2	Findings.	228
13.3	STUDY THREE	229
13.3.1	Hypotheses.	229

13.3.2	<i>Findings.</i>	229
13.4	STUDY FOUR	231
13.4.1	<i>Hypotheses.</i>	231
13.4.2	<i>Findings.</i>	232
13.5	STUDY FIVE	232
13.5.1	<i>Hypotheses.</i>	232
13.5.2	<i>Findings.</i>	232
14	DISCUSSION	234
14.1	SECTION ONE: THE FINDINGS AND PREVIOUS RESEARCH	234
14.1.1	<i>Gender differences in blaming and rape myth acceptance.</i>	234
14.1.2	<i>Differences in type of rape perception.</i>	237
14.1.3	<i>Rape myths and stereotypes.</i>	239
14.1.4	<i>Belief in a just world.</i>	243
14.1.5	<i>Gender role traits and gender role beliefs.</i>	245
14.1.6	<i>Measurements of blaming and rape myth acceptance.</i>	248
14.1.7	<i>Victim blaming within the criminal justice system.</i>	251
14.2	STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE NEW RESEARCH STUDIES PRESENTED IN THIS THESIS	255
14.2.1	<i>Strengths.</i>	255
14.2.2	<i>Limitations.</i>	258
14.3	THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS	261
14.3.1	<i>Gender differences in victim blaming and rape myth acceptance.</i>	262
14.3.2	<i>Rape myths and stereotypes.</i>	264
14.3.3	<i>Type of rape.</i>	265
14.3.4	<i>Belief in a just world.</i>	266
14.3.5	<i>Gender role traits and gender role beliefs.</i>	267
14.4	PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS	269
14.5	FUTURE DIRECTIONS	273
15	CONCLUSION	276
16	REFERENCES	278
17	APPENDICES	326
17.1	APPENDIX A: VIGNETTES	326
17.2	APPENDIX B: ETHICAL APPROVAL	329
17.2.1	<i>Ethical approval for studies one and two.</i>	329
17.2.2	<i>Ethical approval for study three.</i>	330
17.2.3	<i>Ethical approval for study four.</i>	332
17.2.4	<i>Ethical approval for study five.</i>	333
17.3	APPENDIX C: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF TRANSFORMED VICTIM BLAMING SCALE FOR STUDY ONE	337
17.4	APPENDIX D: PRINCIPLE COMPONENT ANALYSIS USING TRANSFORMED AND UNTRANSFORMED DATA FROM THE VICTIM BLAMING SCALE FOR STUDY ONE	338
17.4.1	<i>Untransformed data.</i>	338
17.4.2	<i>Transformed data.</i>	339
17.5	APPENDIX E: PRINCIPLE COMPONENT ANALYSIS FOR VICTIM BLAMING SCALE USING DIRECT OBLIMIN ROTATION	341
17.6	APPENDIX F: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF TRANSFORMED VICTIM BLAMING AND PERPETRATOR BLAMING SCALE FOR STUDY THREE	343
17.7	APPENDIX G: PRINCIPLE COMPONENT ANALYSIS USING TRANSFORMED AND UNTRANSFORMED DATA FROM THE VICTIM BLAMING AND PERPETRATOR BLAMING SCALE FOR STUDY THREE	345
17.7.1	<i>Untransformed data.</i>	345
17.8	APPENDIX H: PRINCIPLE COMPONENT ANALYSIS FOR VICTIM BLAMING SCALE USING DIRECT OBLIMIN ROTATION	349
17.9	APPENDIX I: PRINCIPLE COMPONENT ANALYSIS FOR MALE RAPE MYTH SCALE USING DIRECT OBLIMIN ROTATION	352
17.10	APPENDIX J: COPY OF PAPER PUBLISHED OF STUDY FOUR	356

List of Tables

Table 1:	Summary of Just World Scale Measures (adapted from Furnham, 2003)
Table 2:	Summary of Gender Role/Beliefs about Gender Role Measures
Table 3:	Summary of Normality Testing
Table 4:	Descriptive Statistics of Victim Blaming, Rape Myth Acceptance, and Belief in a Just World.
Table 5:	Percentage of Participants (separated by gender) who indicated a Level of Acceptance to the Female Rape Myth
Table 6:	Descriptive Statistics of Victim Blaming Scale
Table 7:	Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Victim Blaming Scale
Table 8:	Correlations of Victim blaming Items and Total Victim blaming
Table 9:	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Victim blaming
Table 10:	Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Subfactors of Female Rape Myth Acceptance Predicting Victim blaming
Table 11:	Descriptive Statistics of Victim Blaming, Rape Myth Acceptance, and Belief in a Just World
Table 12:	Percentage of Participants (separated by gender) who indicated a Level of Acceptance to the Female Rape Myth
Table 13:	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Victim blaming
Table 14:	Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Subfactors of Female Rape Myth Acceptance Predicting Victim blaming
Table 15:	Descriptive Statistics of Victim Blaming, Perpetrator Blaming, Rape Myth Acceptance, and Belief in a Just World
Table 16:	Percentage of Participants (separated by gender) who indicated a Level of Acceptance to the Female Rape Myth
Table 17:	Descriptive Statistics of Victim and Perpetrator Blaming Scale
Table 18:	Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Victim and Perpetrator Blaming Scale
Table 19:	Correlations of Victim blaming Items and Total Victim blaming and Perpetrator Blaming Items and Total Perpetrator Blaming
Table 20:	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Victim blaming

Table 21:	Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Subfactors of Female Rape Myth Acceptance Predicting Victim blaming
Table 22:	Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Femininity, Personal Masculinity, and Social Masculinity Predicting Rape Perpetrator Blaming
Table 23:	Cell sizes for the victim blaming analysis of specialist police training
Table 24	Descriptive Statistics for Victim Blaming, Perpetrator Blaming, Belief in a Just World, Male Rape Myths, and Sex Role Egalitarianism
Table 25:	Percentage of Participants (separated by gender) who indicated a Level of Acceptance to the Male Rape Myth Items
Table 26:	Descriptive Statistics of Male Rape Victim and Perpetrator Blaming Scale
Table 27:	Principle Component Analysis of Victim and Perpetrator Blaming Scale
Table 28:	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Victim blaming
Table 29:	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Rape Perpetrator Blaming
Table 30:	Descriptive Statistics of Male Rape Myth Scale
Table 31:	Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Male Rape Myth Scale Items
Table 32	Follow-up Analysis of Male Rape Myth Scale Items
Table 33	Correlations between Sub-factors of the Male Rape Myth Scale and the IRMAS

1 Rape and Blaming

The examination of the process of blaming in rape is particularly concerned with trying to understand why and how this assessment is attributed towards a victim and a perpetrator of rape (Pollard, 1992). Understanding this phenomenon and what may cause it, is particularly important for two main reasons. Firstly, victim self blame has been shown to increase when a victim encounters unsupportive and negative responses from others (Anderson, 1999). Therefore, research can give some indication of society's perception of rape and how the general population may react to both victims and perpetrators of this crime (Davies, 2002). This may be important for education so that rape victims do not encounter such negative attitudes. Secondly, it is possible that rape victims may encounter such negative attitudes even from the people whom they turn to for support (Sheldon & Parent, 2002). This includes personnel from the police and legal system and could be particularly problematic given their public protection role (Filipas & Ullman, 2001). Dissemination of such findings could therefore guide improvements for rape victims within the criminal justice system. The section below will review what we know about rape perception and blaming in the context of female (male perpetrator-female victim) and male (male perpetrator-male victim) rape. Male victims of female sexual aggression will not be discussed as this thesis has focussed upon attitudes towards victims of rape according to the criminal definition for rape within England and Wales. The Sexual Offences Act (2003) defines the physical act of rape as the penetration of the vagina, anus, or mouth by a penis which negates the ability of females to commit rape.

Much of the prior rape research has focussed on beliefs and perceptions of rape victims, and in comparison little research has been directed towards the perpetrators of rape (Viki, Abrams, & Masser, 2004). Focussing on the victims of rape, Viki et al. (2004) suggests that we are neglecting the importance of the role of the perpetrator, particularly since it is the perpetrator that jurors/courts must ultimately judge when the situation relates to the criminal justice environment. The limited research regarding perpetrators has been interested in understanding how blame and responsibility is apportioned between the victim and perpetrator. For example, if some aspect of the rape incident (e.g., victim attire) increases the level of blame attributed towards the victim, does this subsequently lessen the blame attributed towards the perpetrator? Following on from the sections examining victim blaming, the literature discussing perpetrator blaming will be reviewed. However, this section will begin first with gaining an understanding of how blame can be defined.

1.1 Definition of blame

It is important to begin this thesis with an outline of the definition of blame used for this thesis. In constructing a theory of the attribution of blame, Shaver (1985) argues that there are three fundamental questions which must be addressed. These are: 'what is the cause of this event or action?', 'is anyone responsible for its occurrence?' And 'who is to blame for this event?' Therefore, Shaver suggests that the assignment of blame is a social process which explicitly must include a human action. The start of this process is the occurrence of an event which can be perceived to have a negative outcome.

Following this, the blameworthiness of the individual is assessed through judgements of

causality, personal responsibility, and mitigation. Shaver considered responsibility to be one element of blame in the particular circumstances of evil intent (the individual voluntarily causes the harmful outcome) and the absence of a satisfactory excuse (a person may be considered responsible for a negative event occurring but not blamed because they have a satisfactory excuse for their behaviour). This develops a pathway to blaming through which once an individual has been assessed to be responsible, they are then attributed blame (Shaver). This separates out the concepts of responsibility and blame in a theoretical sense. However, in practice, within much of the research literature the concept of blame is often not thoroughly outlined (e.g., Frese, Moya, & Megias, 2004) or these two concepts have been integrated. For example, Bell, Kuriloff, and Lottes (1994) provide a definition of blaming as the process of the rape victim being assessed (at some level) as precipitating or being responsible for being raped. As noted from this definition, the concept of responsibility is integrated into the definition of blame. This association in the literature is further underlined by the frequency of items which assess the responsibility of the victim or perpetrator in an overall measure of blame (see chapter 6). It is clear that the dominant approach within the research literature has been to integrate these two concepts. Therefore, this thesis will consider responsibility as a related concept to blame and as such will use Bell et al.'s definition of blame to underpin the thesis. This decision is also based in the research cited by Shaver that demonstrates that the language utilised by attribution theorists does not always correspond closely to the language of lay persons within the community.

Additional terms have been used within the thesis to assess the concept of blame. These mimic those considered by Shaver (1985) as responsibility-related words. Shaver listed 18 terms which were: at fault, blameworthy, caused, coerced, controllable, culpable, foreseeable, guilty, intended, legally accountable, legally responsible, liable, morally accountable, morally responsible, obligated, punishable, responsible, and voluntary. A number of these terms are frequently used within the current published literature to assess a measure of blame being attributed towards a victim of rape (see chapter six). Therefore, the adoption of these terms to measure blame in this thesis was informed by the prior research literature (see chapter six) as well as the theoretical underpinnings of blame (Shaver).

1.2 Female Victims of Rape

This section will initially discuss what we know about real rape cases. This should then highlight some of the differences demonstrated in people's stereotypical perceptions of female rape which may lead to increased blaming.

1.2.1 Characteristics of female rape.

1.2.1.1 Stranger and acquaintance rape.

In discussing the occurrence of stranger and acquaintance rape, a stranger rape is defined by the below papers as the victim being a complete stranger to the perpetrator. Where the victim knew the perpetrator even for a brief period, this is categorised under an acquaintance rape heading (see Harris & Grace, 1999 for these designations in more detail). Feist, Ashe, Lawrence, McPhee, and Wilson (2007) carried out one of the most

recent analyses of female rape within England and Wales based on reported rapes in 2003/4. These data demonstrated that only 14% of all reported rapes were stranger rapes. The remainder of the rapes were carried out by someone known to the victim and included family members, ex-partners, friends, and acquaintances. This figure for stranger rapes was also very similar to that reported by Harris and Grace (1999) who also analysed a sample of reported rapes within England and Wales. They found that 12% of their cases were designated as stranger rapes. Such statistics strongly suggest that rape is most often carried out by acquaintances to the victim but it must be noted that these analyses are taken from reported rape statistics and thus may not be representative of the full occurrence of rape (see section 5.1). However, the common perception or stereotype of rape seems to suggest that people believe that a woman is most likely to be attacked by a stranger (Golge, Yavuz, Mudderrisoglu, & Yavuz, 2003).

1.2.1.2 Incidence of female rape.

Myhill and Allen (2002) found that 4.9% of the women, surveyed in their sample drawn from England and Wales, reported being raped since the age of 16. A later analysis of British Crime Survey data demonstrated that 7% of the females surveyed reported that they had suffered sexual assault or rape during their lifetime (Office for Criminal Justice Reform, 2006). These statistics show some similarity with the reported levels of incidence of male rape (see section 1.2.1.4 for a more in-depth discussion of the incidence of male rape).

1.2.2 Experimental research.

The influence of gender of participants has been extensively studied to understand differences in the perception of rape by males and females (Anderson, Cooper, & Okamura, 1997). A number of studies have shown that men blame female rape victims more than women do (e.g., Bell et al., 1994; Hillier & Foddy, 1993; Krahe, Temkin, & Bieneck, 2007; Pollard, 1992) and that men generally hold more accepting attitudes towards rape than women do (Anderson et al.). Indeed, Anderson et al. found that participant gender was a far stronger predictor of attitude towards rape than age, ethnic group, and socio-economic status. However, there have been some studies which have not demonstrated any gender effects (e.g., Brems & Wagner, 1994; Frese et al., 2004; Janoff-Bulman & Timko, 1985; Newcomb, van den Eynde, Hafner, & Jolly, 2008; Viki & Abrams, 2002). Gerber, Cronin, and Steigman (2004) found that male participants did not blame the victim more than female participants, though these authors did suggest that the violence depicted in the scenarios may have negated this effect. Cowan and Curtis (1994) found that the gender differences demonstrated in their study on victim blaming, disappeared when combined with other background and attitudinal variables, suggesting that it may not solely be gender that accounts for such effects. This is a viewpoint echoed by Grubb and Harrower (2008), who also note that gender differences in the attribution of blame are not always consistent and that traditional gender/sex role attitudes may be mitigating them, as opposed to gender alone.

Explanations for a gender effect regarding female rape victims have centred on additional factors such as sexist attitudes towards women (Abrams, Viki, Masser, &

Bohner, 2003) and also a difference in the ability of men and women to adopt the perspective of the female rape victim (Allison & Wrightsman, 1993). This may be because female participants are more able to empathise with the female victim compared to males (Mitchell, Hirschman, & Hall, 1999). Anderson, Simpson-Taylor, and Herman (2004) also believe that males are socialised to endorse what these researchers label as rape supportive rules (i.e., rules which allow behaviour that involves the coercion of a female into sexual intercourse). These rape supportive rules are similar to rape myths or stereotypes (discussed later in this review) and include factors such as the dress of the victim, assumed sexual experience of the victim, and level of resistance encountered. Through these rules, rape is legitimised to allow men to force women into sexual intercourse if they perceive the female to have broken these rules.

Some research has examined characterological (blame attributed to the character of the victim) and behavioural blame (blame attributed to the behaviour of the victim)(e.g., Howard, 1984a). Janoff-Bulman and Timko (1985) manipulated a vignette scenario so that the event ended in either the victim being taken home or the victim being raped. This study found that participants in the rape outcome condition engaged in more behavioural blame than participants in the take home condition though no differences were found for characterological blame. Also, those participants who were in the rape outcome condition engaged in more behavioural blame than characterological blame, whereas participants in the take home condition did not differ in their blaming types. Howard found that more characterological blame was attributed towards the female

victim whereas the male victim was attributed more behavioural blame. However, the main focus within the rape perception research field has been to adopt a general measure of blame attributed towards the victim which will also be the approach of this thesis (e.g., Abrams et al., 2003; Bell et al., 1994; Frese et al., 2004).

Another common aspect of rape perception research has established that acquaintance rape and stranger rape can be perceived very differently. Acquaintance rape is defined as where the victim has a prior acquaintance with the perpetrator of the rape and can include date and marital rape (Bell et al., 1994). (Stranger rape differs in that there is no acquaintance between the victim and perpetrator.) Observers have been found to attribute a higher level of blame to a date rape victim than a stranger rape victim (e.g., Golge et al., 2003). Some studies have found an interaction between the gender of the participant and the type of rape presented within the study (e.g., Tretreault & Barnett, 1987). Pollard (1992) suggested that there was a broad effect of male participants being less sympathetic towards victims of non-stranger rape compared with female participants. However, this effect was found to vary according to the type of acquaintance rape being depicted. Pollard found that, although differences were demonstrated in the levels of responsibility being attributed towards the victims across gender and type of rape conditions, these differences were not large enough to produce a significant interaction. Findings by Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, and Binderup (2000) supported this point in that they found that the perceived seriousness of the sexual assault decreased in a linear fashion as the level of prior acquaintance between the victim

and perpetrator increased. The interaction between gender and type of rape was such that female participants blamed the victims in the late dating and marital conditions more than the victims in the stranger or early dating conditions. In comparison, male participants' blaming levels were lowest for the stranger and late dating conditions but were significantly higher for the early dating conditions and highest in the marital condition. Also examined in this study was the influence of a prior sexual relationship (for acquaintance rape). Participants who were told that the victim and perpetrator had previously had consensual sexual intercourse also made more rape supportive and sex role stereotypical attributions about the rape. Other studies have demonstrated a lack of effect between type of rape and gender of participant suggesting that this is an inconsistent effect (e.g., Bell et al., 1994; Frese et al., 2004; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Krahe et al., 2007; Simonson & Subich, 1999). Further, Pollard (1992) noted that research studies that have looked at a minor level of acquaintance prior to the rape have produced some inconsistent findings, though the differences are clearer when the victim and perpetrator have previously dated (see also Grubb & Harrower, 2008). Kormos and Brooks (1994) found no victim blaming differences in their college student sample where they manipulated the level of acquaintance.

These research findings are particularly problematic given that, contrary to popular belief, the majority of rape is not committed by strangers, but rather by acquaintances and other trusted persons (Golge et al., 2003). Pollard (1992) explains the occurrence of increased levels of blame to the acquaintance rape victim (and decreased

levels of blame attributed to the perpetrator) as being due to society's expectations about dating behaviour. Agreeing to a date or some sexual interaction may be viewed by society as indicative of a woman's willingness to engage in sexual intercourse, suggesting that she is sexually permissive and potentially promiscuous (Monson et al., 2000). As society sees it as the woman's responsibility to define the sexual interaction, any sexual behaviour which occurs must have been the result of negotiation between the two individuals (Pollard).

Littleton and Axsom (2003) found evidence that scripts for seduction and rape have some considerable overlap suggesting that people may misinterpret some elements of a rape as consensual sexual activity. In this study, participants were asked to construct a typical rape incident and a typical seduction incident. The authors found that these scripts contained common elements such as the victim and perpetrator being only brief acquaintances and the use of coercion/persuasion type behaviours on the part of the male. Interestingly, alcohol use was used equivalently within the scripts suggesting that alcohol may be viewed as disinhibitory, used as a tool to obtain sex either via rape or seduction. Some differences were found, in that the rape scripts were more violent with outcomes that were more negative for the victim, whereas seduction scripts involved more sexual behaviours on the part of the woman. The authors note that these findings are particularly problematic in the real world given that incidents of rape which include certain elements may in fact be interpreted as seduction as opposed to rape (an additional discussion of scripts is included in chapter two).

1.2.3 Summary.

Analysis of reported rape statistics within England and Wales suggest that the overall prevalence of rape is relatively low but given issues with underreporting it is likely that the true prevalence of this crime is considerably higher (HMCPSI/HMIC, 2007)(see chapter five for a further discussion of reporting rape). In analysing these statistics, it is clear that a woman is far more likely to be raped by someone whom she knows as opposed to a stranger (Feist et al., 2007). This section has demonstrated that blaming of a female rape victim can increase in certain circumstances, for example where the perceiver is male, and/or the victim and perpetrator know each other. This may be due to several reasons for example, the socialisation of men and women in relation to sexual activity, which links to the sexual scripts that they may use to interpret such events. The next section will review the limited male victim blaming literature.

1.3 Male Victims of Rape

Traditionally, men are more often viewed as the perpetrators of sexual crime as opposed to being the victim (Mezey & King, 2000). Until the 1990s, this view was also reflected within the published psychological research, since much of the attention with regards to rape focussed almost exclusively on female victims (Rogers, 1998). However, following this time the focus began to shift to include the discussion of men as victims of rape (Davies & Rutland, 2007). One reason for the previous focus on female victims may be because the feminist perspective in explaining rape can polarise men as perpetrators of rape and women as the victims of rape. Mezey and King argue that instead of viewing rape along these gendered lines, we need to broaden our definition of sexual violence to

include both male and female victims. Also, more significantly, a change in rape legislation in 1994 in England and Wales broadened the definition of a rape to encompass men as victims of rape (Criminal Justice and Public Order Act, 1994). This meant that male victims became much more focussed upon.

1.3.1 Characteristics of male rape.

There are several contradictions within the research literature regarding the characteristics of male rape. This next section will briefly summarise some of the contradictions within male rape such as level of acquaintance, sexual orientation of victims/perpetrator, and the violence involved in male rape.

1.3.1.1 Stranger and acquaintance rape.

As discussed previously with regards to female victims, male rape is also often thought to be committed by strangers (see section 1.2.1.1 for definitions of stranger and acquaintance rape). However, this assumption has been found to be incorrect. Isely and Gehrenbeck-Shim (1997), who gathered data from 1300 agencies who offered services to sexual assault victims, found that two thirds of their sample of male victims knew their offender, with most perpetrators being male and also identified as heterosexual. Similar to this, Hickson et al. (1994) gathered data from 930 homosexually active men living in England and Wales, this found that 15.5% of their sample did not know their perpetrator and the rest of the sample were known to the victim via some level of acquaintance (e.g., friend, work colleague, family member). In a community sample of 358 homosexual men in Canada, Ratner et al. (2003) found that of those who reported non-consensual sexual activity, a third of the cases were stranger rapes, a third were committed by a casual male

partner/date, with 12% carried out by a regular male partner. Davies, Walker, Archer, and Pollard (2010) found in a sample of 38 that 50% of the sample were identified as stranger rapes (although this definition also included meeting briefly beforehand such as on the same night which differs from the previous definitions of stranger rape).

1.3.1.2 Sexual orientation of victims and perpetrators.

Male rape is thought to solely occur to homosexual men (Scarce, 1997). However research within this area is contradictory regarding the sexual orientation of victims, although these differences may be explainable through sampling issues. Isely and Gehrenbeck-Shim (1997) sought information from victim service agencies regarding the characteristics of sexual assault of men in the community. The majority of this sample were under 30 years of age and identified themselves as heterosexual (81%). Davies et al. (2010) found that out of a sample of 38, 20 identified as gay, 13 heterosexual, three bisexual, and two asexual. However, Kimerling, Rellini, Kelly, Judson, and Learman (2002) in a review of cases found that the majority of the sample of male victims identified themselves as gay or bisexual.

With regards to the sexual orientation of perpetrators, the research in this area is even more limited (Abdullah-Khan, 2008). It is more difficult to establish the sexuality of perpetrators especially when they are not convicted for the crime. Groth and Burgess (1980) showed that of a sample of 16 convicted perpetrators of male rape, half of these identified themselves as heterosexual, six identified as bisexual, and two identified themselves as homosexual. Mezey and King (1989) found that for a sample of 22 male

rape victims, 11 perpetrators were thought to be homosexual, three were thought to be heterosexual, and three were thought to be bisexual (for the rest of the sample the sexuality was unknown). These studies have obvious contradictions but it must also be kept in mind that these are only very limited sample sizes.

1.3.1.3 Male rape is more violent than female rape.

Kaufman, Divasto, Jackson, Voorhees, and Christy (1980) compared male and female victims of rape reporting to a medical emergency room. Male victims were found to have more physical trauma than female victims, with nine out of the 14 men being beaten (five severely) compared with 11 out of 100 for female victims. Obviously, this study's sample may be biased because of recruiting participants from an emergency room, which may mean that the cases are much more severe with regards to physical injury sustained. This suggestion is supported by Pino and Meier (1999) who found that male and female victims were equally likely to suffer injuries and require medical attention. However, men were more likely to be attacked by a stranger using a weapon, in a public place.

1.3.1.4 Incidence.

Levels of incidence of male rape or non-consensual sexual activities have varied within the literature, probably because of the sampling methods involved. This means that these findings must be interpreted cautiously. Davies (2002) found that levels of incidence ranged from around 7% to 14%. Other levels which have been reported have been 3% amongst men recruited from general practices (Coxell, King, Mezey, & Gordon, 1999), 15% amongst a sample of homosexual men (Krahe, Schutze, Fritzsche, &

Waizenhofer, 2000), and 28% amongst a sample recruited through the gay press and entertainment venues (Hickson et al., 1994).

1.3.2 Experimental research.

Experimental research in this area is useful as it gives an insight into how male victims may be treated and perceived (Davies, 2002). In these studies, participants are often presented with a vignette of a depicted rape and their attitude towards the rape victim is assessed via a victim blaming measure. Where a rape victim is depicted as male, male participants often attribute more blame to the victim than do female participants (e.g., Mitchell et al., 1999; Whatley & Riggio, 1993). However, this blaming does seem to be affected by the sexual orientation of the victim. Burt and DeMello (2002) found that male participants held the homosexual male rape victim more responsible than female participants did. In an acquaintance rape scenario, Davies, Pollard, and Archer (2006) also found that male participants blamed the homosexual male victim more than the heterosexual male victim (when raped by a male perpetrator but not when raped by a female) but there were no significant differences found in female participant blaming. Davies and McCartney (2003) found that the sexual orientation of participants can also affect blaming of male rape victims. Heterosexual men were found to blame a male acquaintance rape victim more than homosexual men, however there were no differences in blaming levels found between heterosexual men and women.

When the rape victim gender is manipulated (male vs. female), male participants are still often found to be more victim blaming, of both male and female victims, than are

females (e.g., Anderson & Lyons, 2005; Wakelin & Long, 2003). Davies and Rogers (2006) argue that the sex role expectation hypothesis accounts for why men blame the male rape victim more than women do. This hypothesis suggests that men have a more traditional viewpoint and endorse masculine ideals, which contributes towards a more negative evaluation of the male rape victim. However, findings are not always consistent, both Anderson (2004) and Gerber et al. (2004) found no significant differences between victim blaming when manipulating victim gender and using participants' gender as an independent variable.

When the sexual orientation of the victim is not included in the scenario, female victims are often blamed more than male victims (e.g., Schneider, Ee, & Aronson, 1994). In a qualitative study, Anderson (1999) found that both male and female participants blamed the female rape victim more than the male rape victim. Men were found to make nine times more blaming attributions towards the female rape victim than the male rape victim. Female participants made twice as many blaming attributions to female victims than male victims. Similarly, Schneider et al. found that participants wanted the female victim to accept more blame for what happened than the male victim. In addition, participants thought that the female victim would blame herself more than the male victim, was more likely to have behaved in a manner that contributed to the rape, was more likely to get herself in a situation where rape occurs, and was more likely to have caused the rape by her behaviour than the male victim. However, Anderson and Quinn (2009) found that attitudes towards male victims were significantly more negative than

attitudes towards female victims in a sample of medical students. Howard (1984a) found that female victims are generally blamed more characterologically whereas male victims are blamed more behaviourally. Although, the findings from this study must be treated with some caution as Howard indicates that the category of characterological blame used in her study was somewhat ambiguous. As Pollard (1992) notes, the items in the characterological section refer to the victim's pre-attack behaviour, specifically the amount of caution that the victim employs prior to the attack rather than the actual character of the victim. Davies et al. (2001) examined behavioural blame toward male and female victims of rape and found that first, male participants blamed the rape victim more than female participants and, second, that the male victim was blamed more than the female victim.

Where the sexual orientation of the victim is included as a variable, homosexual victims are often blamed more for being raped than heterosexual victims (e.g., Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001; Wakelin & Long, 2003). Ford, Liwag-McLamb, and Foley (1998) found support for the idea that the typical sexual partner of a man (either a homosexual man or heterosexual woman) may be blamed more for their victimisation because they may have been behaving in a way that precipitated the rape. Davies et al. (2001) suggest that because of gender stereotypes, sexuality or perceived sexuality may have an influence on the attributions which are made about male victims of rape because heterosexual men should be able to protect themselves and fight off anyone who attacks

them. However, with a homosexual male victim, this type of attack may raise questions about consent.

As established previously in this literature review, female victims of acquaintance rape are often attributed more blame than female victims of stranger rape. This finding is less easy to establish within the male rape literature as much of the current literature focuses on scenarios which depict solely stranger rapes (e.g., Schneider et al., 1994; Whatley & Riggio, 1993), with manipulations of sexual orientation of the victim (e.g., Burt & DeMello, 2002; Davies et al., 2001; Mitchell et al., 1999; Wakelin & Long, 2003), or solely acquaintance rapes (e.g., Anderson, 2004; Davies & McCartney, 2003; Gerber et al., 2004).

Doherty and Anderson (2004) argue that the differences which are found in victim blaming can be explained in what they designate as a hierarchy of suffering. This means that certain rapes are judged to be a worse experience for certain types of victims (e.g., worse for heterosexual males than homosexual men or women of either orientation). This idea was based in the assumption that a rape for a heterosexual male deviates from the sexual behaviour that they would be assumed to usually take part in. This suggests that participants are drawing similarities between consensual sex and rape which is problematic as this is considering rape alongside consensual sexual acts. A perception confirmed by Anderson (2001) who found that participants perceived the motivation for rape to be sex rather than power.

1.3.3 Summary.

Section 1.3 has reviewed the literature regarding male rape blame. It appears that the incidence of male rape ranges from three to 28% dependent upon the sampling method used (see chapter five for a further discussion of reporting rape). Regarding victim blaming, it appears that male participants are more victim blaming of male victims than are female participants, which is an equivalent finding to that within the female victim blaming literature. Also, male homosexual victims (whether identified as such or perceived to be) seem to be blamed more than male heterosexual victims (e.g., Ford et al., 1998).

1.4 Perpetrator Blaming

As noted above, in comparison with victim blaming, very little attention has been paid towards understanding perpetrator blaming (Viki et al., 2004). The majority of the research outlined below refers to female rape unless otherwise specified. Similar to victim blaming, gender differences have been found in perpetrator blaming. For example, Alicke and Yurak (1995) found that females thought that the perpetrator was more likely to be guilty, ascribed greater legal responsibility to the perpetrator, and blamed the perpetrator more for the acts that occurred than male participants did (see also Gerber et al., 2004). Male participants have also been found to blame the perpetrator of a homosexual male rape significantly less than did female participants (Burt & DeMello, 2002). As with victim blaming, these gender differences are not always consistent with Newcomb et al. (2008) and Viki et al. both finding no significant gender differences for

perpetrator blame. Similarly, Davies et al. (2006) found no gender difference in their measure of reaction to the perpetrator.

The perpetrators of stranger and acquaintance rape are also perceived differently, Golge et al. (2003) found that mock jurors proposed a more serious punishment for the stranger rape perpetrator when compared with the acquaintance rape perpetrator. Viki et al. (2004) also found that longer prison sentences were attributed towards the stranger rape perpetrator than the acquaintance rape perpetrator in a vignette scenario. Similarly, Freetly and Kane (1995) found that as the levels of prior intimacy increased, assessments of the perpetrator's behaviour as totally unacceptable decreased (see also Krahe et al., 2007). However, Wiener and Vodanovich (2001) suggest that the attribution of blame towards the victim and towards the perpetrator are two different processes. This was demonstrated in their study where the perpetrator and victim relationship did not alter the level of responsibility towards the perpetrator but did for victim responsibility.

When comparing blaming attributions towards perpetrators of male and female rape, Anderson and Lyons (2005) found that perpetrators of female rape were blamed more than perpetrators of male rape. Anderson and Lyons suggest that male perpetrators of rape may be blamed less because participants find male rape harder to understand, thus attributing less responsibility towards the perpetrator. Also, there may be the suggestion that male victims should be better able to resist male rape, less sympathy given to men in a non-dominant role (as a victim), or it may be due to

homophobia (Anderson & Lyons). Finally, it may be related to the idea that men are always ready and available for casual indiscriminate sex suggesting that participants are comparing rape with normal sexual behaviour (see Anderson, 2001, on perceived motivations for male and female rape). All of these factors may lead to the perpetrator of male rape being held less responsible for committing the rape.

1.5 Summary of Rape and Blaming

This chapter has demonstrated the breadth of the research literature regarding the blaming of victims and perpetrators of female and male rape. It is clear that in relation to blaming attitudes, less attention has been given towards the perpetrator of rape. The literature has demonstrated that without the influence of sexual orientation, female rape victims can be blamed more than male victims. However, when victim sexual orientation is included as a factor, homosexual male victims may be attributed more blame than other types of victims. Doherty and Anderson (2004) suggest that this may be because participants use a hierarchy of suffering to apportion blame to victims however, homophobic attitudes may also be responsible for this effect (Anderson & Lyons, 2005). Perpetrator blaming seems to demonstrate opposite effects to that of victim blaming. For example, perpetrators of stranger rape are blamed more than perpetrators of acquaintance rape. (A further understanding of why people may engage in blaming will be examined in chapters three and four.)

2 Rape Myths and Stereotypes

This chapter will review the current literature with regards to female and male rape myths within our society. Burt (1980, p.217) provided us with one of the first definitions of rape myths as “prejudicial, stereotyped or false beliefs about rape, rape victims and rapists”. Several researchers have suggested purposes for rape myths. For example, Anderson, Beattie, and Spencer (2001) argue that rape myths have an ego defensive and self protective function which can result in biases in the attribution process. This shifts the focus away from the perpetrator and towards the victim. Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) have suggested that rape myth acceptance in males and females functions in a different way. Men use them to justify male sexual violence while females believe in myths to deny personal vulnerability. Buddie and Miller (2001) suggest that people use rape myths in different ways according to how the victim is perceived. For example, where a victim may be considered responsible for what happens to him/her, rape myths may be used to a greater extent to causally implicate the victim in what happened to them. However, for a more 'innocent' victim, perceptions may focus on the trauma that the victim will suffer rather than trying to blame the victim for what happened to them. The differing functions of rape myths was a point also echoed by Payne, Lonsway, and Fitzgerald (1999) who suggest that it is unlikely that all rape myths function in the same way.

Peterson and Muehlenhard (2004) suggest that there is a link between rape scripts and rape myths such that they reinforce each other. Stereotypical rape scripts reinforce a

belief in rape myths and exposure to rape myths strengthens the belief in stereotypical rape scripts. Crome and McCabe (2001) explain that if people have no direct experience of rape, this is when they are most likely to use scripts which socialisation has provided them. People may use culturally based scripts such as those which suggest appropriate clothing for women and whether a male can be a victim of rape. Littleton and Axsom (2003) suggest that our attitudes towards rape victims and the responsibility that we apportion rape victims may be reliant particularly upon sexual scripts that are normative or traditional. Traditional sexual scripts can include elements such as the ideas that women are the gatekeepers of sexual activity and that men have a much higher sex drive than women. They also suggest that these scripts may be most often activated in situations where individuals engage in sexual activity where they have no established prior relationship (Littleton & Axsom).

The label rape myths in itself may be a misnomer. A rape myth may not be an actual myth but rather should be considered as a stereotype about rape behaviour. Norton and Grant (2008) suggest that the label myth can be a useful framework against which these stereotypes can be explored. However, they suggest that the label 'rape myth' is a benign presence, whereas in fact what is being encompassed by this definition are negative, potentially damaging stereotypes about rape. Within the following section, the terms rape myth and stereotype will be used interchangeably as Burt's (1980) definition of rape myths has been adopted for the purpose of this thesis. The following

sections discuss in more depth the structure of rape myths in relation to female and male victims.

2.1 Female Rape Myths and Stereotypes

Several researchers of rape myths have organised female rape myths into distinct categories. Scully (1990) defined four categories of female rape myths, (1) female rape victim precipitation (the idea that the behaviours and characteristics of women cause them to be victims of rape); (2) victim responsibility (that women are to blame for being a victims of rape); (3) victim participation (that women secretly want to be raped); and (4) false accusation (that women cry rape as revenge over men). Within this framework in which women contribute to their own rape, Scully highlighted several specific myths which relate to victim precipitation which further justifies a rape occurring. These were (1) women as seductresses; (2) women mean yes when they say no; (3) women eventually 'relax and enjoy it'; (4) nice girls don't get raped (any woman that is seen to be violating gender role expectations deserves to be raped); and (4) guilty only of a minor wrongdoing (rape is a trivial event); and (5) macho man.

Jones, Russell, and Bryant (1998) carried out a factor analysis of Burt's (1980) Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. This analysis accounted for a three factor solution: (i) disbelief of rape claims, (ii) victim blame, and (iii) rape claims are manipulative. Disbelief of rape claims applied to items such as "would doubt white woman's claims". Victim blame includes items such as "scantily clad women are asking for trouble". Finally rape claims are manipulative refer to items such as "women lie about rape to get back at men".

Johnson, Kuck, and Schander (1997) also examined the dimensions of rape myths with three myth categories being established. These were blaming the victim (“women provoke rape”), excusing the man (“men have sexual urges they can’t control”), and justifications for acquaintance rape (“if a woman had has previous sex with a man, she cannot claim that she was raped when the same man has sex with her again”). Cuklanz (2000) also summarised rape myths as including the idea that rape victims are frequently lying about their rape, that rapists are few and easily identifiable, that rape is committed by strangers and involves a violent attack, that victims 'ask' to be raped, and that rape is a special crime which requires out of the ordinary legal procedures.

These categorisations of rape myths have been helpful in demonstrating the breadth of female rape myths which may be apparent in people’s beliefs about rape. Potentially more useful is the extent to which such myths are actually held within our society. A survey by Amnesty International UK (2005) showed, to a certain extent, how pervasive rape stereotypes can be. This study examined the attitudes of the general public regarding several different types of rape scenarios. Nearly a third of participants attributed some level of responsibility towards a woman who was raped whilst drunk. Just over a third of participants believed that a woman behaving in a flirtatious way was responsible for being raped. Again, a third of participants believed that a woman failing to say no clearly meant that she was responsible for being raped. A quarter of respondents felt that a female victim wearing revealing clothing was responsible for being raped. Just over a fifth of participants thought that a woman who had many previous

sexual partners was responsible for being raped, and finally nearly a fifth of participants felt that a victim walking alone at night was responsible for being raped. These results suggest that a significant majority of the general public do not believe that the behaviour of women makes them responsible for them being victimised. However, there does seem to be a section of society that accepts such stereotypes and believes that the behaviour of women in certain respects means that they should be attributed some level of responsibility for being raped.

Johnson et al. (1997) also found a considerable proportion of respondents accepted various rape myths. The percentage of respondents that agreed with the various different rape myths examined ranged from 0.7% to 89.4%. The greater percentage of respondents accepted myths which tended to excuse the perpetrator rather than blame the victim. However, there was a smaller but considerable proportion of respondents who adhered to myths that blame the victim. For example, over a quarter agreed that a woman's past reputation was an important issue in whether it was rape and 17.4% agreed with the myth that women provoke rapes.

Jones et al. (1998) suggests that the structure of men's and women's beliefs about rape actually appear to be similar. Although, the levels of acceptance of these stereotypes are not, their study found that males accepted myths at a significantly higher level than females. This is a finding echoed by similar studies (e.g., Anderson et al., 1997; Frese et al., 2004). However, other studies have found no such differences (e.g., Abrams

et al., 2003). Johnson et al. (1997) found gender differences in rape myth endorsement in each of the three dimensions. The most important participant gender differences were found in the 'blaming the woman' dimension in that a significantly higher proportion of men agreed that most rapes could be prevented if women did not provoke them and if women secretly did not want to be raped. In the 'excusing the man' dimension, a significantly greater proportion of men agreed that "men have sexual urges they can't control". Finally regarding the justifying acquaintance rape dimension, a higher proportion of male respondents believed (i) a man had a right to assume a woman wants to have sexual intercourse with him if she allows him to touch her in a sexual way, (ii) a man has a right to assume a woman wants to have sexual intercourse with him if she has an oral sexual encounter with him, and (iii) if the woman has had previous sex with a man she cannot claim that she was raped if the same man has sex with her again without her consent. Jones et al. (1998) also found differences for the way in which rape myths are endorsed for men and women. In their three-factor model, men's endorsement of 'disbelief of rape claims' myths was found to be almost one standard deviation stronger than women.

The strength of acceptance of rape myths has been found to affect attributions of blame and responsibility to victims of rape. Frese et al. (2004) found that participants with high rape myth acceptance attributed more responsibility to the victim than participants who reported low rape myth acceptance and that they were less likely to recommend that the victim report the rape to the police. Similar findings were noted by

Golge et al. (2003) who manipulated the amount of rape myths in the vignettes presented to observers. They found that the presence of myths in the vignette increased the responsibility participants attributed to victims. The most severe punishment was also proposed for the stranger rape without myths when compared with the stranger rape with myths. An interaction was also found between type of rape and gender such that male participants blamed the rape victim more than female participants in the date rape and stranger rape without myths but not in the stranger rape with myths.

One of the main reasons why rape myths are researched is because of their potentially harmful effects on victims of rape. Peterson and Muehlenhard (2004) found support in their review of the literature, that rape myths and stereotypical rape scripts blame the victim and define what rape is very narrowly, often more narrowly than legal definitions do so. Further, Peterson and Muehlenhard argue that rape myths perpetuate rape in our society, basing their arguments on the idea that rape myths set up a series of hurdles or barriers that rape victims must get through. Each type of rape myth provides a reason for why what happened to them did not actually constitute rape. For example, the myth that 'He didn't mean to' (one of the subscales of the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale) proposes that men just get carried away on occasion suggesting that there is no underlying problem with this type of behaviour and that it just happens sometimes. Defining the incident as 'getting carried away' does not allow the rape victim to define what happened to them as rape, thus providing a barrier to them seeking help or acknowledging what happened to them as rape (Peterson & Muehlenhard). Torrey (1991)

also suggests that the acceptance of myths within our society is linked with the tolerance of the occurrence of rape, supporting the viewpoint of Burt (1980) who argues that rape myths create an environment which is hostile to rape victims.

This is a view supported by Anderson and Doherty (2008, p.21) who suggest that rape myths or stereotypes provide a "vocabulary of motive" utilised to explain rape within a normative interpretation of sexual behaviour which inevitably neutralises a claim of rape. This 'vocabulary of motive' also permits excuses for the perpetrator's behaviour. Bohner (2001) found some support for this idea, in that participants who were more accepting of rape myths used more passive forms of descriptions when describing the rapist and his actions than did participants who were less accepting of rape myths. Bohner argues that this use of the passive voice is a distancing feature which obscures a degree of responsibility being attributed towards the perpetrator.

The following section will discuss in more depth two rape myths as an example of how specific myths are evident within society and affect how rape victims are perceived.

2.1.1 Alcohol use.

The use of alcohol by women seems to be misinterpreted in that a woman drinking alcohol is perceived to be more interested in sex. However, perpetrators of rape seem to be perceived differently in that the drinking of alcohol seems not to be related to sexual intent but rather used as a reason for the rape occurring (Maurer & Robinson, 2008). Sims, Noel, and Maisto (2007) found that a female date rape victim was attributed more

responsibility when alcohol was present than when it was not, suggesting that participants are more willing to blame a rape victim who has been drinking alcohol compared to a sober victim. The increased blaming for alcohol use may be due to participants believing in sex role stereotypes which suggest that drinking alcohol is inappropriate for females but acceptable for males (Pollard, 1992).

2.1.2 Victim clothing.

There is a structure to clothing within many societies that guides the moral standards for dress. This form of etiquette guides the wearer in what dress is considered proper and improper to wear and display. These moral standards can have strong sanctions against those who break the rules of what is considered modest although these rules vary considerably within societies and also cultures (Roach-Higgins & Eicher, 1992). Much of the research which assesses the importance of women's clothing has found that women described as scantily clad or in revealing clothing are judged to be more responsible for being raped (e.g., Kanekar & Kolsawalla, 1981; Maurer & Robinson, 2008; Pollard, 1992). Johnson, Hegland, and Schofield (1999) found that for victims of rape, the perception of dress seems to be that clothing represents the willingness of the individual to engage in sexual behaviour. Therefore, if a victim is dressed in a revealing manner then this can suggest that the victim is consenting or that the clothing provides a nonverbal consent to sexual intercourse. This can result in biasing attitudes against a victim dressed in such a manner and reduce the level of blame attributed towards the perpetrator.

2.2 Male Rape Myths and Stereotypes

Davies and Rutland (2007) suggest that the myths and preconceptions held within society are considerable barriers to men reporting their victimisation to the police. These myths play a role in the stigma that surrounds this particular crime. Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson (1992) developed the first measure of male rape myths which was based around three categories: that male rape cannot happen, that men are to blame for their rape, and that men will not find being a victim of rape traumatic. Their study found that females were less rape myth accepting than males (as with female rape myth studies) and that participants disagreed more strongly with myths in which the victim was raped by a man than those in which the victim was raped by a woman. Acceptance of male rape myths was low overall, but there was a small minority who did agree with the myths presented. The following sections review some of the previously suggested myths associated with male rape (e.g., Abdullah-Khan, 2008; Chapleau, Oswald, & Russell, 2008; Kassing, Beesley, & Frey, 2005; Kassing & Prieto, 2003). These are explored in more depth than the female rape myths because this thesis intends to develop a measure of male rape myth acceptance which assesses the full range of male rape myths within our society.

2.2.1 Association with homosexuality.

Similar to as stated above, Jones (2000) contends that male sexual assault is viewed as a subset of homosexual behaviour. This can explain therefore, why it is only homosexual men who are thought to commit and become victims of sexual crime, labelling this crime as a 'homosexual' crime (Adler, 2000). Indeed, Scare (1997) argues that one reason why male rape is neglected is because it is associated with homosexual

behaviour and so the prejudice demonstrated towards homosexuality is similarly projected towards male rape victims. As noted in chapter one, it does seem that homosexual men are blamed more for being raped than are heterosexual men (e.g., Burt & DeMello, 2002). Eigenberg (2000) suggests that male victims of rape are portrayed as homosexual or weak and effeminate because traditional definitions of masculinity do not allow men to be a victim of rape. Men should be the dominant force within society and women should be the targets for sexual violence (Eigenberg).

2.2.2 Masculinity.

Following on from the above point that traditional definitions of masculinity do not allow men to be victims of rape, survivors' accounts suggest that societal expectations about men and masculinity actually discourage men from reporting sexual victimisation because of this fear of being labelled as weak or inadequate (Doherty & Anderson, 2004). Doherty and Anderson found that in becoming a victim of rape, heterosexual men in particular, may be perceived as less than men. The authors suggest that this perception may occur because of cultural expectations of hegemonic masculinity. Whereby male rape victims would be blamed because they have failed in their duties as real men and society is seen as being unsympathetic to those men who do not fulfil their roles as 'real' men. A man, as a victim of rape, is counter to the societal expectations of masculinity (Davies et al., 2001). Whitehead (2005) argues that the male victim is excluded from the category of 'man', therefore making this victim a non-man. A non-man has failed to meet these qualities of masculinity.

2.2.3 Invulnerability to rape.

There is a perception that men cannot be raped. Donnelly and Kenyon (1996) found that 37% of the rape victim agencies that they contacted would not provide services to male victims of rape. The authors reported that many agencies believed that men couldn't be raped or were raped only because they wanted to be. One participant stated that "men can't be raped".

2.2.4 Coping.

Mitchell et al. (1999) suggest that there is a stereotype that men may be tougher emotionally and better able to cope, so they would not be as emotionally affected by a rape as female victims. This is consistent with the gender role expectation that it is unmanly to express negative emotions even in the context of being a male rape victim (Walker, Archer, & Davies, 2005). This, coupled with the fact that very few men seek professional help or counselling following a rape (King & Woollett, 1997), may lead people to believe that men are better at coping with the consequences of rape than female victims are.

2.2.5 Hierarchy of suffering.

Stereotypes about male homosexual relationships may lead people to assume a rape would be less traumatic and more pleasurable for homosexual victims than for a heterosexual victim (Mitchell et al., 1999). This idea also arose in Doherty and Anderson's (2004) study which examined how people make sense of male rape in naturalistic conversations. The theme that rape may be worse for heterosexual men than for women

or homosexual men arose from a dyadic conversation between participants. In reference to the normal sexual practices for homosexual and heterosexual men, it is suggested that because the act involved in male rape deviates from that assumed to be practised by heterosexual men, that this would therefore be worse for heterosexual male victims. Rape was also judged by some participants to be worse for men than women.

2.2.6 Enjoyment of sex.

Anderson (2001) found that the motivation for rape continued to be perceived as a need for sex rather than an act motivated by power. A point also made by Groth and Burgess (1980) who state that rape is still perceived as a sexual event. According to Davies (2002), the socialisation of men that suggests that 'any sex is good' means that sexual coercion (by a female) should be interpreted within normal sexual experience rather than a victimisation. Sexual coercion by a male is less easy to interpret in this way as it is counter to a heterosexual masculine identity and as such may allow men to recognise it as a negative event.

2.3 Summary of Rape Myths and Stereotypes

It is clear that there are a wide range of rape myths and stereotypes relating to female rape. Studies have demonstrated that overall acceptance of myths is relatively low but that a particular section of society does adhere to negative and potentially damaging stereotypes (e.g., Amnesty International UK, 2005). In particular, two types of female myths are reviewed more fully, those of alcohol use by women and the choice of clothing by women. In both types of myths, it appears that engaging in certain behaviours

(e.g., drinking alcohol, wearing revealing clothing) is misinterpreted in some way, suggesting that the woman may be sexually permissive or promiscuous.

Male rape myths have also been discussed and this has demonstrated some clear differences with female rape myths particularly with associations with homosexuality and masculinity. However, our understanding of the range of available male rape myths is still limited since much of the current knowledge is anecdotal (Abdullah-Khan, 2008). The limitations of our understanding is also evident in that there is no well developed measure of the acceptance of male rape myths whereas in comparison, one has existed for female rape myths for over ten years (IRMAS, Payne et al., 1999).

Burt (1980) suggested that changing adherence to rape myths will not be easily accomplished since they are so closely interconnected with other strongly held and pervasive attitudes. However, Edward and MacLeod (1999) are somewhat more positive, arguing that acceptance of rape myths is not static, rather it is dynamic and partly reflects wider societal beliefs that are in turn dynamic. It is important in discussing these differences to note that most respondents generally tend to show a low endorsement of rape myths (e.g., Davies & McCartney, 2003). Also, the absence of stereotypical ideas about rape does not mean that a person is not influenced by situational factors such as type of rape because even low rape myth acceptance participants express doubt about a victim's responsibility in acquaintance rape (Frese et al., 2004). (See chapter five for further discussion on rape myths within the criminal justice system.)

How rape myth acceptance relates to perpetrator blaming has not been reviewed in the above section because of the lack of literature in this area. Although Burt's (1980) definition of rape myths included stereotypical ideas about rapists, this has not been tested empirically within the research literature. This thesis intends to remedy this with a measure of perpetrator blaming included in the new studies presented within this thesis.

3 Belief in a Just World

This chapter will examine research examining the relationship between belief in a just world and blaming attitudes. Lerner (1980) originally formulated the concept of a belief in a just world as a framework through which people can construct the world as a just and fair place, where good and bad events happen only to people who deserve them (Crome & McCabe, 2001). Belief in a just world therefore allows people to believe that the world is stable and orderly which as Furnham (2003, p.796) states “provides a psychological buffer against the harsh realities of the world”. Lerner differentiates between interpreting the world as stable and orderly (which is associated with belief in a just world) to otherwise interpreting the world as predictable or controllable.

3.1 Functions of Belief in a Just World

According to Wolfrat and Dalbert (2003) there are three main functions of belief in a just world. Firstly, it is indicative of a personal contract and agreement to abide by the rules of fairness. Secondly, it forms a conceptual framework within which people interpret events in a meaningful way. Consequently, it gives people the confidence that they will be treated fairly by others and will not fall victim to unforeseeable disaster.

Given that Williams (2003, p. 463) states, belief in a just world is “astonishingly crude as explicit thoughts, there is nonetheless good evidence that such thinking pervades human interpretations of the world”. Therefore, it is thought that maintaining a belief in a just world holds significant benefits for the individual. It allows people to believe that the world is stable and orderly and therefore, has been associated with other positive

aspects of well being (Loo, 2002). According to Furnham (2003), holding a belief in a just world means that people feel less personally vulnerable within the everyday world. Believing that only good things happen to good people means that as long as that person behaves well, they can have an expectation that only good things will happen to them. This should therefore reduce the perceptions of risk and vulnerability that people can feel in relation to their everyday lives. Tomaka and Blascovich (1994) found that individuals with a high belief in a just world were much more likely to evaluate and experience daily stresses as challenges whereas individuals with a low belief in a just world were more likely to interpret those same events as a threat. Given these benefits, a belief in a just world has a motivational bias to be maintained particularly in experiencing the everyday world. The next section will discuss what strategies are adopted when a threat to a person's belief in a just world is encountered.

3.2 Threats to a Belief in a Just World

3.2.1 Victims.

One of the main difficulties with maintaining a belief in the world is that bad things can happen to good people and vice versa. Since a person's belief in a just world is important to them, reactions directed towards victims can be guided by a need to maintain this belief. One such reaction is to blame or derogate the victim (Hafer, 2000). This may mean that an event is reinterpreted such that the fate of the victim is considered somehow desirable or good for the victim (Crome & McCabe, 2001), or that observers attribute responsibility or fault to the victim. Correia, Vala, and Aguiar (2001) suggest that in a situation where responsibility is being attributed towards the victim, people will first

focus on the victim's behaviour as an explanation for the situation. Where responsibility cannot be attributed towards the victim's behaviour, then the responsibility is attributed towards the victim's character. Lerner (1997) also argues that people will automatically reason backwards when confronted with a person's fate so that they can make assumptions with hindsight based on the victim's previous actions and/or personal worth. These assumptions thus protect and preserve the belief that the world is a just and fair place.

In one of the early studies of victim derogation, participants watched a fellow student react with apparent pain to a series of supposed electric shocks (Lerner, 1980). In one condition, participants could compensate the victim by voting to reassign the victim to a reward condition in which the victim would receive money instead of shocks. Most participants took this chance and restored 'justice' to the situation. In a second condition, participants could not themselves compensate the victim, but those who were told that the victim would be compensated rated the victim more favourably than those who were told that the suffering would continue. The rating in the latter condition showed a rejection of the victim, suggesting that the victim was perceived as being somehow responsible for their fate.

The need to derogate or blame a victim may vary in relation to aspects of the situation. Lerner (1980) suggested that a victim who most threatens a person's belief in a just world is one who is innocent and whose suffering continues. Hafer (2000) found that

innocent victims create a greater threat to a belief in a just world with participants showing slower responses in a modified stroop test to justice related words when compared with non-justice related words (in a situation where an innocent victim had been depicted). Similarly, Correia and Vala (2003) found that, where a victim was innocent and who suffered more persistently, victim derogation occurred at a higher level for those participants who received priming for a just world, compared to those who received priming for an unjust world. However, Correia et al. (2001) found that participants with a high belief in a just world did not differ in their assessments of the innocence of a victim compared to participants with a low belief in a just world. Similar to research regarding the innocence of the victim, Correia, Vala, and Aguiar (2007) found that an in-group victim threatened a belief in a just world more than an out-group victim. Aguiar, Vala, and Correia (2008) suggest that where victims are outside of our scope of justice, the threat to the belief in a just world may not be as automatically activated as it is with victims who are within our in-group.

Given the importance of belief in a just world and its contribution towards understanding our reactions to victims, it is logical that this belief has often been used by researchers as an explanation for why rape victims are held responsible for being raped. However, it is important to note with regard to the perceptions of rape victims and belief in a just world, that the research findings are less clear than they are for other types of victims (Correia et al., 2001). The previous rape research has produced contradictory findings, with some finding a positive association between belief in a just world and

increased victim blaming (e.g., Sakalli-Ugurlu, Yalcun, & Glick, 2007; Whatley & Riggio, 1993), while other studies have demonstrated a variety of gender effects which account for some associations between belief in a just world and victim blaming (e.g., Cowan & Curtis, 1994; Ford et al., 1998; Kleinke & Meyer, 1990; Murray, Spadafore, & McIntosh, 2005), and others have demonstrated no relationship (e.g., Brems & Wagner, 1994; Lambert & Raichle, 2000; Rye, Greatrix, & Enright, 2006).

With regards to the variety of gender effects, Cowan and Curtis (1994) found that belief in a just world was only significant in explaining female participants' victim blaming. Similarly, Murray et al. (2005) found only amongst female participants was a high belief in a just world associated with a more negative perception of the female victim when participants were primed with rape related versus neutral words. However, Kleinke and Meyer (1990) found that only men with a high belief in a just world evaluated a female rape victim more negatively than did men with a low belief in a just world. Also, women with a high belief in a just world were less negative towards the female rape victim than low belief in a just world women. The authors suggested that this may be because women are more capable of relating to the female rape victim and this inhibits their ability to derogate the rape victim as they may become victim to a similar crime (in opposition to their probable belief in the world being just to some extent). This explanation does however, run counter to the findings of Cowan and Curtis and Murray et al..

Foley and Pigott (2000) examined the impact of people's belief in a just world on attribution of responsibility and awards of monetary damages in a civil rape case. This study used two samples, one of which was university students and one which was a jury eligible sample of non-students. In terms of belief in a just world, female participants did not differ in their attributions of responsibility (student vs. non-student), though belief in a just world did affect the amount of money they awarded to the plaintiff, with high belief in a just world female participants awarding more money. This suggests that the high belief in a just world female participants were restoring justice to the situation by the awarding of damages (as opposed to derogating the victim). For men, however, participants with a high belief in a just world awarded much less money to the plaintiff than did low belief in a just world participants. This study highlighted that perhaps when restoring justice to a situation, people prefer to award damages (i.e., punish the guilty) as opposed to derogating the victim (e.g., by attributing more responsibility to victims.)

In relation to victim blaming for male victims of rape, Whatley and Riggio (1993) found that participants with a high belief in a just world were more likely to blame the male victim than participants with a low belief in a just world. Further, Ford et al. (1998) found that belief in a just world affected attributions of responsibility only when the male rape victim was described as heterosexual (as opposed to homosexual) and that this effect was influenced by the participants' gender (i.e., more responsibility was attributed by female and less by male participants).

Given the differing findings above, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions in relation to the importance of belief in a just world as an explanation for victim blaming. In addition, there has been considerable discussion within the literature regarding the reliability and validity of one of the dominant measures of belief in a just world used, which is the Rubin and Peplau (1975) scale. This measure has been utilised in the majority of the studies reported above (e.g., Brems & Wagner, 1994; Cowan & Curtis, 1994; Foley & Pigott, 2000; Ford et al., 1998; Murray et al., 2005; Rye et al., 2006; Whatley & Riggio, 1993), however Furnham (2003) argues that this scale can be psychometrically problematic with differing conclusions being drawn about the factor solutions for the scale as well as questions relating to its low internal reliability. This suggests that some of the findings should be interpreted with caution (Cowan & Curtis).

3.2.2 Perpetrators.

Hafer and Begue (2005) note that very little research has been carried out to examine the role of belief in a just world in relation to reactions to perpetrators. As they note, this area should be developed since perpetrators of injustice may be particularly focussed upon by people in their attempts to restore justice to a situation. Moran and Comfort (1982) found that female jurors who were prone to finding a defendant guilty held much higher belief in a just world, though no such relationship was found for male jurors who were prone to finding a defendant guilty. Begue and Bastounis (2003) found that a belief in a just world was correlated within punitive attitudes towards delinquents. Rye et al. (2006) found no difference between high and low belief in a just world participants in their blaming of the rape perpetrator or of rating of liking for the

perpetrator. However, Murray et al. (2005) found that only amongst female participants did a high belief in a just world result in perceiving the perpetrator of rape more negatively when primed with raped related words (compared with neutral words).

3.2.3 Summary.

This section has reviewed the available literature in relation to blaming and its relationship with belief in a just world. Belief in a just world is a frequent explanation for why people attribute responsibility towards the victim. However, the research findings are inconsistent in that some studies have demonstrated a positive association between victim blaming and belief in a just world, whereas others have demonstrated no such significant effects. In relation to perpetrator blaming, given the limited research and the problematic properties of the Rubin and Peplau (1975) scale, this area requires considerable development to better understand the importance of belief in just world and is therefore a focus of some of the new studies presented within this thesis.

4 Gender Role Traits and Traditional Gender Role Beliefs

This chapter will examine two slightly related but different concepts of gender.

These are the (i) development and effect of gender role traits as well as the (ii) development and adoption of traditional gender role beliefs. Humans are gendered beings whose lives and experiences are (most likely) influenced by their gender (Smiler, 2004). Gender roles are stereotypic norms and expectations, defined and continuously reinforced by society, that indicate what is appropriate behaviour for men and women (Golge et al., 2003). Initially, psychological research into gender role conceptualised masculinity and femininity as a single bipolar dimension (Auster & Ohm, 2000). However, from the 1970s onwards there was a move instead to view masculinity and femininity as two different dimensions in which measures of an individual's gender role produced both a masculinity and a femininity score which were distinct and uncorrelated (e.g., Bem Sex Role Inventory, BSRI, Bem, 1974). In comparison, traditional gender role beliefs are an acceptance of these proscribed roles as appropriate for each gender and the measurement of these beliefs has largely been developed along a sliding scale from traditional to more egalitarian beliefs about gender (e.g., Sex Role Egalitarianism Scale, SRES, Beere, King, Beere, & King, 1984). It is important when discussing these two concepts that the differences between them are clearly highlighted. The adoption of a gender role is the adherence to specific traits which are defined by society to be the norm for a specific gender (Bem, 1974). For example, in measuring the gender role using the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), the masculine gender role is defined by traits such as

‘dominant’, ‘willing to take risks’, and ‘forceful’. An increasing adoption of these types of traits demonstrates an increasing adoption of the masculine gender role (Bem, 1981). This is different from the adoption of traditional gender role beliefs which is an attitude about the appropriate roles for men and women in society. This can be measured by examining attitudes such as ‘The man should be the head of the family’ (Beere et al., 1984). Archer (1989) assessed the relationship between these types of measures therefore assessing the similarity of measures which assess gender role traits and those which assess gender role attitudes. This review examined the correlations reported between measures such as the BSRI and gender role attitude measures. The results of this established that although there are significant correlations between these types of measures, the relationship is a very small one (see also Archer & Rhodes, 1989). As will be seen below, this thesis will use two different concepts of gender to assess the relationship that they may have with victim/perpetrator blaming. This approach was taken to ensure that an assessment could be made of whether it is gender role traits which are associated with blaming or whether it is instead gender role attitudes that demonstrate a relationship with victim blaming.

The development of a gender role or gender role beliefs is generally thought to occur in childhood (Beale, 1994). Sex Role theory (also known as Social Role theory) argues that the development of an understanding of gender is achieved through an amalgamation of many social influences from our parents, education system, peers, mass media as well as others (Bandura & Bussey, 2004; Alsop, Fitzsimons, & Lennon, 2002).

However, Alsop et al. question the usefulness of this theory based on its failure to account for why there are differing forms of masculinity and femininity and also for neglecting the development of an explanation of how a gender role is acquired. Cognitive developmental theory of gender development emphasises that an understanding of gender forms earlier, suggesting that by age seven the most mature level of gender understanding has been achieved (i.e., that gender is permanent and invariant)(Bandura & Bussey). Helwig (1998) suggests that this means children have already gained an understanding of gender (i.e., by age 7) before they reach a point where their social experiences will influence them.

In reviewing such theoretical perspectives, it is clear that there is still much debate as to how this process occurs (see for example, Bandura & Bussy, 2004; Bussey & Bandura, 1999; Martin, Ruble, & Szkrybalo, 2002; Martin, Ruble, & Szkrybalo, 2004). Tenenbaum and Leaper's (2002) meta-analysis highlighted the potential importance of parents in developing traditional gender role beliefs. This demonstrated that parents who held more traditional gender schemas were more likely to have children who held gender typed beliefs about themselves when compared with parents who held more egalitarian beliefs. Though certainly of interest, it is important to point out that this does not constitute a causal relationship between parents' beliefs and their children's beliefs.

Since the way in which people perceive masculine and feminine roles should influence the interactions between people in society (e.g., between men and women but

not solely limited to this), these roles and beliefs are frequently utilised as an explanation for the negative perception of female rape victims (Scully, 1990). Ben-David and Schneider (2005) suggest that the process of gender role socialisation and the development of traditional gender role beliefs promote the formation of negative attitudes towards female victims of rape and negative stereotypes about rape and female rape victims. This may be particularly relevant when the woman is seen to violate the perceptions of an appropriate role for a woman (Harrison, Howerton, Secarea, & Nguyen, 2008). However, it is currently less clear how this perspective relates to men as victims of rape and as well to perpetrators of rape (see section 4.1.1.2 and 4.2).

4.1 Association with Victim Blaming

Burt (1980) conceptualised the 'Sex Role Socialization Analysis of Rape', which argues that through developmental processes and social prescriptions, the normative gender role behaviours for men and women during sexual interactions are developed. In many societies, within the expected role for men is that they be dominant, powerful, sexually aggressive, and able to gain sexual access to reluctant women. For women, the expected role is more passive including components of submission and yet controlling the extent of their sexual activity (Simonson & Subich, 1999). The socialisation process for men includes an understanding of the accessibility of females for sexual intercourse and the level of their own (i.e., male) sexual needs. The perceived difference in these levels between men and women therefore justifies the taking sexual fulfilment by force (Scully, 1990). Rape is therefore, an extreme, but normal extension of traditional gender roles and this male-female sexual interaction is not seen as deviant or pathological behaviour

(Burt, 1980). Lees (1997) also suggested that there is a very thin line between what is considered as 'normally' aggressive sexuality and rape. Male socialisation generally involves characteristics of dominance and control, which may lead to a level of coercion from men to force women to engage in sexual intercourse (see also Scully).

This perspective agrees with the feminist conceptualisation of rape, with Cuklanz (2000) arguing that stereotypes about rape have developed from traditional ideas where women are considered the property of their husbands and their pre-marriage value is determined by their chastity. Rape was therefore considered a theft either from the father or the husband of the woman. Rape is also conceptualised as being committed by men outside of the normal environment of male-female interactions. However, the feminist perspective suggests that rape benefits even the ordinary man as its role in society is to preserve male dominance. The patriarchal culture maintains a dominant role for men and a submissive position for women (Alsop et al., 2002; Anderson et al., 1997). When a woman does not maintain this socially proscribed role, they are perceived negatively for violating that role. This can lead to an acceptance of the use of force by men to dominate women sexually (Anderson et al.). Ryckman, Kaczor, and Thornton (1992) suggest that the socialisation process for women means that they are unable to prevent themselves from being raped because of the emphasis placed on being passive, deferential, and submissive to men. In being submissive to men, women are expected to engage in what is labelled 'token resistance'. This token resistance is also thought to occur because women are not supposed to express any interest in sexual activity (Frese et

al., 2004). This viewpoint is problematic as the connection between sexuality and male power means that sexuality, particularly heterosexuality, is considered oppressive as women serve only for male pleasure. This negates the enjoyment of sexuality for women and emphasises the dangers of sexual desire for women (Alsop et al.).

Other theoretical perspectives, for example the evolutionary perspective, have also underlined the importance of traditional sex role beliefs. This perspective emphasises the importance of faithfulness amongst wives to ensure that they do not become pregnant by another man. Therefore, a sexually promiscuous woman can be a target for sexual violence because she does not adhere to this principle (Anderson et al., 1997).

These theoretical perspectives (i.e., Burt's [1980] theory, the feminist and evolutionary perspective) are useful in understanding the socialisation process which leads to the adoption of beliefs about the appropriate roles for men and women. However, they do not encompass a view of men as a victim of rape and so is limited in its applicability to this type of victim.

4.1.1 Experimental research.

4.1.1.1 Female victims.

Research within this area has demonstrated contrary findings with relation to the influence of gender role traits and traditional gender role beliefs. This may be a result of the many different measures of gender role traits and gender role beliefs that have been

employed within this area. Hill and Fischer (2001) note the ambiguity in the literature regarding the importance of masculine gender role within victim blaming behaviours. However, given this point, the literature does seem to demonstrate an association between adhering to traditional gender role traits or gender role beliefs and an increased level of responsibility being attributed towards the victim.

With regards to the adoption of gender role traits, Quackenbush (1989), using the BSRI, found that participants who were classified as masculine or undifferentiated held more rape supportive beliefs than did androgynous participants. Whereas, Kopper (1996) found that female participants who were classified as androgynous were significantly more likely than other gender roles to believe that the rape could have been avoided when the time of initial resistance occurred later in the encounter suggesting a much more victim blaming stance. Murnen, Wright, and Kaluzny (2002) in a meta-analysis of masculine ideology and its association with sexual aggression found that the BSRI demonstrated small but significant effect sizes in relation to sexual aggression. However, Szymanski, Devlin, Chrisler, and Vyse (1993) and Golge et al. (2003) found no effect using the BSRI, in that the adoption of a traditional gender role (e.g., masculine or feminine) did not affect the level of responsibility attributed towards the female rape victim.

However, in establishing whether it might in fact be traditional gender role attitudes which are associated within victim blaming, some studies have shown that participants with traditional attitudes are found to blame the victim more (e.g., Willis,

1992) and to accept rape myths at a higher level (e.g., Anderson et al., 1997; Johnson et al., 1997; Shechory & Idisis, 2006; Truman, Tokar, & Fischer, 1996). Howard (1984b) found that those with more traditional gender role attitudes attributed more blame to a female than to a male rape victim, whereas participants with more egalitarian beliefs did not differ in their attributions of blame. However, Ryckman et al. (1992) found no significant difference between traditional and non-traditional participants in the level of responsibility attributed towards a rape victim (see also Ben-David & Schneider, 2005). Monson et al. (2000) found that participants were more likely to incorporate sex role expectations and rape supportive beliefs in judging an acquaintance rape scenario than when judging a stranger rape scenario. There was also a trend such that with increasing traditional sex role beliefs, there was a greater hesitancy in defining an acquaintance rape scenario as rape. Monson et al. suggest that this may be because acquaintance rape is more likely than stranger rape to be considered at the extreme end of a range of 'normal' male-female sexual interactions.

Using the Sex Role Egalitarianism Scale (SRES) as a measure of gender role traditionality, Simonson and Subich (1999) found that the SRES negatively correlated with victim blaming and seriousness of the situation measures. This meant that the more traditional a person was, the more likely the seriousness of the rape and the effects on the victim were minimised (see also Yamawaki & Tschanz, 2005). Simonson and Subich also found that gender did not add significantly to the prediction of rape perceptions beyond that already explained by gender role beliefs. The authors suggest that this may

mean that it is more important to focus on gender role beliefs than on gender itself.

Yamawaki (2007) found that gender role traditionality was a significant predictor only in a date rape scenario and not in a stranger rape scenario. This led Yamawaki to suggest that gender role traditionality may not have an effect in assessing a stranger rape scenario because the victim would not be violating any traditional gender roles.

4.1.1.2 Male victims.

With regards to male victims of rape, gender role beliefs may function to increase victim blaming regarding this type of victim. As White and Yamawaki (2009) note, gender role traditionality may explain the negative perception of male rape victims because of the association between male rape and homosexuality (see Jones, 2000 and also section regarding male rape myths). Homosexuality is considered, by those with traditional gender role beliefs, to be a violation of and therefore may increase the level of blaming towards male victims of rape (Jones). Also, since the masculine gender role is expected to be independent, assertive, dominant and competitive in social and sexual relations (Hetherington & Parke, 1993), the role of a man as a victim of rape runs counter to these gender role beliefs. This may explain why male victims of rape can be behaviourally blamed more than female victims of rape (e.g., Davies et al., 2001; Howard, 1984a). Anderson and Lyons (2005) found that victim blaming was negatively related to attitudes towards gender role. This study also found in a mediation analysis with attitude towards gender role as a covariate, that participant gender no longer had a significant effect on victim blaming. These authors suggested that although men and women differ in their

perception of victim blaming, this is primarily because of their differing gender role attitudes.

Gender role stereotypes support the viewpoint that men control sexual behaviour, thus reinforcing the idea that a man cannot be a victim of rape as a form of non-consensual intercourse (Donnelly & Kenyon, 1996). Kassing et al. (2005) suggest that in relation to negative stereotypes about male rape victims, whilst there are no well developed theories, beliefs about gender roles are likely to explain many of the myths and stereotypes held about male victims of rape. In one of the few studies examining gender role beliefs and attitudes towards male victims of rape, White and Yamawaki (2009), using the SRES, found that as gender role traditionality increased, the minimisation of the rape increased within the acquaintance rape scenario. This was not found for the stranger rape scenario. This study draws parallels with Yamawaki (2007) who suggested that effects may not be found in stranger rape conditions because the victim is not perceived to be violating any traditional gender role.

4.2 Association with Rape Perpetrator Blaming

As stated above, a majority of the research in this area has focussed solely on victims of rape. However, Anderson and Lyons (2005) suggest that gender role beliefs may lead to male perpetrators of rape being held less responsible for committing rape, particularly when the victim is male. This may be because of the perception that male victims should be better able to resist male rape or that there is less sympathy attributed towards men in a non-dominant role (i.e., as a victim). However, they found no

relationship between attitudes towards gender role and the extent that the perpetrator was held to blame. Using the SRES, Yamawaki (2007) found that gender role traditionality predicted excusing the rapist in the dating scenario but not in the stranger rape scenario. As noted above, this may question the effect of gender role beliefs in assessing stranger rape.

Using the BSRI, Riedel (1993) found that participants categorised as feminine or androgynous were more likely to give the perpetrator a guilty verdict in a mock rape case than were other gender roles. In a more recent study, Golge et al. (2003) found that female participants with a masculine gender role, when compared with females with an undifferentiated gender role, supported a more severe punishment for the perpetrator.

4.2.1 Summary.

Given the quite limited research within this area, it is somewhat unclear as to the influence of gender role traits or gender role beliefs in relation to attitudes towards rape victims, in particular male victims. Recent research by Yamawaki and colleagues has suggested an important role for traditional gender role beliefs, particularly in cases of acquaintance rape, but not so in stranger rape. Simonson and Subich (1999) also suggest that a measure of gender role traditionality is much more comprehensive than previous research which has focussed solely on measures of masculine and feminine ideology. However, the previous theoretical research has strongly emphasised the importance of the masculine and feminine gender role in determining the responses of individuals towards rape victims. According to this, rape victims can be seen to be blamed for their

victimisation if they do not fulfil the proscribed role as defined by society. This provides a strong argument for examining both gender role traits and traditional gender role attitudes within this thesis.

5 Rape and the Criminal Justice System

From the literature discussed above, it is clear that blaming attitudes towards the victim exist (Buddie & Miller, 2002). It is therefore somewhat unsurprising that such attitudes may also be held by relevant professionals who come into contact with rape victims, for example the police (Jackson, Witte, & Petretic-Jackson, 2001). This section will discuss the literature regarding the responses that rape victims can encounter when reporting their rape, as well as the limited prior research assessing police officers' and legal professionals' attitudes about rape and rape victims.

5.1 Research involving Rape Victims

Historically, rape victims have been treated poorly by the criminal justice system as a whole (Caringella, 2009). In the 1980s, the public perception of the treatment of rape victims by the police was epitomised within the BBC television series "Police" where, in one episode, an alleged rape victim was subjected to aggressive questioning and disbelieving attitudes by three detectives (British Film Institute Screenonline, 2003). Though much has improved in the U.K. during the following years, with regard to both the police and court systems, there are still considerable problems surrounding the crime of rape. The underreporting of rape remains very high with current estimates, in England and Wales, suggesting that 87-95% of all rapes (both male and female victims) are not reported to the police (HMCPSI/HMIC, 2007). This is a trend repeated within the United States where Kolivas and Gross (2007) state that sexual victimisation is the most underreported violent crime (see also Clay-Warner & Burt, 2005; Kaukinen, 2002). However, Clay-Warner and Burt found that a rape is much more likely to be reported

following reforms to the legal system (than it was pre-1975) which suggests that improvements within policing and/or criminal justice system may be encouraging more rape victims to report their victimisation.

There is evidence to suggest that certain types of rape are more likely than others to be reported by rape victims. For example, Du Mont, Miller, and Myhr (2003) found, in an analysis of female victims, that a victim suffering physical injuries or the perpetrator using physical force increased the likelihood of reporting to the police. Campbell, Wasco, Ahrens, Sefl, and Barnes (2001) found that female rape victims raped by a stranger were much more likely to report their rape to the police. Finally, Clay-Warner and Burt (2005) found that female victims of aggravated rape were seven times more likely to report their rape than victims of simple rape (see Estrich, 1987 for definitions of types of rape). As their study involved examining cases over a lengthy period of time, Clay-Warner and Burt were also able to conclude that this was an effect that had not changed over time. This suggests an influence of the 'real' rape stereotype whereby victims compare their victimisation to this stereotype when making the decision whether or not to report their rape. Similarly, Addington and Rennison (2008) found in a sample of female victims, that if additional crimes occurred when a rape was committed, the rape was much more likely to be reported to the police and that such co-occurrence was one of the strongest predictors of the crime being cleared by the police. Addington and Rennison suggest that it may be that both rape victims and the police are adhering to the 'real' rape stereotypes.

Where a rape occurs with an additional crime, this legitimises the rape as an actual rape worthy of being both reported by the victim and investigated by the police.

Hodge and Canter (1998) carried out a study which compared a sample of male rape victims who self-reported their attack after being recruited via voluntary groups and the UK national press with a sample of male rape victim data gathered from police reports. Within the police sample data, the majority of victims were identified as heterosexual, with only 25% of the sample reporting knowing their assailant for more than 24 hours, and 39% of the cases identified as stranger sexual assaults. These findings were statistically significantly different from those found in the self-report questionnaires where the distribution of victims' sexuality was much more even between heterosexual and homosexual, 51% of the sample knew their victims for more than 24 hours, and 22% were identified as stranger rapes. The results of this study suggest that there are in fact two types of male sexual assault: the first is sexual assault carried out by heterosexual men who target any man regardless of sexuality which tends to be stranger attacks. The second type is carried out by homosexual men usually within an acquaintance rape framework. Given these differences between police data and self-report data, Hodge and Canter suggest that official data can obscure these cases of acquaintance rape in male victims.

Davies (2002) suggests that male rape might actually be quite common but that reporting to the police or other agencies is relatively rare. A point reiterated by Walker et

al. (2005, p.69) who note “few male rapes appear in police files and other official records”. A number of studies suggest that out of their samples, only very small numbers of the male rape victims report their rape to the police (e.g., Coxell et al., 1999; Isely & Gehrenbeck-Shim, 1997; Mezey & King, 1989). Groth and Burgess (1980) note that the many existing stereotypes could well impact on men’s decisions to report their rape as much as they do for female victims of rape. Groth and Burgess list three factors which they believe contribute towards male rape victims’ decisions to not report their victimisation to the police: societal beliefs that men should be able to defend themselves against sexual assault, that the victim’s sexuality will be questioned, and that telling someone is upsetting and distressing. Rentoul and Applebloom (1997) also emphasised these factors in the underreporting of male rape but added that the belief that men should be self-reliant and so should not have to seek help following victimisation may also impact on a victim’s decision to not report to the police (see also Vearnals & Campbell, 2001).

Pino and Meier (1999) compared male and female rape victims’ reporting behaviour. Female victims were found to be one and a half more times likely to report their crime to the police when compared with male victims. For females, their rape was more likely to be reported if the offender was a stranger (twice as likely), if something was stolen (four times as likely), and if the victim required medical attention (three times as likely). Pino and Meier believe that given these results women are more likely to report their rape when it conforms to the stereotypical idea of 'real' rape. For men the findings

differed in that the two factors which increased the likelihood of reporting were injuries suffered by the victim (increased likelihood of reporting by five times) and the need to seek medical help (increased the likelihood of reporting by eight times). Pino and Meier suggest that men are more likely to report in these situations because the physical injuries that they sustain and the medical help that they need demonstrate that they resisted the rape and were overpowered by the perpetrator.

One of the problems with receiving negative treatment from the criminal justice system is the impact that this can have on rape victim recovery. In the U.S., Campbell et al. (2001) found that experiences with the legal system were perceived to be hurtful by just over half of the women (52%), with victims whose cases were not prosecuted more likely to consider the experience as hurtful. They also found that victims who did not have their cases prosecuted were found to suffer higher psychological and physiological health distress. Similarly, Kaukinen and DeMaris (2009) found that police reporting seemed to exacerbate the impact of sexual assault, increasing the levels of depression reported. However, these relationships must be interpreted cautiously because certain types of rape are more likely to be reported to the police (Du Mont et al., 2003). It may be that these types of rapes are associated with more significant long-term effects (Kaukinen & DeMaris).

5.2 Attrition within the Criminal Justice System

The process of case attrition within criminal justice systems has, in particular, become focussed upon within the psychological literature and in government policy. In

the U.K., the HMCPSI/HMIC (2007) report highlights the many exits from the criminal justice system that a rape report can make. Prior to several changes in the way official decision making is made in rape cases, Lea, Lanvers, and Shaw (2003) identified four main points at which rape cases can drop out of the criminal justice process (i) police must decide to record the case as an offence or 'no-crime it', (ii) police must decide whether to refer the case to the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) or take no further action (NFA), (iii) CPS may decide whether to prosecute the defendant or take NFA, and (iv) the jury must decide to convict the defendant or not. Lea et al. found that 61% of their sample of reported rapes between 1996-2000 were NFA-ed either by the police or the CPS. Of the remaining 39%, 10% were pending, 11% were no-crimed, in 7% the victim refused to assist the inquiry or retracted the allegation, and 11% resulted in some type of conviction. In only 5% (i.e. 19 out of 379 cases) was there a conviction for rape. Attrition rates were found to be very high in cases where the victim would be considered 'vulnerable' (e.g., learning disabled or psychiatric difficulties) and also where alcohol/drugs were involved. With respect to male victims which were also included in this sample, the authors suggested that this group remains underrepresented and possibly disadvantaged by current practice within the criminal justice system, with probable underreporting of this crime. Overall, in England and Wales, detection rates for rape have dropped significantly from 78% in 1997 to 31% in 2003/4 (Feist et al., 2007, using a sample of female rapes).

One of the most recent studies examining attrition within England and Wales was carried out by Kelly, Lovatt, and Regan (2005) analysing a sample of both male and female

victims of rape. This found that a considerable number of cases were being no-crimes at the initial investigation stages (approximately 25%). In addition to these no-crimes cases, the majority of cases were not progressing beyond the initial investigative stage. The reasons for these cases not progressing were numerous but comparisons can be drawn with the earlier Lea et al. (2003) study in that cases with a vulnerable victim (i.e., due to learning difficulties) were more likely to not progress beyond the initial investigative stage. In a third of such cases lost at this initial stage of investigation, the victim withdrew or declined to continue with the investigation. Reported reasons for this were a fear of being disbelieved and a fear of the criminal justice process ahead of them should they continue the complaint. Overall, the conviction rate within this study was 8%, with Kelly et al. reporting a culture of suspicion in both the police and Crown Prosecution Service which can result in a loss of confidence by the victim in the process they are going through or considering going through.

This trend of attrition is also apparent within the United States. Campbell (1998) analysed data provided by a sample of rape advocates on the most recent rape case that they had worked with. This study identified, through cluster analysis, the characteristics associated with progression through the criminal justice system. The first cluster contained 32% of the sample where the majority of the cases progressed to a court trial (though not necessarily under a rape charge). However, two thirds of the victims were not satisfied with the trial outcome even though the majority of assailants were likely to receive prison sentences in this cluster. Though many of this group experienced difficult

interactions with many of the service providers (from police, medical, and legal personnel), Campbell noted that this cluster of victims experienced the best outcomes in comparison with other clusters. The second cluster included the largest number of the sample (39%). For this cluster, the majority of the victims wanted their cases to progress through the legal system, however this did not occur or the cases did not progress very far through the system. Only 8% of the cases were charged in comparison with 89% in the previous cluster. The final cluster involved high levels of advocacy, for example, the rape advocates had to intervene more to ensure that cases progressed through the legal system. This cluster was characterised by the cases progressing further than cluster two but still not as well as the first cluster. There were often instances where cases fell apart within the court trial or where plea bargaining occurred. This meant that only 39% of the victims were satisfied with the court outcome.

Campbell (1998) also carried out further analyses of these data which showed that victims who were raped by someone whom they knew and/or without the use of a weapon increased the likelihood that the case would drop out of the legal system. Furthermore, where cases involved the victim consuming alcohol, involvement within the legal system was also likely to not progress to a satisfactory end from the victim's point of view. These analyses led Campbell to conclude that for rape victims to receive a satisfactory response from legal, medical, and mental health services, certain characteristics of the victim, the assault, and the community must be in alignment. Any deviation from what Campbell describes as a narrow path means that the number of

services reduces and victim satisfaction was subsequently lessened. It appears that the legal system is the least forgiving with these deviations, whereby cases that do not conform quickly fall out of the system.

A later study by Campbell et al. (2001) found that of those female victims who did report their victimisation to the criminal justice system, many experienced considerable difficulties with only 25% of the cases being prosecuted. Assaults that fitted a real rape scenario (e.g., weapon used, injury sustained by the victim) were more likely to result in a prosecution. Eighty per cent of the cases prosecuted were stranger rapes.

Against this background of high levels of attrition, within England and Wales the government developed a new policy regarding rape within the criminal justice system. This policy has included changes such as Crown Prosecutors making decisions about whether a defendant should be charged with rape rather than the police making this decision, changes in the definitions of some sexual offences via the Sexual Offences Act (2003), as well as new guidance for the Crown Prosecution Service and the Police Service in investigating and prosecuting cases of rape (HMCPSI/HMIC, 2007). As these changes are only beginning to be fully utilised, it will be interesting to see if this improves the attrition rate for rape.

5.3 Research within the Police

Considering the impact that the police response can have on rape victims, there has been very little research examining police behaviour and attitudes towards rape

(Frazier & Haney, 1996). Indeed Page (2008, p. 45) notes that “research assessing police officers’s attitudes toward rape has been sparse in the last thirty years”. Lonsway, Welch, and Fitzgerald (2001) contend that the police are often considered the key determinant of the type of response that the rape victim will receive. These authors also note the lack of research on police attitudes as well as a limited understanding the impact of specialist training.

Edward and MacLeod (1999, U.K. based study) suggest there is evidence which supports the viewpoint that a police officer’s belief in a female rape victim’s allegation is based in their own individual beliefs about rape (see also Schuller & Stewart, 2000 for a U.S. perspective). Krahe (1991) asked German police officers to apply a feature list to the description of six possible female rape scenarios (only two, credible and dubious, will be described here as they are most relevant). Police officers’ definition of a credible rape included a victim aged between 20-40, non-distinctive dress, engaged in physical resistance, incurs serious psychological consequences, no alcohol involved, minor injuries to the victim who tried to escape, and communicated with the assailant. The perpetrator was also described as aged 20-40, had occasional sexual experience, was psychologically disturbed, slight alcohol drinking involved, threatened the victim with physical violence, used a weapon, and was of average physical size. The circumstances of the rape were outdoors, with no witnesses, where the victim and perpetrator did not know each other, and at night where the victim thinks they could recognise the assailant. Interestingly, the description of the dubious rape differed significantly from the credible rape description in

that the victim was described as being aged greater than 40, wearing non-distinctive dress, not engaging in either verbal or physical resistance, only slight psychological consequences, heavily drunk, no injuries, no attempt to escape and communicated with the assailant. The assailant was described as being aged 20-40, non-distinctive dress, not psychologically disturbed, no criminal record, heavily drunk, did not threaten the victim, did not use a weapon, and was of weak physical size. The location was described as being in the victim's/perpetrator's home, with no witnesses, where the victim and perpetrator knew each other, at night, and where the victim could identify the perpetrator. These prototypes may be problematic as they do not match what occurs in most rapes. For example, research on U.S. samples of female rape victims has demonstrated that weapons are only very rarely used in rapes, that physical resistance is only engaged in by about a quarter of all rape victims, only a third of victims sustain injuries, and victims are much more likely to be raped by someone whom they know (Ullman, 1996, 2007). The differences between the reality of rape and the prototypes held by this sample of police officers may well be problematic in the treatment of rape victims.

Campbell and Johnson (1997) asked a sample of 91 U.S. police officers how they define rape (at this point, the U.S. definition of rape was gender specific with only females as victims of rape). A cluster analysis of the themes that emerged from the police officers' definitions found three clusters of definitions. The first cluster (representing 31% of the sample) defined rape by penetration and by the lack of consent. The second cluster (representing 19% of the sample) involved a slightly more complex definition of rape

which involved penetration, the use of force, and threat of force. However, the issue of consent was not mentioned so frequently by these officers. For the third cluster (50% of the sample), the focus was on penetration, rape as a sexual act, and consent. This study showed that police officers' personal definitions of rape can differ from those ascribed by law. In addition, Galton (1975) demonstrated that U.S. female police officers can be more disbelieving or suspicious of rape allegations than male counterparts with higher demands placed upon the victim (e.g., in terms of resistance behaviours) than male counterparts. In comparison, Page (2007) found that U.S. male police officers endorsed rape myths at a higher level than female police officers.

Experimental research has demonstrated that police judgments of credibility can be affected by victim characteristics. For example, Bollingmo, Wessel, Eilertsen, and Magnussen (2008) found that credibility ratings by the police are affected by the emotions displayed by the female victim when giving their statement. Highest credibility ratings were given to the congruent (negative emotion displayed, upset victim) victim and the lowest were given to the incongruent (positive emotions displayed, relaxed victim) victim. When the witness presents negative emotions and is upset, this matches the stereotypical beliefs that people can hold about victims of rape and potentially strengthens the impression that the allegation of rape is therefore credible. This effect was also found in other populations such as lay persons and judges. Also, Davies, Smith, and Rogers (2009) demonstrated that a sample of U.K. police workers (comprised 65% of

police officers) were more victim blaming of a scenario depicting a male victim than a scenario depicting a female victim.

Koppelaar, Lange, and van de Velde (1997) examined, in the Netherlands, judgments made by law students and by detectives working in the vice squad. Irrespective of any kind of information given regarding the credibility of the victim (positive, negative, or neutral), participants' attributions of responsibility were related to their stereotypical beliefs about rape. The greater the stereotypical belief, the more responsibility was attributed to the victim and less responsibility to the perpetrator. There was a positive relationship between the participants' estimates of the number of false rape crime reports and the responsibility being attributed to the victim. Law students showed more bias than police officers, with police officers being more sympathetic to the victim, less stereotypical in their view of rape, and more severe in their judgement of the perpetrator.

As noted above, the initial reporting rate is of concern, however also problematic is the evidence that of those rapes which are reported to the police between 50-66% will not proceed beyond any initial investigation stage. Jordan (2004) notes that subjective judgments are being made about rape victims' credibility by the police (a point also emphasised by the recent HMCPSI/HMIC [2007] report), with a focus on appraisals of the victim's characteristics and culpability. Jordan notes a tendency on the part of the police to view rape victims' behaviour through a narrow perspective which does not allow for

alternative interpretations or explanations. This focus is not assisted by some investigating officers' approach to rape victims with a way of thinking which emphasises suspicion and disbelief (Jordan). This is reflected in the beliefs of rape victims who report being particularly concerned about expected negative treatment by the police which can result in the rape victim deciding not to report the crime to the police (Winkel & Vrij, 1993). Research by Jordan (2001) in New Zealand suggests this may not be a misplaced concern. This study compared earlier interview data with more recent interviews in which female rape victims discussed their experiences with the criminal justice system. The study found that little of substance had changed over the years in the experience of women reporting rape to the police. Women reporting in the 1990s were as likely to report encountering negative attitudes as were those in the early 1980s. Also, there was a lack of consistency in the quality of response that the complainants received. Two thirds of the victims felt some level of satisfaction with the treatment that they received from the police during the initial reporting stage. However, 15% of the victims reported that after their experience with the police, they would not encourage others to report their rape to the police. This study also noted another aspect of police interactions with victims, which polarised the victims' opinion, was their courtroom preparation. Some victims believed that they were not briefed properly on what to expect in court and thus felt unprepared for the negative tactics used by defence lawyers. Other rape victims reported that being briefed on the potential negative experience of court left them feeling like they were being discouraged to continue with their case. This reinforced a perception that their allegation was not believed by the police (Jordan).

Jordan (2008), again in New Zealand, followed up this research with a later sample of female victims who rated the police responses much more positively. This was a particular set of victims who had all been attacked by a serial rapist. Jordan found that these victims conformed more to the 'ideal' rape victim stereotypes (in that they did not know their attacker and the rapes often involved violence) which may be one reason why the victims reported higher levels of satisfaction. However, the rape victims' police experiences were not always positive. One victim related an incident that occurred at a police station.

"About three days after it happened I was up at the station talking with (the detectives) and they turned around and said 'come on Kathleen, we know you are making this up. We know you were having an affair and you were having sex that morning and it all got a bit rough and you made all this up so your husband doesn't find out'" (Jordan, 2008, p. 56)

This clearly demonstrates the presence of rape stereotypes and how these may be used by the police to discredit the rape victim.

With regards to male rape, Walker et al. (2005) found that, in a sample of 40 U.K. men who had been raped, five reported their rapes to the police. One man said that the police were helpful whereas the remaining four reported negative reactions such as

homophobia and disinterest. Only one case resulted in a conviction and the victim reported a very negative experience in court where he was made to feel to blame for what had happened to him. In the other four cases, the police did not press charges. Kimerling et al. (2002, U.S. study) in a review of cases reported to a rape treatment centre found that 49% of the cases involving male victims were reported to the police. This high level of reporting may be because while victims were treated at the centre, forensic evidence was also gathered. The nature of this may mean that more people felt encouraged to report their rape.

Findings from Maier (2008) suggest that the police may pose questions when interviewing victims, which can be interpreted in a victim blaming way (e.g., questioning about the clothing the victim was wearing, use of alcohol/drugs, previous sexual history, and resistance employed during the rape). This U.S. study gathered data from rape advocates who suggested that police interviewers are impersonal and distance themselves emotionally from the victim. This can lead to a lack of sensitivity on the part of the police. However, as Jordan (2001) notes, a police investigation has a focus on evidence gathering (because rape is so difficult to prove) which may mean that the police do not often have the time to empathise with rape victims. Jordan concludes there is considerable tension between victim needs and police procedures for investigating rape cases. The police focus on the investigation and arresting a perpetrator may mean that the needs of the victim are not be recognised.

In comparison, Coughlin (2008) looked at suspect interview techniques used by U.S. investigators in cases of rape. Coughlin states that the literature from certain interrogation manuals suggests that one of the most efficient ways to ensure a confession is achieved from a suspect is by telling them victim blaming stories. These stories shift the 'moral' blame from the suspect to the victim. Interrogators replace the use of the word rape by using other terms such as 'problem', 'trouble', 'misunderstanding'. This reduces the impact of the situation and allows suspects to engage in 'face-saving' by which they can offer explanations for the rape occurring (e.g., the victim was wearing provocative clothing). Interrogators themselves argue that they are not introducing victim blaming narratives because they support them, but rather by introducing these themes to suspects allows the investigator to lull rape suspects into a false sense of security. However, Coughlin argues that by using these stories, interrogators are still reinforcing stereotypical attitudes that may lead some men to commit rape, that cause victims to not report their rape, and make it difficult for the criminal justice system to achieve convictions for all but the most violent of rape cases. Coughlin believes that the police should stop using these victim blaming narratives because they reinforce sexist attitudes on the part of the police officers, on the part of the suspects, and ultimately on the part of the public.

Within England and Wales, police officers who deal with rape victims are currently called Specially Trained Officers (STOs). However, previously these officers were also called Sexual Offences Investigation Trained Officers (SOITs) and can still be called this in some force areas. Very little is known about the impact of police training and any

resulting effect on police attitudes and behaviour towards rape victims within England and Wales. Indeed, very little is known about the content of police training in specialising to work with rape victims. However, it is understood that the focus of this specialist police training is on forensic medical examination and interviewing skills (Cheshire Constabulary, 2009). Lonsway et al. (2001) carried out one of the few known evaluations of police officer training within the United States and found that training did not affect rape myth acceptance. In addition, Page (2007) found that police officers (in the U.S.) who were experienced in working on rape investigations (defined as having investigated 21 or more rape investigations) accepted rape myths at a lower level compared to police officers who were inexperienced in carrying out rape investigations (defined as five or fewer cases). These findings suggest that although training may not alter the endorsement of stereotypes about rape, experience in dealing with rape cases may in fact lower adherence to rape myths. In this thesis, the research in this area will be developed examining the role of training and experience and its effects on police officer attitudes.

The above review casts a negative light with regard to the police response to rape victims. However, attitudes gathered from some rape victims suggest that they held generally positive attitudes towards the police that they encountered, with them disagreeing with statements that suggest that the detectives blamed them for their victimisation (Frazier & Haney, 1996). This viewpoint is supported by Lea et al. (2003) who found that many police officers did seem able to empathise with rape victims. Maier (2008) also argues that the nature of rape may be one reason why rape victims can end

up with very differing attitudes towards the police. As rape is so traumatic, a police officer who responds well and sympathetically is very quickly appreciated whereas negative attitudes demonstrated can have a devastating effect (Jordan, 2001). Brown, Hamilton, and O'Neill (2007, U.K. sample) argue that any prejudicial attitudes demonstrated by the police were not more prejudicial or stereotypical than the lay public's attitudes towards rape victims. Therefore, police officers do not hold a more negative view of rape victims than the general public but instead hold similarly negative attitudes that have been demonstrated to be accepted within society. There does, however, seem to be a small minority of officers with traditional views about rape and rape victims (i.e., showing less sympathy towards rape victims and being more likely to doubt their report of rape). It seemed that such officers still seemed to believe that women 'cry rape' in order to seek attention (Lea et al.).

5.4 Research within the Legal System

The treatment of rape within the court system has also been highlighted as problematic. The studies reviewed below largely relate to female cases of rape within the legal system. However, a standard response by some defence teams is to attack the credibility of the victim by suggesting that in some way the victim asked for what happened to them and were responsible for getting themselves raped (Jordan, 2008). The credibility of the rape victim can, therefore, become the focus of the trial rather than the assessment of the guilt/innocence of the perpetrator (Jordan). Any stereotypical beliefs presented to the court by legal personnel may be used to undermine the position and credibility of the victim as well as influencing perceptions of the victim's culpability

and blame (Krahe, Temkin, Bieneck, & Berger, 2008). HMCPSP/HMIC (2007) highlights the influence that the Crown Prosecution Service (in England and Wales) can have on a victim, in that should the victim receive poor treatment by the courts, this could easily be interpreted as disbelief of the allegation or as blame being attributed towards the victim. However, Edward and MacLeod (1999, U.K. study) suggest that the attrition which occurs within rape cases may partly be because of the burden of proof required by the court system. The level of proof of beyond reasonable doubt may not be met in many sexual assault and rape cases (e.g., because of issues establishing consent) which may mean that decisions are made not to progress with the cases, even though both the prosecution and police may believe the rape victim to be a credible victim.

However, similar to the progression of cases through the police investigation stage, some research suggests that only some types of rape cases progress through the court system. Harris and Grace (1999) found that female rape cases involving known assailants were most likely to not progress through to a court trial, with cases involving intimates being the most likely to be discontinued by the Crown Prosecution Service. Interestingly, where a suspect was identified in a stranger rape cases, this type of case was much more likely to progress to a court trial than a case of intimate/acquaintance rape (where it is assumed the suspect would be known)(see also Frazier & Haney, 1996, U.S. based, female sample).

Assessing the attitudes of mock jurors has shown that they can be influenced by rape myths presented within judges' summing up. Gray (2006, U.K. study) examined the influence of mock judges' summing up, in a female rape case, with three conditions: supporting rape myths, anti rape myths, and neutral. This study found that those mock jurors who received supporting rape myths were more confident of the defendant's innocence compared to those who received anti rape myths. Those participants who had high rape myth acceptance were also more likely to be confident that the defendant was innocent compared to those participants with low rape myth acceptance. Finch and Munro (2005, U.K. study) presented jurors with a vignette scenario in which a female victim was raped by a male perpetrator. This study assessed juror stereotypes about intoxicants and rape and found that many potential real life jurors held attitudes which were inconsistent with the correct application of the law. Jurors were also found to emphasise factors which were extra-legal such as the sexual history of the victim and character of the victim (e.g., did the victim regularly drink to excess?) This is particularly problematic with regards to the application of these findings to real-life jury court cases.

Other studies have looked at the language used in real judges' summing up or judgments. Coates and Wade (2004, Canadian study) found that judges can often mitigate the responsibility for the rape away from the perpetrator, particularly when discussing the three main themes that they found: alcohol/drug use, sexual drive attributions, and psychopathology. This can result in responsibility being attributed towards the victim, a reduction of responsibility attributed towards the perpetrator, and

conceal the violence of rape. Similarly, Bavelas and Coates (2001, Canadian) analysed the language presented in court judgements and found five main categories of language used. Firstly, sexual language described the acts involved in the rape within affectionate parameters perhaps trying to emphasise the consensual nature of the act. Secondly, violent language was used to describe the act as an assault. Such language emphasised the lack of consent on the part of the victim and the forced and non-consensual nature of the act. Thirdly, physical descriptions were used to describe (without sexual or violent connotations) the position of body parts. Fourthly, disapproving words were used to emphasise this act as counter to social and moral expectations. The fifth category was where the description included some combination of the previous categories. The authors quantified the frequency of these descriptions and assessed the differences in cases where the defendant was found guilty compared to those where the defendant was found not-guilty; this found no statistically significant differences in the types of language used in such cases. However, the authors conclude that there was a strong trend for the judges' language to be sexual in nature which emphasises consensuality on the part of victim. The authors suggest that this is problematic because it conceals the violence of the act of rape. Using affectionate terms is counter to the nature of rape as an unwanted and coerced violation. Both of these actions serve to minimise the seriousness of rape in itself (Bavelas & Coates).

Furthermore, McCormick, Maric, Seto, and Barbaree (1998, Canadian study) found that within the legal system, the defendant's relationship to the victim affected sentence

length in cases of sexual assault. Stranger rapists received longer sentences than acquaintance rapists even though there were no appreciable differences between the offences. It could be that judges, similarly to ordinary people, may be affected by common misperceptions of rape victims. However, a potential backlash from this is that the sentencing of rapists may in turn influence societal perceptions of the seriousness of the crime. Acquaintance rapists being given lesser sentences may well influence society's view of this crime (which influences sentencing) including the seriousness of rape and blame attributions (McCormick et al.). Frazier and Haney (1996) also found that defendants in stranger rape cases were twice as likely to be found guilty and when found guilty received longer prison sentences when compared with acquaintance rape cases.

As noted by Krahe et al. (2008, Germany study), there are very few studies which have examined the attitudes of professionals who come into contact with rape victims. Temkin (2000, U.K. study) was one of the few studies which was able to access legal professionals. This study examined the attitudes and perceptions of barristers who had considerable experience in both prosecuting and defending rape cases. Victim blaming attitudes were evident in some of the comments made, where victims were seen to be partly responsible for being raped/to blame for what happened to them. This was particularly linked to the victim's behaviour at the time of the rape and also her previous sexual character. For example, one barrister stated

“I mean the silly woman is prepared to be picked up by a stranger and go back for, quotes, coffee, you know, what does she expect? If a woman does that, can she really be surprised that a jury will say that she may have consented to sex?” (Temkin, 2000, p.225).

Also, when prosecuting rape, besmirching the behaviour of the victim at the time of the rape was seen as integral to cross-examination. This was based in an attempt to ensure that the jury focussed upon the behaviour of the victim which was emphasised as blameworthy and foolish. This was particularly evident when considering the consent of the victim. It was often suggested to juries that the way in which the victim had behaved implied that she had consented, or that the perpetrator could have thought that the victim had given consent. This was especially linked with some of the barristers’ attitudes about rape victims and victims’ lack of usage of common sense. This ‘common sense behaviour’ meant for women that they should understand the primacy of men’s sexual urges and understand, that if women behave inappropriately, they were to blame when men sought the natural gratification of these urges. Temkin (2000) suggests that codes of ‘appropriate’ behaviour for women still play a central role in rape trials. Given this circumstance, it is not surprising that many rape victims may still choose not to report their victimisation.

Given the additional role that the Crown Prosecution Service now has in deciding whether or not to charge rape cases (HMCPSI/HMIC, 2007), researching the perception of

legal professionals has become much more relevant. However, access to such samples can be very problematic which is why prospective lawyers may present any ideal group to research attitudes towards rape victim. Krahe et al. (2008), utilising a sample of law students found that the less similar a scenario was to a 'real' rape scenario, the less the students attributed liability to the defendant, whilst increasing the attributions of blame towards the complainant. Higher rape myth acceptance was also associated with lower defendant liability and increased victim blaming.

When examining cases of male rape within the court system, Rumney (2001, U.K. study) highlights that similar to female rape cases, several tactics are used by defence counsel within the courtroom. This includes using (involuntary) bodily responses such as an erection or orgasm as demonstrating consent of the victim as well as questioning the victim's past sexual history and associations with homosexuality. The lack of physical resistance can be highlighted, which does not recognise the fact that many rape victims (men and women) freeze and thus are unable to resist (Ullman, 1996, U.S. study; Walker et al., 2005, U.K. study). For male rape victims, Rentoul and Applebloom (1997) report that a freezing reaction is associated with greater levels of shame, guilt, and humiliation because of the cultural stereotype that men should be able to defend themselves. Rumney argues that the stereotypical perception of how a 'real' rape victim behaves are being used in male rape trials (as well as female rape trials) and that it is these stereotypes which can be most problematic.

5.5 Summary

This section has clearly highlighted the impact that the 'real' rape stereotype can have on rape cases and victims within the criminal justice system. The literature reviewed here suggests there is a vicious circle in that rape victims are less likely to report their rape if it does not conform to the stereotypical view of rape. This means that the majority of cases which the criminal justice system deals with conform to the stereotypical view, which in turns confirms the stereotypical view of rape held by criminal justice personnel. The value of researching perceptions of rape victims should be in highlighting this role of rape stereotypes, particularly those held by people who come into contact with victims of rape (e.g., police and legal professionals). It is also clear that prior research has not adequately explored the role of police attitudes particularly those held by officers who are trained to deal with rape victims.

(Please note that the Research Questions are placed after the methodological review).

6 Methodological Review

This chapter will review the main measures which have been used in measuring the concepts discussed in the previous chapters. This will include a review of measures of victim and perpetrator blaming relating to both male and female victims of rape, male and female rape myth acceptance, belief in a just world, and measures of gender role traits and gender role attitudes. As well as this, there will be a brief discussion of the utility of the vignette within rape perception research and a discussion of the use of online questionnaires in sensitive research areas.

6.1 Measures

6.1.1 Victim and perpetrator blaming.

There have been few standardised measures of victim or perpetrator blaming developed within this research area, with the majority of researchers developing their own measures (e.g., Davies et al., 2001). In developing these individualised questionnaires, there are a number of questionnaire items which have been used across the research area. It is common-place (and also self-explanatory) that these scales contain an item which assesses the measure of blaming attributed towards the victim e.g., “How much do you blame [*victim name*] for what happened (see Abrams et al., 2003; Brems & Wagner, 1994; Davies & McCartney, 2003; Gerber et al., 2004; Viki & Abrams, 2002) Blaming towards the victim or perpetrator is also assessed using similar wording with the descriptors “fault” and “responsibility” (e.g., Davies et al., 2001; Frese et al., 2004; Brown & Testa, 2008; Harrison et al., 2008; Maurer & Robinson, 2008). Other items used within blaming scales assess how much control the victim or perpetrator have over

the situation e.g., “How much control do you think [*victim name*] had over the situation” (Ben-David & Schneider, 2005; Krahe et al., 2008); whether the situation could be avoided (Abrams et al., 2003; Krahe et al., 2007); and how much sympathy is felt for the victim (Abrams et al., 2003; Viki et al., 2004). Ben-David and Schneider (2005) have also assessed victim responsibility using items which ask participants to assess how sexually provocative was the victim and how much the victim desired sexual intercourse (see also Davies, Rogers, & Bates, 2008). Victim responsibility has also been measured through items which examine whether the victim was flirting with the perpetrator or/and was leading the perpetrator on (e.g., Davies et al., 2009; Sims et al., 2007). Items from the Bell et al.’s (1994) scale have been used within two following studies (i.e., Burt & DeMello, 2002; Gerber et al., 2004). However, this scale was not shown to be consistent by Gerber et al. who found using principle component analysis, that these scale items could not be collapsed into one single blame measure because each set of questions produced varying factor results. Wenger and Bornstein (2006) assessed victim credibility through items which examine how clear the victim’s lack of consent was and the extent to which the defendant honestly believed that the victim consented. Items are usually phrased the same for measures of victim and perpetrator blaming but are rephrased to reflect to whom they refer to. Measurement of blaming attributed towards male rape victims and perpetrators is carried out in the same way as for female rape victims and perpetrators. For example, items relating to the blame attributed towards the victim (e.g., Anderson & Lyons, 2005; Davies & McCartney, 2003; Ford et al., 1998; Mitchell et al., 1999; Whatley & Riggio, 1993).

The number of items within these scale can be quite limited. For example, Idisis, Ben-David, and Ben-Nachum (2007) used only one item as a measure of victim responsibility. However, the vast majority of studies use approximately four to seven scale items each to assess victim (e.g., Frese et al., 2004; Gerber et al., 2004; Viki & Abrams, 2002) or perpetrator responsibility (e.g., Viki et al., 2004; Burt & DeMello, 2002).

Other measures which have been developed within the field include the Feild (1978) Attitude towards Rape Scale. However, the use of this measure is problematic because it is intentionally multidimensional with some attitudes relating solely towards rape rather than rape victims (Ward, 1988). Ward also suggests that too many dimensions are assessed in too few scale items. This means that this scale is not useful in solely assessing victim blaming. The Ward (1988) Attitudes towards Rape Victims may also have been used as this does specifically relate to attitudes towards rape victims. However, this is also one of its drawbacks in its use as a victim blaming measure. Many of the items would not assess blame or responsibility towards the victim. This measure would, however, be more useful as a measure of stereotypes about rape and so will be considered later as a possible rape myth acceptance measure. It is also problematic in its sole focus on women as victims of rape so items such as “Women who wear short skirts or tight blouses are not inviting rape” would need to be either removed or adapted for use within a male rape victim blame measure.

Based on the literature cited above, this thesis will use a blame measure which will assess the blame, control, avoidability, sympathy, responsibility and fault which can be attributed towards the victim or perpetrator of the rape (see section 8.4.2).

6.1.2 Rape myth acceptance.

6.1.2.1 Female rape myth acceptance.

The earliest measure of rape myth acceptance was a scale constructed by Burt (1980) called the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS). This was a 19 item scale with items that largely focus on rape myths associated with the victim. For example “In the majority of rapes, the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation”, “Any female can get raped”. Reliability measures of this scale have demonstrated a satisfactory level of reliability with Cronbach alphas in the range of 0.73 – 0.88 (e.g., Burt, 1980; Gray, 2006). However, there is some divergence in how this scale is used. For example, Gray (2006) used the full 19 items (see also Frese et al., 2004) whereas Rye et al. (2006) added eight additional items. Jones et al. (1998) noted that Burt’s (1980) scale had not been assessed as to whether the concept was multidimensional or unidimensional. An earlier factor analysis by Briere, Malamuth, and Check (1985) established that four orthogonal factors emerged from this analysis. However, this was a male only sample and so limited in its applicability to the general population (Jones et al.). A second factor analysis of the RMAS by Jones et al. across several different samples demonstrated that three oblique factors were much more explanatory with seven of the original items removed from the analysis. These three factors seemed to assess ‘disbelief of victim claims’, ‘victim blame’, and that ‘rape claims are manipulative’.

Three limitations of the RMAS have also been highlighted by Oh and Neville (2004) which are that (i) some items are ambiguous and include awkward phrasing, (ii) a focus on belief about rape victims to the detriment of other types of rape myths such as those relating to perpetrators, and (iii) the inclusion of outdated rape myths (e.g., “women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve”). Ward (1988) has also noted a usage of North American colloquialisms in some of the wording which may be problematic in extending this research to U.K. populations (see also Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995; Norton & Grant, 2008 for a further critique of the RMAS). Payne et al. (1999) also identified the lack of rape myths relating to the perpetrator and also items which do not always specifically relate to rape myths.

In light of these and the problems noted above with the RMAS, Payne et al. (1999) developed a new measure of rape myth acceptance called the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMAS). This measure provides a significantly more in-depth assessment of rape myth acceptance through its 45 items (40 rape myth items, five filler items) which measures seven rape myth factors. The importance of this scale is in its efforts to distinguish between different types of rape myths, as Payne et al. note that different types of rape myths may function in different ways for each individual. The seven factors which this scale measure are ‘she asked for it’, ‘it wasn’t really rape’, ‘he didn’t mean to’, ‘she wanted it’, ‘she lied’, ‘rape is a trivial event’, and ‘rape is deviant event’. The range of content of the rape myth subscales demonstrates a breadth of rape

myths relating to the victim, the perpetrator, and the society in which the rape occurs. Reliability analyses of this scale also demonstrate higher levels of reliability with reliability alphas in the 0.80 and above range reported (e.g., Harrison et al., 2008). In comparison to this measure of rape myth acceptance, other measures (e.g., Acceptance of Rape Myth Scale – Gilmartin-Zena, 1988; Attitude toward Rape Victims Scale – Ward, 1988) do not have the same depth and range of factors demonstrated within the IRMAS. Therefore, this scale will be used within this thesis to establish a measure of female rape myth acceptance.

6.1.2.2 Male rape myth acceptance.

The measurement of male rape myths is, as noted above, far less developed than female rape myth acceptance. Where the RMAS and IRMAS has been in existence for over ten years, such a thorough measure of male rape myth acceptance has yet to be developed. One of the early measures which has been used within subsequent articles is a scale by Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson (1992)(adaptations were used within Chapleau et al., 2008; Davies & McCartney, 2003). This measure contained 12 items, six which relate to a male perpetrator and six which relate to a female perpetrator. These six items relate to three categories: (i) male rape cannot happen, (ii) men are to blame for their rape, and (iii) trauma. The use of this measure, within this thesis, would be problematic in its overlap with victim blaming which would result in only four scale items being usable (as this research relates only to male perpetrators). Also, an analysis of this scale, using confirmatory factor analysis, by Chapleau et al. (2008) suggested that

further scale development was needed as the best fitting model did not meet many of the indicators of a good scale structure (e.g., poor fit statistics, low coefficient alphas).

Kassing and Prieto (2003) used the Gilmartin-Zena (1988) Acceptance of Rape Myth Scale adapted to a gender neutral language. Similarly, Davies and McCartney (2003) developed their own six items scale out of the Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson (1992) scale. The myths within their scale attempted to encapsulate myths relating to masculinity such as “Chris could have fought Bob off” and myths relating to homosexuality. However, both of these measures do not adequately cover the full range of rape myths which may relate to male victims of rape (as highlighted above within the literature review of male rape myths).

Kassing et al. (2005) used within their study a measure developed by Melanson (1999). This measure was developed out of an initial item pool of 80 items of which 22 items were retained as they demonstrated an excellent level of reliability. As such, this scale covers a much broader range of rape myths relating to an association with homosexuality, enjoyment of sex, coping, and blame. Therefore, this scale will be used in the studies assessing male rape myth acceptance within this thesis. However, given that there has been such limited research within this area, there is clearly scope for the development of a new measure of male rape myth acceptance which measures a fuller range of male rape myths not currently examined within the Melanson (1999) scale. This process will be demonstrated in chapter 12.

6.1.3 Belief in a just world.

Belief in a just world has been measured by several different scales, however three scales are predominantly used within the literature and so are reviewed in more detail below. However, it is important to note that other scales have been developed to measure this belief (see Table 1, adapted from Furnham, 2003).

Table 1

Summary of Just World Scale Measures (adapted from Furnham, 2003)

Author	Scale name	No of items	Response scale
Rubin and Peplau (1973)	Just World	16	6 point, agree - disagree
Rubin and Peplau (1975)	Just World (revised)	20	6 point, agree - disagree
Dalbert et al. (1987)	Glaube an eine gerechte Welt als Motiv	6	6 point, agree - disagree
Lipkus (1991)	Global belief in a Just World	7	6 point, agree – disagree
Furnham and Procter (1992)	Multidimensional Just World	30	7 point, agree – disagree
Maes (1998)	Belief in Immanent Justice	5	5 point, agree – disagree
Mohiyeddini and Montada (1998)	Hope for a Just World	8	0 point not right; 6 absolutely right.
Schmitt (1998)	Centrality of Justice	6	6 point, agree - disagree

One of the original scales was the Rubin and Peplau (1973) scale, later reformulated in 1975. The Rubin and Peplau (1975) scale is now most commonly used. The original scale contained 16 items, whilst the reformulated scale contained 13 of the

original items and seven additional items retained from a factor analysis (Loo, 2002). This resulted in a 20 item scale where higher scores were related to a strong belief in a just world. This scale was assumed to be unidimensional, however some studies have suggested unstable factor solutions but generally a two factor solution is used measuring just and unjust world belief (e.g., Furnham, 1985; Loo, 2002). There have been other reviews of this measure which have also suggested that this scale is psychometrically problematic with, in particular, questions about its low internal reliability (Furnham, 2003; Lambert, Burroughs, & Nguyen, 1999). For example, Ford et al. (1998) reported a coefficient alpha of 0.48 which is below that which is usually considered satisfactory. Hellman, Mulenburgh-Trevino, and Worley (2008) carried out a statistical review of the Rubin and Peplau (1975) scale and found that the mean reliability coefficient (taken from 47 studies) was 0.68 with scores ranging from 0.38 to 0.84 reported. The assessments of this scale tends to suggest that it would not be the best measure of the belief in a just world within this thesis.

A second scale was developed by Lipkus (1991). The reliability for this scale has shown much more promising results, with Hellman et al. (2008) reporting a review of 20 studies which demonstrating a mean reliability coefficient of 0.81 with scores ranging from 0.65 to 0.89. However, these more satisfactory levels of reliability must be interpreted cautiously as noted by Hellman et al.. This scale has primarily been used solely by Lipkus and within the same research setting. Therefore, these reliability estimates may be inflated. O'Connor, Morrison, and Morrison (1996) analysed the Lipkus

(1991) scale and found that the second item within the scale produced problematic factor loadings with differing factor results amongst male and female samples.

The final scale to be reviewed was developed by Dalbert, Montada, and Schmidt (1987). Originally constructed in German, an analysis of the English version of this scale demonstrates that the scale is psychometrically sound within U.K. samples (Furnham, 1995). In this study Furnham compared the reliabilities of the Rubin and Peplau (1975) and Dalbert et al. scale and concluded that the Dalbert et al. may be a more useful scale because of its greater internal reliability and smaller number of items. Dalbert and Yamauchi (1994) also demonstrated a one factor solution and strong inter-item correlations for the scale which suggests that this is a good, stable measure of global belief in a just world (see also Loo, 2002). Given the benefits of this scale, compared to previously used scale, the Dalbert et al. has been chosen for use within this thesis.

6.1.4 Gender role traits and gender role beliefs.

The field of gender role traits/gender role attitudes is particularly extensive (see Table 2 for some examples currently in use).

Table 2

Summary of Gender Role Traits and Beliefs about Gender Role Measures

Name	Authors	Example scale item
Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence (AIV)	Burt (1980)	"Being roughed up is sexually stimulating to many women"
Adversarial Sexual Beliefs (ASB)	Burt (1980)	"Men are out for only one thing"

Attitudes Toward Women (ATW)	Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1975)	"The intellectual leadership of a community should largely be in the hands of men"
BSRI	Bem (1974) Bem (1981) – short version)	Level of agreement to personality traits such as "dominant"
Hostility Toward Women (HTW)	Check (1985)	"I feel upset even when by slight criticism from women"
Hypermasculinity	Mosher and Sirkin (1984)	"Any man who is a man needs to have sex regularly"
Personal Attributes Questionnaire	Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1974)	Level of agreement on items such as "active"
Sex Role Conservatism	Burt (1980)	"A nice woman will be offended or embarrassed by dirty jokes"
Sex Role Stereotyping	Burt (1980)	"A wife should never contradict her husband in public"
SRES	Beere et al. (1984)	"Women are just as capable as men to run a business"

As this field is so broad, this table demonstrates a range of measures available to researchers wishing to examine these attitudes within a piece of research but cannot fully encompass the full range of measures available. The direction of this programme of research is to examine whether it is the adoption of certain gender role traits or beliefs about gender which are related to victim and perpetrator blaming. Many of the measures summarised, already reflect negative attitudes in particular towards women, which would logically be related to negative attitudes towards female victims of rape (e.g., the HTW and the Hypermasculinity Scale). Similarly, as this thesis will examine attitudes towards

male and female victim blaming, it would be inappropriate to utilise scales which solely reflect attitudes towards one gender (e.g., ATW).

The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) was developed by Bem (1974) as a measure which assesses traits associated with the masculine and feminine gender role. This measure in its original form contained 60 items, of which, 20 related to masculine attributes, 20 related to feminine attributes, and 20 filler attributes associated with neither masculine or feminine attributes. The response set was from 1 – never or almost never true to 7 – always or almost always true. Using the median of the masculine and feminine score, the person can be categorised as either masculine (higher on median on masculine score, lower on median on feminine score), feminine (lower on median on masculine score, higher on median on feminine score), androgynous (higher than median on both masculine and feminine score) or undifferentiated (lower than median on both masculine and feminine score) (Bem, 1974). The development of this measure, in its time, challenged the previous concept of masculinity and femininity as a bipolar construct. Instead, this formulates masculinity and femininity as distinct constructs (Hoffman & Borders, 2001). There is still considerable debate surrounding this measure, although it remains one of the most widely used measures of gender role traits within the research area (Colley, Mulhern, Maltby, & Wood, 2009). On the positive side, this measure has shown good level of internal consistency, for example Choi and Fuqua (2003) reported coefficients of .80 and .82 for the femininity scale and .86 and .86 for the masculinity scale respectively. Holt and Ellis (1998) assessed the content validity of the BSRI and found that

all of the masculine traits and all but two of the feminine traits were rated as significantly more desirable for a man or a woman, which the authors concluded that this means that the BSRI continues to be a valid measure of gender role traits. Similarly, Ozkan and Lajunen (2005) carried out an exploratory factor analysis which supports the original two factor structure suggested by Bem (1974) with the two factors relating to masculinity and femininity respectively. However, other studies have suggested that the factor structure is not so stable (e.g., Agbayani & Min, 2006).

Since this thesis began using the short form of the BSRI (as this was considerable psychometrically stronger and more stable than the original BSRI (Hoffman & Borders, 2001), a number of very recent studies have raised further questions about the factor structure of the BSRI (e.g., Choi, Fuqua, & Newman, 2008). This has led to the suggestion that instead of a two factor solution, the BSRI should be considered as a three factor solution in which there is one femininity scale and two masculinity scales, one which Choi, Fuqua, and Newman (2009) suggest represents personal masculinity and one which represents social masculinity. The concept of personal masculinity reflects qualities such as 'defends own beliefs' and 'has leadership qualities', whereas social masculinity reflects characteristics such as 'forceful', 'dominant' and 'assertive'.

The Sex Role Egalitarianism Scale (SRES) (Beere et al., 1984) in its original form contains 95 items with a five point response scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. These items measure participants' attitudes across five domains: marital,

parental, employment, social-interpersonal-heterosexual, and educational. Individuals who score lower on the scale are considered to be more traditional in their ideas about gender, whereas those individuals who score highly on the measure are considered more egalitarian in their attitudes about gender (King & King, 1986). The benefits of using this instrument is that instead of solely focussing on one gender role, this measure examines attitudes towards both men and women adopting roles/behaviours which are not traditionally accepted in each gender (Beere, King, Gudanowski, & Taft, 1997). This allows it to be utilised similarly when assessing attitudes towards male or female victims of rape. There are four versions of the SRES, form K, B, KK and BB. The forms KK and BB represent short forms of the original scale in which 25 items are contained, of which five items in each scale measures one of the five domains of the original scale. The SRES differs from the BSRI in its measurements of gender role ideology rather than the approach taken by the BSRI which examines gender role traits (King & King, 1997). A summary of comparisons between the BSRI and SRES concluded that these scales measures separate constructs (King & King) which confirms its utility in extending the research within this thesis.

McHugh and Hanson-Frieze (1997) consider that some of the development processes for the SRES were exemplary which, combined with the use of form BB to assess gender role traditionality in attitudes towards stranger and acquaintance rape (Yamawaki & Tschanz, 2005; followed later by Yamawaki, 2007 and White & Yamawaki,

2009), supports the use of this measure to extend our understanding of male victim and perpetrator blaming.

6.2 Vignette Methodology

Vignette methodology is used extensively within the rape perception framework research (e.g., Bell et al., 1994; Frese et al., 2004). Barter and Reynold (1999) propose that vignettes are a method by which attributions can be elicited from participants with the use of a story depicting a situation. In constructing these vignettes, there are very few guidelines on how to produce a vignette which will elicit the required participant response. Anderson and Lyons (2005) recommend against a longer vignette as this can be detrimental to the research as the attributional processes within the real world are often made upon only incomplete information. A lengthy and detailed account of the rape will still not provide the full amount of information required by participants and so a shorter vignette is suggested as more appropriate.

Barter and Reynold (1999) also suggest some guidelines about the production of vignettes for participants. These suggest that vignettes need to have sufficient context but also must be vague enough for respondents to use attributional processes in drawing conclusions about the vignette. It is preferable to include a 'control' vignette to ensure that the differences demonstrated are a reflection of the content of the vignette. Also, the vignette should be easy to understand and not contain too complex content. This final suggestion supports the ideas by Anderson and Lyons (2005) that vignettes used within rape perception research should not be too long.

Using the word rape in the vignette to describe what occurs between the victim and perpetrator has according to Pollard (1992) led to more harsh responses by participants. Other researchers within the area (e.g., Anderson et al., 2001; Davies & Rogers, 2006) have similarly suggested that the word rape should not be used within vignettes. If an incident is described as rape, the blame should lie with the perpetrator however, the point of rape perception research is to understand how blame can be apportioned between the victim and perpetrator. Describing the incident as forced sexual intercourse may allow participants to more freely examine how the blame may be attributed towards the victim and perpetrator (Davies & Rogers, 2006).

6.3 Online Questionnaire Vs. Traditional Paper Based Surveys

Much of the research assessing the reliability and validity of internet research methods suggests that responses from participants do not differ between traditional 'paper and pencil' based questionnaires and those administered via the internet (e.g., Buchanan & Smith, 1999; Pettitt, 2002; Taylor, 2002). Rowe, Poortinga, and Pidgeon (2006) found that there were no consistent differences in terms of response effects (e.g., extreme responding) between internet based survey and a postal survey. Tuten, Urban, and Bosnjak (2002) reviewed this research area and found that measures of data quality are positive for web based surveys. Their review even suggested that self-report data may be more accurate within the web environment. Rowe et al. also argue that electronically administered surveys may provide an improvement over other methods in

that they produce less biased and more truthful responses. Given the sensitive nature of this research study, this online research method was adopted for a number of the studies (i.e., study one, four, and five) where this would facilitate the gathering of data. This was considered appropriate given the suggestion that face-to-face surveys can be more affected by socially desirable responding. This is particularly true for surveys of sensitive topics (Fricker & Schonlau, 2002). Similarly Joinson (1999) found that web based surveys can encourage increased disclosure and candid responses.

In carrying out the research presented in this thesis, Dillman, Tortura, and Bowker's (1998, cited in Dillman & Bowker, 2001) 14 principles of good survey design were all accommodated to reduce any possible coverage error, sampling errors, measurement error, and non-response error. As noted by Buchanan and Smith (1999), even conventional surveys are not free from measurement error or mischievous responding. These effects should be no stronger than those found in traditional paper based methods and given the sensitive topic area, research may actually benefit from being placed in an online environment. Unfortunately, gathering data within more applied samples using an online methodology was not possible within this thesis, however future research hopes that these may be adopted in future studies.

7 Research Questions and Methodology

This chapter will review the research questions which will be examined within this thesis as well as the methodologies which will be utilised.

7.1 Research Questions

There are seven research questions, these will first be stated and then the argument underlying the examination of this question will be put forward. These questions intend to examine victim blaming from the perspective of male and female victims of rape and also perpetrator blaming regarding female rape and male rape.

1. To what extent are gender differences evident in victim and perpetrator blaming?

It is an oft cited finding within the literature that males are more victim blaming than are females (Pollard, 1992). However, more recent research within this area suggests that this finding is not as consistent as may be believed. It is not the purpose of this thesis to demonstrate that males never demonstrate higher levels of victim blaming than females, but to further examine what elements within a rape scenario can result in some or no gender differences being found in victim blaming. A number of studies (e.g., Brems & Wagner, 1994; Frese et al., 2004; Newcomb et al., 2008) have demonstrated no significant gender effect which suggests it is important to consider, under which circumstances, men may be more victim blaming. This question will be examined in the context of the manipulations made within the scenarios to examine how gender may interact with factors such as type of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance).

As well as this, this thesis will examine gender differences regarding perpetrator blaming which has been less researched than victim blaming. This thesis will examine whether a 'balance effect' occurs in relation to perpetrator blaming, for example, if males blame the victim more, do they therefore blame the perpetrator less? Previous research on this topic is limited but it suggests that this is the case (e.g., Gerber et al., 2004). However, this effect will also be examined in the context of the manipulations made within the scenarios.

2. Are acquaintance rape victims blamed more than stranger rape victims, and are perpetrators of acquaintance rape blamed less than stranger rape perpetrators?

Type of rape is one effect within female victim blaming which has fairly consistently demonstrated that victims of acquaintance rape are attributed more blame than victims of stranger rape (e.g., Bell et al., 1994). However, this acquaintance vs. stranger rape effect has not been previously examined within male victim blaming with research studies instead focussing on only one type of rape presented within scenarios (e.g., Schneider et al., 2004). Therefore, it is important to establish whether this effect on blaming functions in the same way for male rape as it does for female rape. The acquaintance rape vs. stranger rape effect will also be examined in the context of perpetrator blaming to examine whether the 'balance effect' in blaming occurs.

3. To what extent do rape myths relate to victim and perpetrator blaming?

This research question is examined on several levels. The first is to assess whether the acceptance of rape myths predicts victim blaming. Prior literature relating to female rape myth acceptance suggests that as rape myth acceptance increases, so does victim blaming (Frese et al., 2004). However, this finding has been less well established within the male rape victim literature. Further, as rape myths relate also to stereotypes about rape perpetrators (Burt, 1980), this thesis will examine whether the acceptance of rape myths predicts female and male perpetrator blaming.

The second element to examining how rape myths relate to victim blaming will be to examine the relationship between the sub factors of the female rape myth acceptance measure and victim blaming. This will extend our understanding of what specific myths relate most closely to victim blaming as different myths are thought to function in different ways (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). Unfortunately, this cannot be completed for male rape myth acceptance as a measure with a clear factor structure has yet to be developed (but this is one of the research aims of this thesis, see below).

Finally, the influence of rape myths on blaming will be examined by manipulating the level of rape myths presented within scenarios. This will result in a neutral description of a rape compared with a description of a rape wherein myths have been introduced such as the clothing of the victim and alcohol use by the victim and perpetrator. Rape myths have been found to be related to victim blaming, however this has not been

established within perpetrator blaming. This effect will also be examined in relation to the other factors which are discussed above (e.g., gender or type of rape).

4. To what extent does a general belief in a just world relate to blaming?

Belief in a just world is an often used to explain why blaming is attributed towards rape victims. However, when published research is examined in detail, the consistency of this relationship is questionable with specific scenario and gender effects (e.g., Murray et al., 2005). The frequent use of the Rubin and Peplau (1975) belief in a just world scale has also raised questions about this relationship since this measure has been demonstrated to have questionable consistency and reliability (Loo, 2002). This thesis will be using the Dalbert et al. (1987) measure of general belief in a just world. This measure has been shown to be far more consistent and reliable as well as being useful in consisting of six items (Furnham, 2003). Therefore, using this measure this thesis should be able to more reliably examine the relationship between general belief in a just world and victim blaming, as well as extending the research towards an understanding of its relationship with perpetrator blame. Attributing blame towards the perpetrator may be one method of restoring justice to a situation which may be considered far more preferable than attributing blame towards the victim (Hafer & Begue, 2005).

5. To what extent does the adoption of traditional gender role traits or traditional beliefs about gender affect blaming?

There are questions within the current research literature as to whether it is the adoption of gender role traits which predicts a gender difference in victim blaming (see Quackenbush, 1989) or whether it is the adoption of traditional beliefs about gender which relate to victim blaming (Yamawaki & Tschanz, 2005). Both of these concepts have demonstrated significant effects within the previous literature. However, this thesis will seek to examine which is the more relevant explanation for differences in victim blaming. In addition to the examination of such differences in victim blaming, this thesis will also extend the findings to examine potential differences in perpetrator blaming.

6. To examine the structure of male rape myths in the development of a new measure of male rape myth acceptance.

As noted in the methodological review, there has not been developed a thorough measure of acceptance of the full range of available male rape myths. This thesis therefore seeks to explore the available male rape myths within our society and to bring these together in a measure which assesses the level of acceptance of these myths.

7. To examine victim and perpetrator blaming in an applied setting involving police officers.

Research examining police officers' attitudes towards rape victims is limited within the published research as a whole, but is even more so within the U.K. (Frazier & Haney, 1996). This thesis intends to examine the relationship of victim blaming and perpetrator blaming with job experience since police officers' experience of working with rape victims

may mean that they have a clearer conceptualisation of rape and more importantly of rape victims. This may mean that police officers do not resort to using rape myths or sexual scripts in their judgements of rape victims (Crome & McCabe, 2001; Page, 2007) and therefore engage in less victim blaming. In addition, the thesis will examine the differences in police officer attitudes between police officers who have received specialist training to deal with rape victims compared to police officers who have not received this training. Research examining the effectiveness of training in relation to how it affects attitudes towards rape victim is extremely limited, with only Lonsway et al. (2001), who found in the United States, that rape myth acceptance levels did not differ between before and after training to deal with rape victims.

7.2 Methodology

This chapter provides a description of the methodologies employed within this thesis. This will outline the design, materials, participants, procedures, and data analysis involved for each of the studies to be presented.

7.2.1 Design.

7.2.1.1 Study one.

The study was a survey design which examined the effects of type of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance) and gender (male vs. female) on female victim blaming. The relationships between victim blaming and (i) rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world were also assessed. Further, the effect of gender role traits on victim blaming was examined.

7.2.1.2 Study two.

The study was a survey design, which as in study one examined the two effects of type of rape and gender on female victim blaming. However, in addition the effect of level of rape myths (high vs. low) on victim blaming was examined. The relationship between victim blaming and (i) rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world were analysed. Further, the effect of gender role traits on victim blaming was examined.

7.2.1.3 Study three.

The design of this study was the same as study two in relation to female victim blaming. However, in this study perpetrator blaming was also measured. Therefore, a between subjects design was used, in which the effects of type of rape (stranger vs.

acquaintance), level of rape myths (high vs. low), and gender on female perpetrator blaming were examined. The relationship between perpetrator blaming and (i) rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world were also assessed. Further, the effect of gender role traits on perpetrator blaming was examined. As this sample comprised of police officers, two additional analyses were carried out assessing the role of experience and the effect of receiving specialist training on female victim blaming and female perpetrator blaming.

7.2.1.4 Study four.

This study employed the same design as study two, however this study examined blaming attitudes towards male victims and perpetrators.

7.2.1.5 Study five.

This study involved factor analysis and it examined the process of initial scale development. As such, the relationship between the measure developed (once factor analysis was completed) was compared with an established measure of female rape myth acceptance, to examine construct validity. Gender differences were also analysed.

7.2.2 Materials.

7.2.2.1 Study one.

Psychology undergraduates read one rape scenario which portrayed either a stranger or an acquaintance rape event. Four questionnaires were then presented to participants which measured victim blaming, belief in a just world, gender role traits, and rape myth acceptance (presented in that order).

7.2.2.1.1 Scenarios.

The two scenarios used within this study were developed from Abrams et al. (2003) but were adapted for the specific purposes of this research. In particular, the stranger rape scenario was adapted to adhere to the principles outlined by Golge et al. (2003) whereby stranger rape is perceived to be 'real' rape where it is dark, silent, and the assailant is a stranger. These scenarios described either a stranger or an acquaintance rape. For the acquaintance rape scenario, the victim was named as Sarah who met Mark at a party. The scenario depicted the events of the evening leading to both Sarah and Mark returning to Sarah's room where Mark raped her. In the stranger rape scenario, Sarah was raped by a stranger whilst walking home. To try and control any effects of rape myths, these scenarios were developed to be as similar as possible to each other. This approach was taken to try to avoid any rape myths being introduced in one scenario but not the other. The phrase 'physically forced sex' was used instead of 'rape' to avoid a bias (as discussed in chapter six) that may be caused by describing the event as rape (Davies & Rogers, 2006).

7.2.2.1.2 Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMAS).

This scale includes 40 rape myth items as well as five filler questions to reduce the effects of response set. There are seven subscales which measure rape myths regarding 'she asked for it', 'it wasn't really rape', 'he didn't mean to', 'she wanted it', 'she lied', 'rape is a trivial event', and 'rape is deviant event'. Reliability analyses for this first study revealed an alpha of .94 demonstrating an excellent level of reliability. A seven point response scale was used, these were labelled 1-very strongly disagree to 7-very strongly

agree with a neutral midpoint of 4-neither agree nor disagree. An example item would be “If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control”. The total scores on the scale are reported within the data analyses.

7.2.2.1.3 Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI).

The shortened version of the inventory was used which consists of 30 items (Bem, 1981). This measure includes ten masculine items, ten feminine items, and ten neutral items. Participants respond along a seven point scale with 1-almost never true and 7-almost always true to attributes such as “strong personality” (masculine attribute). In using the BSRI, to ensure that the most valid results are achieved from the analysis, a two fold approach will be utilised. This will firstly, analyse the BSRI using the original method of categorising participants as outlined by Bem (1981). This will involve categorising participants as masculine, feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated. Reliability analyses for this study revealed an alpha of .84 for the masculine items and .84 for feminine items. The second method involved utilising the structure developed in Choi et al. (2009). This involves creating a mean score from three factors. One which reflects femininity and is formed from items two, five, eight, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, and 29 from the BSRI. The second factor relates to personal masculinity which is formed from items one, four, ten, 16, and 25. The third factor relates to social masculinity and is formed from items seven, 13, 22, and 28. Reliability analyses demonstrated $\alpha = .69$ for social masculinity items, $\alpha = .84$ for personal masculinity items, and $\alpha = .76$ for femininity.

7.2.2.1.4 Belief in a just world (Dalbert et al., 1987).

An English version of the six item scale which measures general belief in a just world with responses ranging from 1-strongly disagree to 6-strongly agree was used. Reliability analysis in this first study revealed an alpha of .72. An example of a scale item would be “I am convinced that in the long run people will be compensated for injustices.” The total scores on the scale are reported within the data analyses.

7.2.2.1.5 Victim blaming scale.

As no standardised measure of victim blame had been identified, this development of the victim blaming scale began with a process of a literature review of the research area (see chapter six). This process identified a number of items which are commonly used to assess victim blaming. In addition to this, Shaver’s (1985) assessment of blame related words was also used to guide the inclusion of items (see section 1.1). An eight item scale was therefore developed to assess the blame attributed towards the victim. Item one assessed the blame attributed towards the victim (e.g., Abrams et al., 2003; Brems & Wagner, 1994; Davies & McCartney, 2003; Gerber et al., 2004; Viki & Abrams, 2002). Item two assessed a measure of blame attributed towards the perpetrator and was thus recoded for the analysis. Item three assessed how much control the victim had over the situation (e.g., Ben-David & Schneider, 2005; Krahe et al., 2008). Item four assessed how much control the perpetrator had over the situation and thus was recoded for this analysis. Item five assessed the avoidability of the situation (e.g., Abrams et al., 2003; Krahe et al., 2007). Item six assessed sympathy for the victim (e.g., Abrams et al., 2003; Davies et al., 2001; Davies & McCartney, 2003; Viki et al., 2004). Item seven assessed who was responsible for what happened (e.g., Davies et al., 2001;

Davies & McCartney, 2003; Davies et al., 2006; Davies et al., 2008; Davies et al., 2009; Frese et al., 2004; Brown & Testa, 2008; Harrison et al., 2008). Item eight assessed who was at fault for the event occurring (e.g., Davies et al., 2009; Maurer & Robinson, 2008). Items were chosen for their frequency of use within the research literature and for their theoretical closeness with blame (Shaver, 1985). For items one to six, a seven point response scale was used (with 1-not at all to 7-completely/totally). For items seven to eight, a seven point responses scale was also used (with 1-victim to 7-perpetrator). Increased scores on the items indicated a victim blaming stance. A principle component analysis was carried out on this scale which resulted in scale items one, three, four, six, seven, and eight being retained for the victim blame analysis. The results section of chapter eight contains the full details of this analysis. Scores on the victim blaming scale were averaged so that comparisons could be made across the new studies presented in this thesis. Reliability analysis in this first study revealed an alpha of .74 demonstrating an acceptable level of reliability.

7.2.2.2 Study two.

Law undergraduates read one rape scenario which portrayed either a stranger or an acquaintance rape event. The scenarios were also manipulated in terms of high and low level of rape myths. Four questionnaires were then presented to participants which measured victim blaming, belief in a just world, gender role traits, and rape myth acceptance (presented in that order). The belief in a just world scale (Dalbert et al., 1987), gender role traits (BSRI), and rape myth acceptance scale (IRMAS) were the same as in study one and reported Cronbach alpha reliabilities of .75, .74 (masculine items), .80

(feminine items), .95 respectively. Reliability analyses for the Choi et al. (2009)

construction of the BSRI demonstrated $\alpha = .78$ for personal masculinity, $\alpha = .58$ for social masculinity and $\alpha = .64$ for femininity.

7.2.2.2.1 Scenarios.

The two scenarios used within study one were again used in this study. As these scenarios had been developed to include as few rape myths as possible, they were designated to have a low level of rape myths. Two further scenarios were developed to represent a high level of rape myths (depicting a stranger and acquaintance rape.) This high level of rape myths was manipulated by including information about the dress of the victim, the drinking of alcohol by both the victim and perpetrator, and the location of the attack. These were manipulated across the scenarios. For example, with regards to the victim's clothing, within the low level of rape myths scenario, the victim was depicted as wearing a coat, a long skirt, and flat shoes. For the high level of rape myth scenario, the victim was depicted as wearing a short skirt, high heels and a low cut top (see Appendix A for full wording of the scenarios).

7.2.2.2.2 Victim blaming scale.

This was the same victim blaming scale as used within study one. To recap, the scale consisted of items one, three, four, six, seven, and eight. Scores on the victim blaming scale were averaged so that comparisons could be made across the new studies presented in this thesis. Reliability analysis in this present study revealed an alpha of .70 demonstrating an acceptable level of reliability.

7.2.2.3 Study three.

Participants read one rape scenario which portrayed either a stranger or an acquaintance rape event which were also manipulated in terms of high and low level of rape myths (as in study two). Four questionnaires were then presented to participants which measured victim blaming and perpetrator blaming (see below), belief in a just world ($\alpha = .77$), gender role traits (Bem, 1981, masculine $\alpha = .79$, feminine $\alpha = .88$; Choi et al., 2009, femininity $\alpha = .90$, social masculinity $\alpha = .71$, personal masculinity $\alpha = .70$), and rape myth acceptance ($\alpha = .96$).

7.2.2.3.1 Rape victim and perpetrator blaming scale.

This scale was redeveloped within study three as this study required a measure of both victim and perpetrator blaming. The scale was increased to 14 items with items taken from the methodological review of victim and perpetrator blaming (see chapter 6). As before, this review was guided by Shaver (1985). Items one, four, five, six, eight, and nine were taken from the scale developed and used within studies one and two. The literature underpinning the inclusion of these items was discussed above in section 7.2.2.1.5. Items two, three, and seven were formed on the basis of the work of Wenger and Bornstein (2006). Items ten, 11, and 12 were formed based upon items which were previously used in Ben-David & Schneider (2005). These were items which were formed on the work of Simonson and Subich (1999) and Bridges (1991). Finally, items 13 and 14 were guided by Shaver's (1985) list of blame related words in assessing the legal responsibility and guilt of the perpetrator. As with the scale development process in study one, items were chosen via an assessment of their frequency of use within the

research literature and their theoretical closeness with blame (Shaver, 1985). A principle component analysis of these data recommended a two factor solution. The victim blaming scale consisted of items one, three, five, nine, ten, and 11. Reliability analysis of this scale revealed an alpha of .70 demonstrating an acceptable level of reliability. The perpetrator scale consisted of items six, seven, eight, and 13. Reliability analysis of this scale revealed an alpha of .60. Scores on the victim blaming and perpetrator blaming scales were averaged so that comparisons could be made across the new studies presented in this thesis.

7.2.2.4 Study four.

7.2.2.4.1 Scenarios.

This fourth study required the development of four new scenarios as this study measured attributions towards male victims of rape. As with studies two and three, the four scenarios manipulated the type of rape presented (stranger or acquaintance) and also the level of rape myths present (high or low). The latter factor was manipulated by including information such as the drinking of alcohol, information about the body type of the victim, and the location of the event. For example for the body type of the male victim, within the low level of rape myth scenario, the victim was depicted as being of an average build. However, for the high level of rape myth scenario, the victim was depicted as being slightly built. As with the female rape scenarios, the phrase physically forced sex was used instead of rape to avoid a bias that may be caused by describing the event as rape (Davies & Rogers, 2006).

7.2.2.4.2 Rape victim and perpetrator blaming scale.

This was the same scale as used in study three. This was initially a 14-item scale assessing responsibility attributed to both the victim and the perpetrator of the rape. For each item, a 7-point response scale was used (with 1-not at all to 7-completely/totally). An example of one of the items that measured victim blaming is “How much do you consider the incident to be Michael’s fault?” Following a principle component analysis, scale items one, three, five, seven, and nine were retained to measure victim blaming. The Cronbach alpha of the victim blame scale was .87, demonstrating a good level of reliability. Scale items four, six, eight, and 13 were retained to measure perpetrator blaming. The Cronbach alpha of the perpetrator blaming scale was .88, demonstrating a good level of reliability. Scores on the victim blaming and perpetrator blaming scales were averaged so that comparisons could be made across the new studies presented in this thesis. (See chapter 11 for a list of scale items and the full analysis.)

7.2.2.4.3 Male Rape Myth Scale (MRMS).

This is a 22-item questionnaire that measures false or stereotypical beliefs about male rape (Melanson, 1999). The response scales are from 1-strongly disagree to 6-strongly agree. Total scores are summated with higher scores indicating a greater acceptance of male rape myths. Previously, a Cronbach alpha of .90 and a test-retest reliability of .89 have been reported for this scale (Melanson, 1999). A Cronbach alpha of .85 was found for this fourth study. An example of one of the male rape myth items is “A man can enjoy sex even if it is being forced on him.” The total scores on the scale are reported within the data analyses.

7.2.2.4.4 Belief in a just world (Dalbert et al., 1987, English translation)

As used in previous studies, a reliability alpha of .77 was found for this fourth study.

7.2.2.4.5 SRES Short Form BB.

Five items of each domain of the full form were included in the short form BB resulting in 25 items measuring sex-role egalitarianism (Beere et al., 1984). A person high in sex-role egalitarianism is tradition free in their attitudes toward other sexes and does not discriminate against either women or men who assume non-traditional gender role behaviours (King & King, 1993). An example of one of the questionnaire items is “The husband should be the head of the family.” The response format is a 5-point Likert Scale ranging from 5-strongly agree to 1-strongly disagree. A Cronbach alpha of .67 was found for this fourth study.

7.2.2.5 Study five.

A process of item development was undertaken following a review of the previous psychological literature within this area. This resulted in the development of 50 items intended to measure seven rape myth categories. These categories were ‘Masculinity’, ‘Association with Homosexuality’, ‘Invulnerability to Rape’, ‘Hierarchy of Suffering’, ‘Coping’, ‘Enjoyment of Sex’, and ‘Responsibility’. The ‘Masculinity’ factor had an initial item pool of ten items because of its importance to male rape myths. An example of an item is “Any man who is raped failed to protect himself as a man should”. Similarly, the ‘Association with Homosexuality’ factor also had ten initial items of which an example is “Most men who are raped are secretly gay men”. ‘Invulnerability to Rape’ also had ten initial questionnaire items e.g., “Male rape doesn’t happen”. The next four factors each

had five initial questionnaire items. An example of a 'Hierarchy of Suffering' item is "Men would find a rape physically worse than women". An example of a 'Coping' questionnaire item is "Men are less emotionally affected by rape than women". An example of an 'Enjoyment of Sex' questionnaire item is "Men believe rape is just sex". Finally, an example of the 'Responsibility' factor questionnaire item is "A man who is rape must have encouraged their rapist". A seven point response scale from 7-very strongly agree to 1-very strongly disagree with a neutral midpoint of 4-neither agree nor disagree for comparability with the IRMAS.

7.2.2.5.1 IRMAS (Payne et al., 1999).

As used within previous studies, reliability analyses for this fifth study revealed an alpha of .96 demonstrating a good level of reliability.

7.2.3 Participants.

7.2.3.1 Study one.

The sample consisted of 147 Psychology undergraduates from either their first ($n=105$) or second year ($n=42$) of study. The sample consisted of 73 male and 74 female participants. The age range was from 18 to 37 years with a mean of 19.30 years ($SD = 2.10$). Seventy-two students were presented with a stranger rape scenario (36 males, 36 females) and 75 students were presented with an acquaintance rape scenario (40 males, 35 females). Participants were recruited via an Experimental Participation Requirement (EPR) which constituted part of their course credit. (Students are given an alternative to taking part in the EPR, so are not required to participate in research studies.) Participants were randomly assigned to one scenario depicting either stranger or acquaintance rape

allocated on a rotation by the webpage. This study was approved by the School of Psychology's Ethics Committee following the guidelines as laid down by the British Psychological Society.

7.2.3.2 Study two.

The sample consisted of 82 Law students in their third year of study undertaking a criminal justice module. The sample consisted of 60 female and 22 male participants. The age range was from 19 to 32 years with a mean of 20.92 years ($SD = 1.46$). Forty-three participants were presented with a stranger rape scenario (24 low level of rape myths, 19 high level of rape myths) and 39 students were presented with an acquaintance rape scenario (22 low level of rape myths, 17 high level of rape myths). Participants were randomly assigned to one scenario depicting either stranger or acquaintance rape and also manipulated by low or high level of rape myths. This study was approved by the School of Psychology's Ethics Committee following the guidelines as laid down by the British Psychological Society. The response rate was 96%.

7.2.3.3 Study three.

The sample consisted of data gathered from two police forces. The first sample consisted of 61 police officers with 25 female and 36 male participants. The age range was from 27 to 54 years with a mean of 37.18 years ($SD = 5.47$). The range of years in police service was from three to 26 years with a mean of 12.51 years ($SD = 5.94$). This sample included 24 police officers who had received specialist training to deal with rape victims and 37 which had not received this training. The length of time in a specialist role ranged from three to 117 months with a mean of 10.59 months ($SD = 22.09$). The second

sample consisted of 62 police officers with 38 female and 24 male participants. The age range was from 21 to 52 years with a mean of 35.16 years ($SD = 7.38$). The range of years in police service was from two to 27 years with a mean of 12.64 ($SD = 6.95$). The sample included 14 police officers who had received specialist training to deal with rape victims and 48 who had not received this training. The length of time in a specialist role ranged from one to 202 months with a mean of 19.25 months ($SD = 32.79$). A series of t-tests were run to examine any attitudinal differences between these two samples. No significant differences were found between the samples apart from in the number of specially trained officers ($t(117.54) = 2.03, p = .02$). Sixty-five participants were presented with a stranger rape scenario (32 low level of rape myths, 33 high level of rape myths) and 58 participants were presented with an acquaintance rape scenario (24 low level of rape myths, 34 high level of rape myths). Participants were randomly assigned to one scenario depicting either stranger or acquaintance rape and also manipulated by low or high level of rape myths. This study was approved by the School of Psychology's Ethics Committee following the guidelines as laid down by the British Psychological Society.

7.2.3.4 Study four.

The sample consisted of 116 participants (67 females, 49 males). Their mean age was 19.23 years ($SD = 1.18$). These were undergraduate students recruited in either their first ($n = 49$) or second year ($n = 67$) of study of a Psychology related degree. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions. A total of 28 participants completed the stranger rape with a low level of rape myths scenario, 30 participants completed the stranger rape with a high level of rape myths scenario, 27 participants

completed the acquaintance rape with a low level of rape myths scenario, and 31 participants completed the acquaintance rape with a high level of rape myths scenario. A total of 11 participants (not counted in final sample size) signed up to the study and subsequently withdrew. This means that the response rate was 91%. This study was approved by the School of Psychology's Ethics Committee following the guidelines as laid down by the British Psychological Society.

7.2.3.5 Study five.

The 314 participants were recruited from two sources. The first of which was the University of Leicester's EPR system as described previously. This accounted for 148 participants (75 males, 73 females). This samples' mean age was 19.10 years ($SD = 1.13$). The second source was through posting a link to the online study on two sites that host legitimate online psychological research. This source gained 65 further student respondents (14 males, 51 females). This samples' mean age was 21.91 years ($SD = 5.08$). This second source was also available to the general public and so the remainder of this sample ($n = 101$) were a non-student population (40 males, 61 females) with a mean age of 31.19 years ($SD = 10.87$). To ensure that these samples did not significantly differ in their rape myth acceptance a one way between groups ANOVA was carried out with female rape myth acceptance as the dependent variable. This demonstrated that there was no significant difference ($p > .05$) in the female rape myth acceptance between the three groups and therefore the group was entered into the main analysis. This study was approved by the School of Psychology's Ethics Committee following the guidelines as laid down by the British Psychological Society.

7.2.4 Procedure.

7.2.4.1 Study one.

Participants were recruited via the EPR system. This system allows participants to read further information about a study before they choose to volunteer to take part in the study. The content of this study is stressed at this point and also at the first page of the online questionnaire. Participants have to indicate their consent to take part before they can proceed through to the main questionnaire. The vignette is presented to participants followed by four questionnaires: victim blaming, belief in a just world, short version of the BSRI, and rape myth acceptance. These questionnaires were not counterbalanced so that any potential effects by completing the rape myth acceptance scale in close proximity to completing a victim blaming measure could be controlled. Following completing the questionnaires, participants were given information as to where they could seek further information or support if the content of the study had raised relevant issues.

7.2.4.2 Study two.

One of the four versions of the vignette was given to participants within a questionnaire pack. Following the vignettes were the four questionnaires assessing victim blaming, belief in a just world, short version of the BSRI, and rape myth acceptance. These were administered to participants within a Law lecture, following their signing of a consent form. Participants completed the questionnaires within no time limits and were advised as to their confidentiality of responses and their right to withdraw. Debriefing information was also supplied upon the return of the questionnaires.

7.2.4.3 Study three.

The vignette followed by the questionnaires assessing victim blaming, perpetrator blaming, belief in a just world, short version of the BSRI, and rape myth acceptance were administered to participants separately as they were recruited to the study. These police participants were given a questionnaire pack which included the consent form, the questionnaire, and a return envelope. Participants were informed that there were no time limits on completing the questionnaire but were given a date by which to return the questionnaire to the police officer acting as a gateway to the police force. These were then returned to the researcher. Participants were advised on their confidentiality of responses and also advised of their right to withdraw. Debriefing information could be requested via an email address.

7.2.4.4 Study four.

Participants were recruited, as part of their Experimental Participation Requirement (EPR), using the method detailed in study one. Participants indicated consent prior to beginning the study. This then directed the participant to the beginning of the study. Participants were firstly presented with a scenario depicting a male rape in which the level of rape myths (high vs. low) and the type of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance) were manipulated. Following this, participants filled in the scales. Following completing the questionnaires, participants were given information as to where they could seek further information or support if the content of the study had raised relevant issues.

7.2.4.5 Study five.

The first group of participants were recruited via the University of Leicester's EPR system with the same process as described above. Once they had signed up to the study, they were directed to the online questionnaire with further warnings about the content of the study. Participants first responded to the male rape myth scale items followed by the IRMAS. Following completing the questionnaire, participants were given information as to where they could seek further information or support if the content of the study had raised relevant issues. The process was the same for the second sample of participants except that recruitment was made through two websites which host legitimate online psychological research. Participants were directed from this host website to the same online questionnaire as detailed above.

7.2.5 Data analyses.

Prior to using the parametric tests reported within this thesis, testing of the assumptions relating to those tests was carried out. For all studies, this included the assumptions of parametric tests (i.e., normality of data, homogeneity of variance, and independence). In addition, for multiple regression, this included assessing for multicollinearity, homoscedasticity, independent errors, normally distributed errors, and linearity. For MANOVA, this included assessing for multivariate normality and homogeneity of covariance matrices. For factor analysis, this involved screening for multicollinearity between variables, checking the determinant of the correlation matrix is above the necessary value of 0.00001, Kaiser-Myer Olkin measure of sampling adequacy, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, and examining the anti-image correlations to ensure these

are above the required 0.50 value for all variables (Field, 2009). All assumptions were met within the data reported in this thesis unless otherwise stated in the section below.

7.2.5.1 Assumptions testing.

The normality assumption was violated for victim blaming and perpetrator blaming throughout the thesis (see Table 3).

Table 3

Summary of Normality Testing.

Study	Assumption
One	A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test demonstrated that the scores on victim blaming were significantly non-normal $D(147) = 0.17, p < .05$.
Two	A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test demonstrated that the scores on victim blaming were significantly non-normal $D(79) = 0.14, p < .05$.
Three	A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test demonstrated that the scores on victim blaming were significantly non-normal $D(122) = 0.18, p < .05$. Also, the scores on perpetrator blaming were significantly non-normal $D(122) = 0.34, p < .05$.
Four	A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test demonstrated that the scores on victim blaming were significantly non-normal $D(122) = 0.22, p < .05$. Also, the scores on perpetrator blaming were significantly non-normal $D(116) = 0.23, p < .05$.
Five	Assumptions of the factor analysis are reported within the results section of chapter 12.

As the data violated normality assumptions, an examination of the robustness of the multivariate statistics used within this thesis was carried out. In the case of ANOVA, Tabachnik and Fidell (2007) argue that when there are at least 20 degrees of freedom for error in a univariate ANOVA, the F test will be still be reliable. This assumption is met for all of the ANOVA analyses carried out within this thesis.

MANOVA has an assumption of multivariate normality which cannot be assessed in SPSS but Field (2009) recommends the checking of the univariate normality for each dependent variable. This means that the assumptions of the F test as stated above relating to ANOVA is also applied here. All MANOVA tests achieved at least 20 degrees of freedom for error, therefore these tests are assumed to be reliable.

In the case of multiple regression, the data within the studies were checked for outliers. This process reduces the likelihood of Type I and Type II errors in the case of non-normality (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2007). Also, an analysis of the normality of the residuals was undertaken for each of the studies in which multiple regression was used. The histogram of the regression standardised residual was inspected for normality and found to be close to normal for all regression analyses. Secondly, the normal P-P plots of the residuals showed small but not substantial violations of normality (see Field, 2009). In conclusion, Field states that violations of normality affect the generalisability of the model to the general population but that the findings of the model themselves are reliable. Since the violation is small, the findings of the multiple regression analysis will be applied to the general population but that caution should be remain in discussing their generalisability.

In principle component analysis (as with multiple regression), the violation of normality does not affect the reliability of the factor structure but rather its generalisability to the general population (Field, 2009). Tabachnik and Fidell (2007) argue

that because principle component analysis summarises the relationships between variables, assumptions about normality are not in force. However, for the underlying factor structure, this can be affected by violations of normality. This was guarded against, within the thesis, by comparing the factor structures of the transformed and untransformed data. This made no difference to the factor structures in these analyses suggesting that a violation of normality had not affected the factor structures being reported in the studies.

Given the above and that Field (2009) suggest that there are additional issues associated with using transformed data (e.g., that transformation means that a different construct is being examined to that which was originally measured), the decision was taken to utilise the untransformed data for all analyses.

7.2.5.2 Power analysis.

Where possible, a power analysis calculation was carried out to calculate to required sample sizes. Where this was not feasible, alternative guidelines to sample size were followed.

7.2.5.2.1 Study one.

G*Power analysis for a 2X2 ANOVA with a medium effect size suggests that to achieve a power of 0.80, a sample size of 128 is required. Power analysis for a multiple regression with two predictors required less than this amount therefore the number of participants was set at 128.

7.2.5.2.2 Study two.

G*Power analysis for a 2X2X2 ANOVA with a medium effect size suggests that to achieve a power of 0.80, a sample size of 128 is required. Power analysis for a multiple regression with two predictors and seven predictors required less than this amount therefore the minimum number of participants was set at 128. As this sample size was not achieved for study two, post-hoc analyses of power were calculated. This demonstrated that the achieved power for the 2X2X2 ANOVA was 0.54. Power analysis for the other statistical analyses carried out in this study demonstrated sufficient power to detect effects ($>.80$).

7.2.5.2.3 Study three.

G*Power analysis recommended a significantly smaller sample size for the MANOVA analysis than for the ANOVA analyses and so alternative recommendations for MANOVA sample size were used. [D'Amico, Neilands, & Zambarano (2001) note the lack of power computations for multivariate general linear models in multiple dependent variables designs.] Tabachnik and Fidell (2007) argue that with regards to MANOVA cell sample size, it is necessary to have more cases than DVs in every cell. Dancey and Reidy (2008) offer a more conservative estimate with the minimum being 12 per cell. The cell size within this sample fits these criteria for all cells. Power analysis for a multiple regression with two predictors (and seven predictors) required less than the achieved sample so power was sufficient.

7.2.5.2.4 Study four.

As with study three, alternative recommendations for MANOVA sample size were used. The cell size within this study fits the Dancey and Reidy (2004) criteria bar one cell which has 11 participants within it. The required sample size for the multiple regression with three predictors was 77 which was achieved within this sample.

7.2.5.2.5 Study five.

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure demonstrated that the sampling adequacy was at the level designated as superb, KMO = .93 (Field, 2009). Power was also sufficient for the t-tests and correlations carried out in this study.

8 Study One: Victim blaming: The Effect of Belief in a Just World, Rape Myth Acceptance, and Gender Role Traits.

8.1 Abstract

This study examines the relationship between victim blaming and participants' (i) rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world. It also examines the effects of type of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance) and gender (male vs. female) on victim blaming. Data collection involved presenting vignettes to Psychology undergraduates via an online questionnaire. Rape myth acceptance predicted victim blaming but belief in a just world did not. There was no significant effect of gender on levels of victim blaming. However, there was for type of rape such that the acquaintance rape victim was blamed more than stranger rape victim. There was no significant effect of gender role traits on victim blaming.

8.2 Introduction

Previous research regarding victim blaming has demonstrated the importance of understanding why rape victims are blamed more than victims of other types of crime (e.g., Brems & Wagner, 1994). These research findings have demonstrated (but not consistently) that males attribute greater levels of responsibility towards female rape victims than females do (Bell et al., 1994). Given the inconsistency in the research, it is important in the initial stages of the new research presented in this thesis to establish an understanding of participant gender effects. In addition, since Monson et al. (2000) demonstrated that the degree of acquaintance between a female rape victim and the

perpetrator can influence participants' assessments of the rape victim, this will also be assessed within this study.

As established in the literature review presented earlier in this thesis, three additional factors have been shown to be important in relation to attitudes towards female rape victims. Rape myths as defined by Burt (1980) are stereotypical and prejudicial beliefs that relate to rape, rape victims, and rape perpetrators. This definition was conceptualised to relate specifically to female victims of rape. The purpose of such beliefs seems to be protective in allowing women to deny their personal vulnerability and for men to justify sexual violence (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). Rape myths have been found to increase the level of blame attributed towards a rape victim (Frese et al., 2004), however previous research has been limited in understanding and examining how specific rape myths may influence levels of blame. Criticisms of the validity of Burt's measure of rape myth acceptance (e.g., Lonsway & Fitzgerald) has also suggested that the use of this scale was inappropriate. Utilising a newer measure of rape myth acceptance with sub-factors such as the IRMAS (Payne et al., 1999) will mean that a greater understanding of the relationship of rape myths with victim blaming may be achieved.

The second factor which will be examined is belief in a just world. This belief that only bad things will happen to bad people and vice versa has been related to victim blaming in that it can also have a protective function (Hafer & Correy, 1999). Studies have found an association between victim blaming and belief in a just world but only in certain

circumstances such as with the use of a particular scale (e.g., Lambert & Raichle, 2000) or with a particular type of victim (e.g., Ford et al., 1998). Again, other studies have found no such effect (e.g., Brems & Wagner, 1994). Criticisms of the Rubin and Peplau (1975) scale in terms of its validity and reliability (see Whatley & Riggio, 1993) have led to questions over this association as this is the commonly used measure. As suggested in chapter six, utilising Dalbert et al.'s (1987) scale should help to further clarify our understanding of belief in a just world in relation to female victim blaming.

The final element to this first study is a measure of gender role traits. Theoretical explanations of female victim blaming have attributed the adoption of a traditional gender role traits as an importance explanation for this phenomenon (e.g., Scully, 1990). In many countries, the gender socialisation process of men and women emphasises a dominant role for men but a submissive role for women. Adoption of a traditional gender role (e.g., masculine or feminine) may be particularly important in influencing attitudes towards female rape victims when they are perceived to have violated the appropriate role for women (Harrison et al., 2008). The short form of the BSRI is considered more psychometrically sound (Hoffman & Borders, 2001) and to have a reliable factor structure (Ozkan & Lajunen, 2005). This measure is still one of the most widely used measures of gender role traits and Holt and Ellis (1998) conclude it remains a valid measure of gender role traits. However, given Choi et al.'s (2008) recent analysis of this scale, a twofold approach to analysing the data from this scale will be taken (see chapter seven).

Given the above literature, the research hypotheses for this study are:

- i. There will be a gender effect in victim blaming such that males will blame the female victim more than females.
- ii. Similarly, there will be a gender effect in rape myth acceptance such that males will accept rape myths at a higher level than females.
- iii. Acquaintance rape victims will be blamed more than stranger rape victims.
- iv. Rape myth acceptance and belief in a just world will predict victim blaming.
- v. Rape myths relating to the victim will particularly contribute towards victim blaming.
- vi. Adoption of traditional gender role traits (e.g., masculine or feminine via Bem, 1981 or the gender role trait factors identified by Choi et al., 2009, of femininity, social masculinity and personal masculinity) will increase victim blaming.

8.3 Method

As this methodology has been reviewed in the methodology chapter, this will only contain brief details of the methodology employed within this study (see chapter seven).

8.3.1 Design.

The design of this study was between subjects in which the effects of type of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance) and gender (male vs. female) on victim blaming were examined. Gender effects were also examined in relation to rape myth acceptance. The relationships between victim blaming and (i) rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just

world were also assessed. Finally, the effect of gender role traits on victim blaming was examined.

8.3.2 Participants.

The sample consisted of 147 Psychology undergraduates, consisting of 73 male and 74 female participants. The age range was from 18 to 37 years with a mean of 19.30 years ($SD = 2.10$).

8.3.3 Materials.

Participants read one rape scenario which portrayed either a stranger or an acquaintance rape event. Four questionnaires were then presented to participants. These measured victim blaming ($\alpha = .74$), belief in a just world (Dalbert et al., 1987, $\alpha = .72$), gender role traits (BSRI) via the Bem (1981) conceptualisation ($\alpha = .84$ for the masculine items, $\alpha = .84$ for feminine items) and also via the Choi et al. (2009) concept ($\alpha = .69$ for social masculinity items, $\alpha = .84$ for personal masculinity items, and $\alpha = .76$ for femininity items), and rape myth acceptance (IRMAS, Payne et al., 1999, $\alpha = .94$).

8.3.4 Procedure.

As described in chapter seven, participants were recruited via the EPR system. The vignette was presented to participants followed by four questionnaires of victim blaming, belief in a just world, short version of the BSRI, and rape myth acceptance. Following completing the questionnaire, participants were given information as to where they could seek further information or support.

8.4 Results

In analysing the data from this study, the initial process involved examining the descriptive statistics. These are presented below in Table 4.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of Victim Blaming, Rape Myth Acceptance, and Belief In A Just World

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skew	Kurtosis
Victim blaming* [†]	1.80	0.75	1.17	0.95
Rape myth acceptance	100.31	27.12	0.26	-0.43
Belief in a just world	19.41	4.71	0.01	-0.18

*Following PCA procedure outlined below

[†] This an average of the victim blame values so that victim blaming can be compared across all studies.

8.4.1 Level of acceptance of rape myths.

The table below shows the percentage of participants who indicated a level of agreement to the female rape myth scale items. As the scale is on a seven point scale, any participant indicating a score above the midpoint of four (i.e., five and above) was designated as having indicated a level of agreement to the rape myth. The table is organised by rape myth type so that comparisons can be drawn across the data.

Table 5

Percentage of Participants (separated by gender) who indicated a Level of Acceptance to the Female Rape Myth

			Males	Females
1	SA	If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.	24.32	30.14

15	SA	When women go around wearing low-cut tops or short skirts, they're just asking for trouble.	16.22	9.59
19	SA	If a woman goes home with a man she doesn't know, it is her own fault if she is raped.	16.22	17.81
25	SA	When a woman is a sexual tease, eventually she is going to get into trouble.	25.68	21.92
36	SA	A woman who "teases" men deserves anything that might happen.	4.05	2.74
37	SA	When women are raped, it's often because the way they said "no" was ambiguous.	5.41	2.74
41	SA	A woman who dresses in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tried to force her to have sex.	21.62	10.96
43	SA	A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on the first date is implying that she wants to have sex.	24.32	20.55
2	WI	Although most women wouldn't admit it, they generally find being physically forced into sex a real "turn-on."	5.41	4.11
8	WI	Many women secretly desire to be raped.	1.35	2.74
18	WI	Many women find being forced to have sex very arousing.	5.41	4.11
23	WI	Some women prefer to have sex forced on them so they don't have to feel guilty about it.	1.35	4.11
44	WI	Many women actually enjoy sex after the guy uses a little force.	20.27	17.81
5	LI	Women who are caught having an illicit affair sometimes claim that it was rape.	29.73	35.62
7	LI	Many so-called rape victims are actually women who had sex and "changed their minds" afterwards.	14.86	10.96
16	LI	Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at men.	17.57	15.07
31	LI	A lot of women lead a man on and then they cry rape.	8.11	15.07
33	LI	A lot of times, women who claim they were raped just have emotional problems.	4.05	5.48
3	MT	When men rape, it is because of their strong desire for sex.	31.08	23.29
20	MT	Rapists are usually sexually frustrated individuals.	39.19	26.03
30	MT	When a man is very sexually aroused, he may not even realise that the woman is resisting.	14.86	17.81
39	MT	Men don't usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.	17.57	23.29
42	MT	Rape happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control.	28.38	27.40
4	TE	If a woman is willing to "make out" with a guy, then it's no big deal if he goes a little further and has sex.	2.70	4.11
14	TE	Rape isn't as big a problem as some feminists would like people to believe.	5.41	2.74
26	TE	Being raped isn't as bad as being mugged and beaten.	1.35	0
29	TE	Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.	5.41	1.37
38	TE	If a woman isn't a virgin, then it shouldn't be a big deal if her date forces her to have sex.	1.35	0

9	DE	Rape mainly occurs on the “bad” side of town.	24.32	5.48
10	DE	Usually, it is only women who do things like hang out in bars and sleep around that are raped.	5.41	1.37
13	DE	Men from nice middle-class homes almost never rape.	1.35	0
22	DE	It is usually only women who dress suggestively that are raped.	2.70	2.74
27	DE	Rape is unlikely to happen in the woman’s own familiar neighbourhood.	2.70	0
28	DE	In reality, women are almost never raped by their boyfriends.	14.86	4.11
35	DE	Rape almost never happens in the women’s own home.	9.46	2.74
12	NR	If a woman doesn’t physically fight back, you can’t really say that it was rape.	5.41	5.48
17	NR	A rape didn’t happen if the woman has no bruises or marks.	1.35	0
24	NR	If the rapist doesn’t have a weapon, you really can’t call it rape.	0	0
34	NR	If a women doesn’t physically resist sex- even when protesting verbally-it really can’t be considered rape.	6.76	2.74
45	NR	If a woman claims to have been raped but has no bruises or scrapes, she probably shouldn’t be taken too seriously.	4.05	2.74

SA = ‘She asked for it’; WI = ‘She wanted it’; LI = ‘She lied’; MT = ‘He didn’t mean to’; TE = ‘Rape is a trivial event’; DE = ‘Rape is a deviant event’; NR = ‘It wasn’t really rape’.

In examining these levels of acceptance, it seems that there is a greater level of acceptance of certain myths within the rape myth acceptance subfactors such as myths which suggest that the victims deserved to be raped (‘she asked for it’), that rape victims lie (‘she lied’), and myths which excuse the actions of the perpetrator (‘he didn’t mean to’).

8.4.2 Analysis of victim blaming scale.

Following this, an analysis of the data from the victim blaming scale items began. The descriptive statistics of this scale are presented below (see Table 6).

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics of Victim Blaming Scale

		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skew	Kurtosis
1.	How much do you blame Sarah for what happened?	1.74	1.22	1.72	2.10
2.*	How much do you blame the man described in the paragraph for what happened?	1.37	0.92	4.03	19.81
3.	How much control do you think Sarah had over the situation?	2.24	1.22	1.09	0.56
4.*	How much control do you think the man described in the paragraph had over the situation?	1.78	1.11	2.17	5.15
5.	Do you think that this incident could have been avoided?	5.18	1.59	-0.59	-0.55
6.	How much sympathy do you feel for Sarah?	1.48	0.93	2.31	5.74
7.	Who is responsible for what happened?	1.60	0.92	1.61	2.15
8.	Whose fault do you think it is, that things turned out the way that they did?	1.91	1.28	1.84	3.78

*Reverse coded

Following an examination of the skewness and kurtosis of the data, the decision was made to transform the data to examine the effect this may have on results from a principle component analysis. (See Appendix C for transformed data descriptive statistics.) Given the continued deviations from normality demonstrated by scale item two, this was removed from the principle component analysis.

8.4.2.1 Principle component analysis.

A principle component analysis was carried out on both the transformed and untransformed data using a varimax rotation. This process identified that both analyses produced identical factor structures which suggests that deviations from normality had

not affected these processes. For this reason, the untransformed data were retained in the following analyses (see Appendix D for the two analyses).

In deciding how many factors to retain within the analysis, a parallel analysis, Kaiser's criterion and a visual inspection of the scree plot was carried out. The parallel analysis concurred with the Kaiser's criterion (along with a visual inspection of the scree plot) in extracting a two-factor solution from the data. As scale item five was loading on both factor 1 and factor 2, this factor was removed and the principle component analysis re-run.

8.4.2.2 Factor rotation and factor loading.

As the theoretical underpinnings of victim blaming suggests that there should be a relationship between the scale items, a comparison between an orthogonal and oblique rotation was carried out to understand any differences in factor structure (see Appendix E for the direct oblimin analysis.) As no differences were demonstrated in the factor structures, a varimax procedure was the most appropriate form of analysis (Pallant, 2007) and thus is reported below.

A principle component analysis was carried out on the six victim blaming scale items using a varimax rotation. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure demonstrated that the sampling adequacy was at a level designated good, $KMO = .75$ (Field, 2009). Also, all KMO values for the individual items were above the acceptable level of .5 (Field, 2009). The Bartlett's test of sphericity demonstrated that the correlations between items were

large enough for principle component analysis to be a suitable method to use ($\chi^2 (15) = 231.41, p < .001$). The analysis supported a one factor solution explaining 46.61% of the variance (via Kaiser's criterion, parallel analysis, and a visual inspection of the scree plot). As this was a one factor solution, no rotation of the data was completed (see Table 7 for factor loadings).

Table 7

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Victim Blaming Scale

		Victim blaming
Eigenvalue = 2.80		
1.	How much do you blame Sarah for what happened?	.77
3.	How much control do you think Sarah had over the situation?	.55
4.*	How much control do you think the man described in the paragraph had over the situation?	.41
6.	How much sympathy do you feel for Sarah?	.79
7.	Who is responsible for what happened?	.76
8.	Whose fault do you think it is, that thinks turned out the way that they did?	.73

* reverse coded

This analysis process meant therefore that the victim blaming measures comprised of scale items one, three, four, six, seven and eight. To further assess the usefulness of the scale, items were correlated with the total victim blaming score (Table 8). From this analysis, it can be concluded that this scale is a valid measure of victim blaming.

Table 8

Correlations of Victim blaming Items and Total Victim blaming

		Victim blaming
1.	How much do you blame Sarah for what happened?	.74*
3.	How much control do you think Sarah had over the situation?	.59*
4.	How much control do you think the man described in the paragraph had over the situation?	.49*
6.	How much sympathy do you feel for Sarah?	.76*
7.	Who is responsible for what happened?	.72*
8.	Whose fault do you think it is, that things turned out the way that they did?	.72*

* $p < .001$ **8.4.3 Gender differences and type of rape.**

No significant gender effect was found between male and female participants in rape myth acceptance ($p > .05$). A two (male vs. female) by two (stranger vs. acquaintance) between groups ANOVA was carried out to examine differences in victim blaming. This found that there was a significant main effect of type of rape [$F(1, 143) = 5.17, p = .02$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$]. The effect size is therefore categorised according to Cohen's suggestions (Field, 2009) as a small to medium effect ($r = .20$). Gender was not a significant main effect [$F(1, 143) = 1.60, p = .21$]. There was no significant interaction between these two factors [$F(1, 143) = 0.07, p = .80$]. Inspection of the means of type of rape demonstrated that the acquaintance rape victim ($M = 1.94, SD = 0.79$) was blamed more than stranger rape victim ($M = 1.66, SD = 0.67$).

8.4.4 Relationship between victim blaming and (i) female rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world.

A hierarchical multiple regression examining the relationship between victim blaming and two predictor variables was carried out. In step one (female rape myth acceptance) the model was significant [$F(1, 145) = 28.37, p < .001$]. In step 2 (female rape myth acceptance and belief in a just world) the model was also significant [$F(2, 144) = 14.19, p < .001$]. Female rape myth acceptance was a significant predictor but not belief in a just world (see Table 9).

Table 9

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Victim blaming.

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>β</i>
Step 1			
Female rape myth acceptance	.07	.01	.41*
Step 2			
Female rape myth acceptance	.07	.01	.41*
Belief in a just world	-.03	.07	.68

Note. $\Delta R^2 = .16$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .15$ for Step 2

* $p < .001$

8.4.5 Relationship between victim blaming and subfactors of female rape myth acceptance.

To further examine the role of different types of female rape myths, a standard multiple regression was carried out with the seven subfactors ('She asked for it', 'She wanted it', 'He didn't mean to', 'Rape is a trivial event', 'She lied', 'Rape is a deviant event', 'It wasn't really rape') of the female rape myth acceptance scale as predictor

variables of victim blaming (see Table 10). The model was significant [$F(7, 139) = 7.25, p < .001$]. This analysis demonstrated that ‘She asked for it’ and ‘Rape is a trivial event’ were significant predictors of victim blaming.

Table 10

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Subfactors of Female Rape Myth Acceptance Predicting Female Victim blaming.

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>β</i>
She asked for it	.03	.01	.33*
She wanted it	.02	.02	.12
He didn’t mean to	-.01	.01	-.06
Rape is a trivial event	.08	.02	.35*
She lied	<-.01	.02	<-.01
Rape is a deviant event	-.02	.01	-.11
It wasn’t really rape	-.03	.02	-.14

Note. $\Delta R^2 = .23$

* $p < .01$

8.4.6 Examining the influence of gender role traits on victim blaming.

As the Bem Sex Role Inventory categorises individuals into four different gender roles according to the strength of belief in their masculine and feminine attributes, a one way ANOVA was carried out with the four gender role traits groups (masculine, feminine, undifferentiated, and androgynous) with victim blaming as the dependent variable. Gender role was found to be spread amongst the sample as 22.4% masculine, 22.4% feminine, 29.3% undifferentiated, and 25.9% androgynous. The gender role effect approached significance [$F(3, 143) = 2.18, p = .09$]. An inspection of the mean values

demonstrated that individuals with an androgynous ($M = 1.86$, $SD = 0.75$) or undifferentiated ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 0.89$) gender role blamed the victim at a somewhat higher level than individuals with a traditional gender role (Masculine $M = 1.60$, $SD = 0.53$, Feminine $M = 1.69$, $SD = 0.68$).

Using the Choi et al. (2009) categorisations of femininity, personal and social masculinity, a standard multiple regression was carried with the three variables placed as predictor variables of victim blaming. The model was not significant ($p > .05$).

8.5 Discussion

This study has demonstrated, in line with other previous research on victim blaming, that males do not always attribute more blame to rape victims than females do (see also Brems & Wagner, 1994; Frese et al., 2004; Janoff-Bulman & Timko, 1985; Newcomb et al., 2008; Viki & Abrams, 2002). This finding may reflect a broadening of attitudes towards women in society generally or specifically towards female rape victims. It may also be that the increased victim blaming for male participants found in some prior studies occurs in only certain depictions of rape vignettes (e.g., where there are a higher level of rape myths). The influence of rape myths within vignettes will be examined within the next study. Similarly, no gender differences were found, in the present study, in female rape myth acceptance.

Type of rape was found to significantly affect levels of victim blame in that the victim of acquaintance rape was attributed more blame than the victim of stranger rape.

This finding supports previous research (e.g., Bell et al., 1994; Golge et al., 2003). This finding is particularly problematic when related back to the real world, as the majority of rape is committed by people known to the victim (Feist et al., 2007). Biases against victims of acquaintance rape may affect a victim's decision to report their victimisation to the police. Indeed, this may already occur, as demonstrated by Campbell et al. (2001) who found that female victims of stranger rape were seven times more likely to report their rape to the police when compared to other types of victims.

Rape myth acceptance demonstrated a significant relationship with victim blaming. This study also demonstrated the importance of particular rape myths in their relationship with female victim blaming. 'She asked for it' and 'Rape is a trivial event' both predicted female victim blaming. 'She asked for it' relates to myths that suggest if a woman is raped because of the victim's behaviour (e.g., drinking alcohol to excess) or the victim's character (e.g., being a sexual tease) then the victim is responsible for what happens to them. The descriptive analysis of the levels of acceptance of rape myths showed that myths such as 'She asked for it' were also accepted at higher levels compared to other myths. A quarter of male participants agreed that if a woman goes to the home of a man on a first date, that she is implying that she wants to have sex. The myth that 'Rape is a trivial event' relates to myths that minimise trauma and distress that rape can cause the victim. The relationship between such rape myths and female victim blaming does suggest, in line with Peterson and Muehlenhard (2004) that the function of such myths is to discredit or disbelieve the victim.

The current study found no relationship between victim blaming and belief in a just world. Given the previous inconsistent findings, this is not unexpected. As shown by Lambert and Raichle (2000) it may be that the association between belief in a just world and victim blaming may depend upon the particular measure used to assess belief in a just world. The use of the more reliable Dalbert et al. (1987) measure of general belief in a just world may give some greater confidence in the reliability of this finding. As concluded by Correia et al. (2001), it does appear that the relationship between belief in a just world and victim blaming is much less consistent than it is for other types of victims.

The role of gender role traits in female victim blaming remains unclear. A difference which approached significance was found. In interpreting this cautiously, this does seem to be in line with some of the previous findings using the BSRI. Within the present study, individuals classified as androgynous or undifferentiated were found to attribute greater blame towards the rape victim than feminine or masculine categorised individuals. This is somewhat consistent with the previous literature within this area, for example, Kopper (1996) found that individuals who were categorised as androgynous engaged in higher victim blaming than other gender roles. Also, Quackenbush (1989) found that undifferentiated and masculine individuals engaged in higher blaming levels than androgynous individuals. As the effect in the present study only approached significance, it is important to not draw further conclusions about the role of gender role traits in victim blaming until this is confirmed in further studies.

This study has provided an initial understanding of the relationships that certain factors can have with victim blaming. However, the present study's sample consisted of Psychology undergraduate students. This is similar to many studies examining victim blaming, though the present study does broaden the research beyond the more typical North American samples.

In conclusion, this study has demonstrated the probable importance of rape myths, with myths that revolve around 'She asked for it' and 'Rape is a trivial event' being of particular importance. The importance of level of acquaintance has also been demonstrated with the acquaintance rape victim being attributed significantly more blame than the stranger rape victim. However, this study does question the role of some factors found by prior research to relate to victim blaming. For example, the importance of belief in a just world and of gender role traits remains unclear. In addition, the lack of consistency of a gender effect is also confirmed, suggesting that it should not be concluded that males are always more victim blaming than females. To develop this research, it is important to understand the influence of rape myths in apportioning blame to the victim and also to understand the role of experience of the legal system and how this might affect levels of blame attributed towards the victim.

9 Study Two: Victim Blaming Amongst a Law Student Sample

9.1 Abstract

This study examines, within a sample of final year law undergraduates, the relationship between victim blaming and participants' (i) rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world. This study also examines the effects of gender (male vs. female), type of rape presented in the vignettes (stranger vs. acquaintance), and level of rape myths (high vs. low) on victim blaming. Participants' rape myth acceptance but not belief in a just world was found to predict victim blaming. There was no significant effect of participant gender on victim blaming. However, level of rape myths and type of rape did influence the level of blame attributed towards the rape victim. There was no significant influence of gender role traits on victim blaming.

9.2 Introduction

This study develops the research presented within this thesis by examining victim blaming attitudes amongst participants with relevant legal experience and in whose future lies a likely role within the criminal justice system. As stated in the literature review presented earlier in this thesis, rape is particularly known for being dealt with negatively within the court system. A standard defence put forward by defence teams would be to suggest that the victim consented to what happened to them and so are responsible/to blame for what happened (Jordan, 2008). There are, however, a limited number of studies which assess the attitudes of legal professionals who come into contact with rape victims (possibly because these are so difficult to access). Law students

therefore offer a viable alternative. Krahe et al. (2008) found that, in a sample of law students, as the scenario deviated further from a 'real' rape scenario, the less blame was attributed towards the defendant. Higher rape myth acceptance, amongst the law students was found to be associated with lower liability attributed towards the perpetrator and increased victim blaming. Temkin (2000) carried out a qualitative study which demonstrated that legal professionals demonstrate an acceptance of rape myths by linking the rape victim's behaviour to their responsibility for being raped. It was also accepted that an important part of the defence would be to discredit the victim's character by suggesting that they had consented to the rape or that by their behaviour, it was reasonable for the perpetrator to believe that they had consented. This could be insinuated through questioning relating to aspects of the victim's behaviour (e.g., the alcohol drinking behaviour of the victim, the clothing of the victim). Erlich (2001) emphasised one rape case in which a rape victim's sexual character was tarnished through presenting her (flimsy) underwear to the jury ostensibly to look at the absence of tears as evidence of no force.

Study one demonstrated the significance of the relationship between rape myth acceptance and victim blaming. To further the examination of the role of rape myths in victim blaming, this second study will examine the role of rape myths within the scenarios by manipulating the level of rape myths present within the scenarios. This will be achieved in several ways such as by manipulating the dress of the victim and the alcohol drinking behaviour of the victim and perpetrator. These factors were manipulated

because of their importance in the previous literature and the association with victim blame. As argued by Maurer and Robinson (2008), victims and perpetrators of rape are interpreted differently according to their alcohol drinking behaviour. Victims drinking alcohol are inferred to be more interested in participating in sexual behaviour, whereas perpetrators of rape are excused from committing rape due to their alcohol intake. Sims et al. (2007) demonstrated that the drinking of alcohol by a female date rape victim increased the level of blame attributed towards them when compared with a female date rape victim who was not drinking alcohol. One form of reasoning underlying why this may increase the level of responsibility attributed towards female victims is because of gender role socialisation (Pollard, 1992). Pollard suggests that the drinking of alcohol is considered inappropriate behaviour for women though not so for men, therefore a female depicted as drinking alcohol is violating their gender role.

Similar to the drinking of alcohol, the clothing of the rape victim has been seen to influence the perception of the preparedness of the woman to engage in sexual behaviour. A revealingly dressed victim may be thought to be sending out the non-verbal message that she is consenting to sexual behaviour which will increase the level of blame attributed towards her should she be raped (e.g., Kanekar & Kolsawalla, 1981; Maurer & Robinson, 2008; Pollard, 1992).

Finally, this study will continue to attempt to establish the role of belief in a just world in female victim blaming. The theory underpinning belief in a just world establishes

this as a potentially useful explanation where there are a high level of rape myths, as this victim would be considered less innocent. As the theory suggests that bad things happen to bad people (Lerner, 1980), blaming such a victim may therefore be justifiable in judging their behaviour. As argued by Correia et al. (2001), when responsibility is being attributed towards a victim, belief in a just world processes first focus on the victim's behaviour and then on their character. A female rape victim who has drunk alcohol to excess or dressed in revealing clothing may be judged as 'behaving badly' and these processes may enable greater blame to be attributed to such victims.

Further, this study will continue to examine the adoption of traditional gender role traits in their relationship with victim blaming. Study one demonstrated an effect which approached significance and so the influence of gender role traits on victim blaming will attempt to be clarified within this study. As the study also includes a manipulation of level of rape myths, gender role traits may have a more significant effect since this will involve judging female rape scenarios where the victim will be perceived to have violated her gender role therefore may attract greater levels of blame.

Given the above literature, the research hypotheses for this study are:

- i. There will be a gender difference in victim blaming such that males will blame the rape victim more than females.
- ii. Similarly, there will be a gender difference in rape myth acceptance such that males will accept rape myths at a higher level than females.

- iii. Acquaintance rape victims will be blamed more than stranger rape victims.
- iv. A higher level of rape myths present in the scenario will increase the level of blame attributed towards the rape victim compared to a low level of rape myths.
- v. Rape myth acceptance and belief in a just world will predict victim blaming.
- vi. Rape myths relating to the victim will particularly contribute towards victim blaming.
- vii. Adoption of traditional gender role traits (e.g., masculine or feminine via Bem, 1981, or the gender role trait factors identified by Choi et al., 2009, of femininity, social masculinity, and personal masculinity) will increase victim blaming.

9.3 Method

As this methodology has been reviewed in the methodology chapter, this will only contain brief details of the methodology employed within this study (see chapter seven for full details).

9.3.1 Design.

The design of this study was a between subjects design in which the effects of gender (male vs. female), type of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance), and level of rape myths (high vs. low) on victim blaming were examined. Gender differences were also examined in relation to rape myth acceptance. The relationship between victim blaming and (i) rape

myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world was assessed. Finally, the effect of gender role traits on victim blaming was examined.

9.3.2 Participants.

The sample consisted of 82 Law students, consisting of 60 female and 22 male participants. The age range was from 19 to 32 years with a mean of 20.92 years ($SD = 1.46$).

9.3.3 Materials.

Participants read one rape scenario which was manipulated by type of rape (stranger or an acquaintance rape) and level of rape myth (high vs. low) event. Four questionnaires were then presented to participants. These measured victim blaming ($\alpha = .70$), belief in a just world (Dalbert et al., 1987, $\alpha = .75$), gender role traits (BSRI) via the Bem (1981) conceptualisation ($\alpha = .74$ for the masculine items, $\alpha = .80$ for feminine items) and also via the Choi et al. (2009) concept ($\alpha = .78$ for personal masculinity, $\alpha = .58$ for social masculinity, and $\alpha = .64$ for femininity), and rape myth acceptance (IRMAS, Payne et al., 1999, $\alpha = .95$).

9.3.4 Procedure.

The vignette followed by the four questionnaires assessing victim blaming, belief in a just world, short version of the BSRI, and rape myth acceptance were administered to participants within a Law lecture, following their signing of a consent form. Debriefing information was also supplied upon the return of the questionnaires.

9.4 Results

The means and standard deviations of the data are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics of Victim Blaming, Rape Myth Acceptance, and Belief In A Just World

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skew	Kurtosis
Victim blaming	1.86	0.65	0.88	0.78
Rape myth acceptance	96.39	30.39	0.17	-0.99
Belief in a just world	18.46	5.18	0.28	-0.19

9.4.1 Level of acceptance of rape myths.

In examining the level of acceptance of rape myths, percentages were calculated on participants who indicated a level of acceptance to the myth (see Table 12). As the scale is on a seven point scale, any participant indicating a score above the midpoint of four (i.e., five and above) was designated as having indicated a level of agreement to the rape myth. These percentages demonstrate that there is a greater acceptance of myths which emphasise that the victim deserved to be raped ('She asked for it'), that rape victims lie ('She lied') and those that excuse the perpetrator ('He didn't mean to').

Table 12

Percentage of Participants (separated by gender) who indicated a Level of Acceptance to the Female Rape Myth.

			Males	Females
1	SA	If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.	25.00	28.33

15	SA	When women go around wearing low-cut tops or short skirts, they're just asking for trouble.	30.00	15.00
19	SA	If a woman goes home with a man she doesn't know, it is her own fault if she is raped.	25.00	11.67
25	SA	When a woman is a sexual tease, eventually she is going to get into trouble.	50.00	21.67
36	SA	A woman who "teases" men deserves anything that might happen.	10.00	3.33
37	SA	When women are raped, it's often because the way they said "no" was ambiguous.	15.00	1.67
41	SA	A woman who dresses in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tried to force her to have sex.	30.00	13.33
43	SA	A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on the first date is implying that she wants to have sex.	35.00	23.33
2	WI	Although most women wouldn't admit it, they generally find being physically forced into sex a real "turn-on."	0	3.33
8	WI	Many women secretly desire to be raped.	0	6.67
18	WI	Many women find being forced to have sex very arousing.	5.00	1.67
23	WI	Some women prefer to have sex forced on them so they don't have to feel guilty about it.	0	0
44	WI	Many women actually enjoy sex after the guy uses a little force.	10.00	3.33
5	LI	Women who are caught having an illicit affair sometimes claim that it was rape.	50.00	31.67
7	LI	Many so-called rape victims are actually women who had sex and "changed their minds" afterwards.	30.00	11.67
16	LI	Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at men.	30.00	16.67
31	LI	A lot of women lead a man on and then they cry rape.	30.00	6.67
33	LI	A lot of times, women who claim they were raped just have emotional problems.	10.00	3.33
3	MT	When men rape, it is because of their strong desire for sex.	45.00	11.67
20	MT	Rapists are usually sexually frustrated individuals.	60.00	15.00
30	MT	When a man is very sexually aroused, he may not even realise that the woman is resisting.	35.00	15.00
39	MT	Men don't usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.	45.00	11.67
42	MT	Rape happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control.	40.00	13.33
4	TE	If a woman is willing to "make out" with a guy, then it's no big deal if he goes a little further and has sex.	0	3.33
14	TE	Rape isn't as big a problem as some feminists would like people to believe.	10.00	3.33
26	TE	Being raped isn't as bad as being mugged and beaten.	0	1.67
29	TE	Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.	0	1.67
38	TE	If a woman isn't a virgin, then it shouldn't be a big deal if her date forces her to have sex.	0	0

9	DE	Rape mainly occurs on the “bad” side of town.	20.00	6.67
10	DE	Usually, it is only women who do things like hang out in bars and sleep around that are raped.	5.00	5.00
13	DE	Men from nice middle-class homes almost never rape.	0	5.00
22	DE	It is usually only women who dress suggestively that are raped.	10.00	5.00
27	DE	Rape is unlikely to happen in the woman’s own familiar neighbourhood.	0	3.33
28	DE	In reality, women are almost never raped by their boyfriends.	5.00	3.33
35	DE	Rape almost never happens in the women’s own home.	5.00	0
12	NR	If a woman doesn’t physically fight back, you can’t really say that it was rape.	10.00	6.67
17	NR	A rape didn’t happen if the woman has no bruises or marks.	5.00	1.67
24	NR	If the rapist doesn’t have a weapon, you really can’t call it rape.	0	0
34	NR	If a women doesn’t physically resist sex- even when protesting verbally-it really can’t be considered rape.	10.00	3.33
45	NR	If a woman claims to have been raped but has no bruises or scrapes, she probably shouldn’t be taken too seriously.	0	0

9.4.2 Gender differences and the influence of type of rape and level of rape myths.

A significant effect of gender was found ($t(75) = 2.43, p = .02$) where males ($M = 111.59, SD = 25.97$) accepted female rape myths at a significantly higher level than females ($M = 91.70, SD = 30.72$). The effect was of a medium size ($r = .19$) (Field, 2009).

A two (male vs. female) by two (stranger vs. acquaintance) by two (high level of rape myths vs. low level of rape myths) between groups ANOVA was carried out to examine effects on victim blaming. This found a significant main effect of type of rape [$F(1, 72) = 3.94, p = .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$], for which the effect is a medium size ($r = .22$). There was also a significant main effect of level of rape myths [$F(1, 72) = 3.76, p = .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$]. The effect size was also medium ($r = .22$). Gender did not have a significant main effect [$F(1, 72) = 0.98, p = .33$]. There were no significant interactions between these factors. Inspection of the means of type of rape demonstrated that acquaintance rape

victims ($M = 2.00$, $S.D. = 0.66$) are blamed more than stranger rape victims ($M = 1.73$, $S.D. = 0.63$). Inspection of the means of level of rape myths demonstrated that the victim in the high rape myth condition ($M = 2.04$, $S.D. = 0.80$) was blamed more than the victim in the low rape myth condition ($M = 1.72$, $S.D. = 0.48$).

9.4.3 Relationship between victim blaming and (i) female rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world.

A hierarchical multiple regression examining the relationship between victim blaming and two predictor variables was carried out. In step one (female rape myth acceptance) the model was significant [$F(1, 77) = 34.16$, $p < .001$]. In Step 2 (female rape myth acceptance and belief in a just world) the model was significant [$F(2, 76) = 17.20$, $p < .001$]. Only female rape myth acceptance was a significant predictor (please see Table 13 for further details).

Table 13

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Victim blaming.

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>B</i>
Step 1			
Female rape myth acceptance	.07	.01	.55*
Step 2			
Female rape myth acceptance	.07	.01	.53*
Belief in a just world	.05	.08	.07

Note. $R^2 = .31$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .04$ for Step 2
* $p < .001$

9.4.4 Relationship between victim blaming and subfactors of female rape myth acceptance.

To further examine the role of different types of female rape myths, a standard multiple regression was carried out with the seven subfactors ('She asked for it', 'She wanted it', 'He didn't mean to', 'Rape is a trivial event', 'She lied', 'Rape is a deviant event', 'It wasn't really rape') of the rape myth acceptance scale as predictor variables of victim blaming (see Table 14 below). The model was significant $F(7, 71) = 7.16, p < .001$. This analysis demonstrated that 'She asked for it' was a significant predictor of victim blaming.

Table 14

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Subfactors of Female Rape Myth Acceptance Scale Predicting Victim blaming.

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>B</i>
She asked for it	.03	.01	.37*
She wanted it	.03	.02	.19
He didn't mean to	-.02	.01	-.16
Rape is a trivial event	.01	.03	.07
She lied	<.01	.02	<.01
Rape is a deviant event	-.02	.02	-.14
It wasn't really rape	.05	.03	.29

Note. $\Delta R^2 = .23$

* $p < .01$

9.4.5 Examining the influence of gender role traits on victim blaming and rape myth acceptance.

As the Bem Sex Role Inventory categorises individuals into four different gender roles according to the strength of belief in their masculine and feminine attributes, this meant that a one way ANOVA was carried out with the four gender role groups (masculine, feminine, undifferentiated, and androgynous) with victim blaming as the dependent variable. Gender role was spread amongst the sample as 24.05% masculine, 24.05% feminine, 29.11% undifferentiated and 22.78% androgynous. The model was not significant ($p > .05$).

Using the Choi et al. (2009) categorisations of femininity, personal and social masculinity, a standard multiple regression was carried with the three variables placed as predictor variables of victim blaming. The model was not significant ($p > .05$).

9.5 Discussion

This study found a significant gender effect regarding rape myth acceptance, in that males accepted rape myths at a higher level than females. This finding runs counter to the non-significant difference found in study one but is more in line with the current literature (e.g., Jones et al., 1998). However, there was no gender effect in relation to victim blaming. This supports the lack of a gender effect found in study one, and also found in some previous studies (e.g., Brems & Wagner, 1994; Frese et al., 2004; Janoff-Bulman & Timko, 1985; Newcomb et al., 2008; Viki & Abrams, 2002). This second study further confirms the differential effects of stranger and acquaintance rape.

In this second study, the importance of rape myths within (various) rape scenarios has been demonstrated, in that a rape victim was blamed significantly more where there were present a high level of rape myths. The level of rape myths was manipulated by including factors such as the victim and perpetrator drinking alcohol. These myths can be related to a more victim blaming stance. For example, Maier (2008) noted that the police may pose questions towards the victim that include alcohol use and clothing worn which can be interpreted by the victim as them being attributed responsibility for what has happened to them. Similarly within the court system, Coates and Wade (2004) have noted that alcohol was referred to within judgements given in court as an explanation for why the rape occurred. This obscured the responsibility of the perpetrator with alcohol being used as a mitigating factor in sentencing decisions. Acceptance levels of rape myths showed a similar trend to the levels reported within study one. In relation to the subfactor 'She lied', 50% of male participants demonstrated a level of acceptance to the myth "Women who are caught having an illicit affair sometimes claim that it was rape".

This second study also shows the importance of methodology in developing vignettes in rape victim blame studies. Previous studies in this area have included rape myth stereotypes within one scenario but not the other where these myths were not being assessed. For example, Frese et al. (2004) introduced aspects of dress and alcohol in the acquaintance rape scenario which were not present in the marital or stranger rape scenarios. This could introduce a confound, affecting the level of blame attributed to rape victims within these scenarios.

As with study one, rape myth acceptance was an important predictor of victim blaming. In relation to the individual rape myths, 'She asked for it' was a significant predictor of victim blaming. This replicates the finding from study one which reflects the importance of this myth that a rape victim's behaviour or character relate towards their responsibility for being raped. Within this particular Law sample, demonstration of acceptance of rape myths may be problematic because of the future potential contact that the participants may well have with rape victims, and the influence that they may have on reported rape cases. Crown Prosecutors (rather than the police) now have the responsibility of making decisions about whether a defendant should be charged with rape (HMCPSI/HMIC, 2007). This gives legal professionals much greater responsibility and such decision making may be influenced by an acceptance of rape myths and stereotypes. Furthermore, defence lawyers and judges may also be affected by their level of acceptance of rape myths.

This study replicated the non-significant finding of study one in that general belief in a just world did not significantly predict victim blaming. This further supports the viewpoint that general belief in a just world may not explain why people engage in victim blaming. Its previously demonstrated relationship with victim blaming may be a result of using unreliable measures of belief in a just world (see Furnham, 2003). Similarly, gender role traits did not significantly influence the level of blame attributed towards the rape victim. As this difference approached significance in study one, this needed to be

examined again in this second study. However, the results here do seem to cast doubt on the adoption of gender role traits affecting victim blaming. Although, given that these two samples are from undergraduate students, it is important to first examine this effect in a sample from the general population, and also within a sample where traditional gender role traits may be more enforced (e.g., the police). In a related vein, although the Choi et al. (2009) factor structure of the BSRI is suggested to be a better measure than the original Bem (1981), the measures of internal consistency reported within this second study do lead to questions about its usefulness. Both measures of masculinity reported levels which fall into the lower levels of acceptable range for scale reliability. This suggests that these measures need further examination.

It is important to note that this study does have limitations with regards to the sample size employed within the analysis. As noted within the section 7.2.5.2, the ANOVA analysis is underpowered which may have affected its ability to detect significant effects. What can be established so far with studies one and two, is that the effects demonstrated by the ANOVA do follow the pattern demonstrated within study one i.e., lack of a gender effect and a significant type of rape effect. In relation to the level of rape myths effects, this has to be interpreted more cautiously at this point because of the lack of replication. Further studies within the thesis will seek to establish this effect.

In conclusion, this study demonstrated a significant gender effect of rape myth acceptance, but no gender effect on victim blaming. (This lack of a gender effect is

consistent with the finding of study one in relation to victim blaming.) Two other effects have been confirmed by this second study. Firstly, the importance of type of rape in affecting the level of blame towards the victim was also consistent with the findings of study one, with the acquaintance rape victim being blamed more than the stranger rape victim. Secondly, a significant relationship was found between rape myth acceptance and victim blaming with 'She asked for it' being specifically related to victim blaming. This replicated the findings of study one in relation to this specific myth but not in regard to the myths which label rape as a trivial event. This second study has also emphasised the importance of rape myths by manipulating the level of rape myths presented within scenarios. This finding showed that where myths such as alcohol and dress are included in a scenario that this significantly increases the level of blame attributed towards the victim compared to scenarios where these elements are controlled. There continues to be doubt over the importance of belief in a just world and gender role traits in explaining victim blaming.

10 Study Three: Examining the Role of Experience and Specialist Rape Training amongst Police Officers

10.1 Abstract

This study examined blaming of female rape victims and (male) perpetrators in a sample of police officers differentiated by whether they had received specialist rape training or not. Vignettes were presented to the sample manipulated with regards to type of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance) and level of rape myths (high vs. low). Results suggest that specialist police training may not affect the blaming of rape victims. The importance of rape myths was emphasised in its role with significant interactions with victim blaming but not perpetrator blaming. There was no significant influence of gender role traits on victim blaming. These findings are related to the context of the criminal justice system.

10.2 Introduction

This study extends the methodology of study two to examine victim blaming within an applied context of police officers. In the vast majority of cases of rape, the police are the first agency of the criminal justice system that rape victims come into contact with. Therefore, it is particularly important that this is a positive experience, particularly as rape victims have reported being concerned about encountering expected negative treatment by the police (Winkel & Vrij, 1993). In addition, Kelly et al. (2005) demonstrated that the majority of reported rapes which drop out of the criminal justice system do so at the police stage of the case. These points demonstrate the important role of the police in rape cases: firstly, a rape victim has to make the decision to report their

rape to the police and any expected negative or disbelieving attitudes may impact on that decision (Winkel & Vrij). Secondly, if a rape victim does report their rape to the police, encountering negative or disbelieving attitudes may result in the victim withdrawing their allegation or declining to cooperate with the investigation (Kelly et al.).

The limited research currently available regarding police officers suggests that they (as with the general public) are influenced by rape myths and stereotypes about rape (Brown et al., 2007; Koppelaar et al., 1997). Krahe (1991) demonstrated that police officers' definitions of a credible rape included elements such as no alcohol involvement, non-distinctive dress, and a victim that engages in physical resistance. However, the victim in a more dubious rape was depicted as being heavily drunk, again wearing non-distinctive dress but not engaging in physical resistance. This suggests that factors such as alcohol may affect the way in which police view a rape incident. These types of myths (i.e., alcohol intoxication in the victim), have been associated with interpreting the victim as being more interested in sex (Maurer & Robinson, 2008) and also have been shown to increase the levels of blame attributed towards the victim (Sims et al., 2007). In terms of differences in the perception of rape victims, Davies et al. (2009) showed that, in a sample of police workers, participants were more victim blaming of a male victim than of a female victim. Galton (1975) suggested that female police officers were more disbelieving of a rape allegation whereas, Page (2007) found that police officers accepted myths at a higher level than female police officers.

There has, however, been very little research comparing the influence of police training on these attitudes and acceptance of such myths. Lonsway et al. (2001) carried out one evaluation within the U.S. which demonstrated that receiving specialist rape training did not affect rape myth acceptance. This suggests that this training in particular has not affected endorsements of stereotypes about rape. Within England and Wales, police officers undergo an intensive training course which leads to them being known as a SOIT officer (Sexual Offences Investigation Trained). This has more recently been updated to be renamed as STO (Specially Trained Officer). The STO training course is understood to relate to forensic medical examination and developing interviewing skills of vulnerable victims (Cheshire Constabulary, 2009). So far, there does not seem to have been any publically available evaluation of these training programmes. Also, it must be noted that the focus seems to be on the investigative nature of rape cases. Jordan (2004) suggests that this can lead to tensions between a rape victim and the police because of the differing focus or view that each side has of the case. The police focus is on the identification and apprehension of the offender whereas the victim's focus may be more on restoring their sense of safety, feelings of control in their life, and to heal. If attitudes of disbelief and victim blaming are encountered, a victim's trauma and sense of injustice is heightened (Jordan, 2001). This study will develop this research topic by using the same design as the previous study (i.e., manipulating the type of rape and level of rape myths within a scenario). However, this study will extend the research by also examining the role of experience and receiving rape training on attitudes towards rape victims amongst

police officers. The effects of rape myth acceptance and gender role traits will also be assessed (as in the previous study).

The research will also be extended by measuring perpetrator blaming as well as victim blaming. It seemed logical at this point that not assessing the role of the perpetrator within the scenarios would ignore the role of blame as a whole within these scenarios. By focussing solely on the victim, we may not be allowing participants to attribute blame where they actually wish to (i.e., towards the perpetrators). Previous research in perpetrator blaming is, as with some areas of rape research, quite limited. Gender differences, as with victim blaming, have not always been consistent nor in a clear direction. For example, Alicke and Yurak (1995) found that females blamed the perpetrator at higher levels than males, whereas Burt and DeMello (2002) found that male participants blamed at higher levels than female participants. In terms of the differing perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape, Viki et al. (2004) found that longer prison sentences were suggested for perpetrators of stranger rape than perpetrators of acquaintance rape suggesting that blaming levels would follow a similar trend.

Given the above literature, the research hypotheses for this study are:

- i. There will be a gender difference in victim blaming such that males will blame the victim more than females.

- ii. Similarly, there will be a gender difference in rape myth acceptance such that males will accept rape myths at a higher level than females.
- iii. The acquaintance rape victim will be blamed more than the stranger rape victim.
- iv. A higher level of rape myths present in the scenario will increase the level of blame attributed towards the rape victim compared to a low level of rape myths.
- v. Rape myth acceptance and belief in a just world will predict victim blaming.
- vi. Rape myths relating to the victim will particularly contribute towards victim blaming.
- vii. Adoption of traditional gender role traits (e.g., masculine or feminine via Bem, 1981, or the gender role trait factors identified by Choi et al., 2009, of femininity, social masculinity and personal masculinity) will increase victim blaming.
- viii. Victim blaming and perpetrator blaming will be related.
- ix. There will be a gender difference in perpetrator blaming such that males will blame the perpetrator less than females.
- x. Perpetrators of acquaintance rape will be blamed less than perpetrators of stranger rape.
- xi. A higher level of rape myths present in the scenario will decrease the level of blame attributed towards the perpetrator compared to a low level of rape myths.
- xii. Rape myth acceptance and belief in a just world will predict perpetrator blaming.
- xiii. Adoption of traditional gender role traits (e.g., masculine or feminine via Bem, 1981, or the gender role trait factors identified by Choi et al., 2009, of femininity, social masculinity, and personal masculinity) will decrease perpetrator blaming.

- xiv. Rape trained police officers will blame the rape victim less and the perpetrator more than police officers who have not received this specialist training.
- xv. Months working in a specialist role with rape victims and years of job experience will be related to victim blaming and perpetrator blaming.

10.3 Method

As this methodology has been reviewed in the methodology chapter, this will only contain brief details of the methodology employed within this study (see chapter seven for full details).

10.3.1 Design.

This study involved a survey design which was the same as for study two, however this study includes a measure of perpetrator blaming. The design of this study was between subjects in which the effects of type of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance), level of rape myths (high vs. low), and gender on rape perpetrator blaming was examined. The relationships between perpetrator blaming and (i) rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world were assessed. Also, the effect of gender role traits on perpetrator blame was examined. As this sample comprised of police officers, two additional analyses were carried out which assessed the role of experience and the role of receiving specialist training can have on victim blaming and perpetrator blaming.

10.3.2 Participants.

The sample consisted of 123 police officers, 63 females and 60 males. The age range was from 21 to 54 years with a mean of 36.17 years ($SD = 6.55$).

10.3.3 Materials.

Participants from a police organisation in the U.K. read one rape scenario which was manipulated by type of rape (stranger or an acquaintance rape) and level of rape myth (high vs. low) event. Five questionnaires were then presented to participants. These measured victim blaming ($\alpha = .70$), perpetrator blaming ($\alpha = .60$), belief in a just world (Dalbert et al., 1987, $\alpha = .77$), gender role traits (BSRI) via the Bem (1981) conceptualisation ($\alpha = .79$ for the masculine items, $\alpha = .88$ for feminine items) and also via the Choi et al. (2009) concept ($\alpha = .70$ for personal masculinity, $\alpha = .71$ for social masculinity, and $\alpha = .90$ for femininity), and rape myth acceptance (IRMAS, Payne et al., 1999, $\alpha = .96$).

10.3.4 Procedure.

The procedure was the same as for study two, however participants were given a questionnaire pack which included the consent form, the questionnaire and a return envelope. Participants were informed that there were no time limits on completing the questionnaire but were given a date by which to return the questionnaire to the gatekeeper within the police force. Participants were advised on their confidentiality of responses and also advised of their right to withdraw. Responses were anonymous as there was no identifying personal information gathered on the questionnaire. Debriefing information could be requested via an email address.

10.4 Results

The means and standard deviations of the data are presented in Table 15.

Table 15

Descriptive Statistics of Victim Blaming, Perpetrator Blaming, Rape Myth Acceptance, and Belief In A Just World.

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skew	Kurtosis
Victim blaming*	1.81	0.90	1.55	2.88
Perpetrator blaming*	6.69	0.53	-1.92	3.27
Rape myth acceptance	94.68	29.15	1.53	7.14
Belief in a just world	17.41	4.93	0.10	-0.69

*Following PCA procedure outlined below

10.4.1 Level of acceptance of rape myths.

The table below show the percentage of police officer participants who indicated a level of agreement to the female rape myth scale item. As the scale is on a seven point scale, any participant indicating a score above the midpoint of four (i.e., five and above) was designated as having indicated a level of agreement to the rape myth. The table is organised by rape myth type so that comparisons can be drawn across the data.

Table 16

Percentage of Participants (separated by gender) who indicated a Level of Acceptance to the Female Rape Myth.

			Males	Females
1	SA	If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.	11.67	20.63
15	SA	When women go around wearing low-cut tops or short skirts, they're just asking for trouble.	0	4.76
19	SA	If a woman goes home with a man she doesn't know, it is her own	0	7.94

		fault if she is raped.		
25	SA	When a woman is a sexual tease, eventually she is going to get into trouble.	18.33	20.63
36	SA	A woman who “teases” men deserves anything that might happen.	1.67	1.59
37	SA	When women are raped, it’s often because the way they said “no” was ambiguous.	5.00	7.94
41	SA	A woman who dresses in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tried to force her to have sex.	1.67	3.17
43	SA	A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on the first date is implying that she wants to have sex.	0	6.35
2	WI	Although most women wouldn’t admit it, they generally find being physically forced into sex a real “turn-on.”	0	3.17
8	WI	Many women secretly desire to be raped.	0	1.59
18	WI	Many women find being forced to have sex very arousing.	1.67	1.59
23	WI	Some women prefer to have sex forced on them so they don’t have to feel guilty about it.	0	1.59
44	WI	Many women actually enjoy sex after the guy uses a little force.	8.33	6.35
5	LI	Women who are caught having an illicit affair sometimes claim that it was rape.	60.00	65.08
7	LI	Many so-called rape victims are actually women who had sex and “changed their minds” afterwards.	40.00	34.92
16	LI	Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at men.	31.67	28.57
31	LI	A lot of women lead a man on and then they cry rape.	18.33	20.63
33	LI	A lot of times, women who claim they were raped just have emotional problems.	6.67	19.05
3	MT	When men rape, it is because of their strong desire for sex.	21.67	15.87
20	MT	Rapists are usually sexually frustrated individuals.	11.67	12.70
30	MT	When a man is very sexually aroused, he may not even realise that the woman is resisting.	5.00	14.29
39	MT	Men don’t usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.	16.67	9.52
42	MT	Rape happens when a man’s sex drive gets out of control.	8.33	4.76
4	TE	If a woman is willing to “make out” with a guy, then it’s no big deal if he goes a little further and has sex.	1.67	6.35
14	TE	Rape isn’t as big a problem as some feminists would like people to believe.	1.67	4.76
26	TE	Being raped isn’t as bad as being mugged and beaten.	0	1.59
29	TE	Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.	0	3.17
38	TE	If a woman isn’t a virgin, then it shouldn’t be a big deal if her date forces her to have sex.	0	1.59
9	DE	Rape mainly occurs on the “bad” side of town.	0	1.59

10	DE	Usually, it is only women who do things like hang out in bars and sleep around that are raped.	1.69	4.76
13	DE	Men from nice middle-class homes almost never rape.	1.67	1.59
22	DE	It is usually only women who dress suggestively that are raped.	1.67	3.17
27	DE	Rape is unlikely to happen in the woman's own familiar neighbourhood.	0	1.59
28	DE	In reality, women are almost never raped by their boyfriends.	3.33	1.59
35	DE	Rape almost never happens in the women's own home.	1.67	4.76
12	NR	If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say that it was rape.	0	1.59
17	NR	A rape didn't happen if the woman has no bruises or marks.	0	1.59
24	NR	If the rapist doesn't have a weapon, you really can't call it rape.	0	1.59
34	NR	If a women doesn't physically resist sex- even when protesting verbally-it really can't be considered rape.	3.33	1.59
45	NR	If a woman claims to have been raped but has no bruises or scrapes, she probably shouldn't be taken too seriously.	0	3.17

SA = 'She asked for it'; WI = 'She wanted it'; LI = 'She lied'; MT = "He didn't mean to"; TE = 'Rape is a trivial event'; DE = 'Rape is a deviant event'; NR = 'It wasn't really rape'.

In examining these levels of acceptance, it seems that there is a greater level of acceptance of certain myths within the rape myth acceptance subfactors such as myths which emphasise that rape victims lie and myths which excuse the actions of the perpetrator ('He didn't mean to').

10.4.2 Analysis of rape victim and perpetrator blaming scale.

The analysis began by examining the descriptive data of the victim and perpetrator blaming scale items. The descriptive statistics of this scale is presented in see Table 17.

Table 17

Descriptive Statistics of Victim and Perpetrator Blaming Scale

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurtosis</i>
--	----------	-----------	-------------	-----------------

1.	How much do you blame Sarah for what happened?	1.34	0.76	2.34	4.26
2.	If identified, to what extent would you consider the man described in the paragraph's claim of innocence of rape to be credible?	6.07	1.81	-1.83	2.01
3.	In your opinion, did Sarah communicate that she did not agree to sexual intercourse?	1.63	1.27	2.70	7.29
4.	Overall to what extent was the man described in the paragraph responsible for what happened?	6.68	0.98	-4.46	21.79
5.	How much do you consider the incident to be Sarah's fault?	1.52	1.18	3.00	9.47
6.	How much do you blame the man described in the paragraph for what happened?	6.83	0.46	-3.28	13.38
7.	To what extent do you consider Sarah's claim of rape to be credible?	1.44	1.04	3.60	14.99
8.	How much do you consider the incident to be the man described in the paragraph's fault?	6.69	0.80	-4.05	22.02
9.	Overall to what extent was Sarah responsible for what happened?	1.67	1.33	2.61	7.03
10.	In your opinion, was Sarah sexually provocative?	2.24	1.81	1.27	0.33
11.	To what extent do you believe that the man described in the paragraph believed that Sarah was willing for sexual intercourse to occur?	5.57	1.88	-0.91	-0.60
12.	Given Sarah's behaviour, was it reasonable for the man described in the paragraph to assume that she was interested in sexual intercourse?	5.97	1.81	-1.58	1.11
13.	To what extent, do you consider the man described in the paragraph is guilty?	6.67	0.72	-2.48	5.91
14.	How likely do you feel that the man described in the paragraph would be found guilty in a court of law?	4.56	1.68	-0.37	-0.51

Following the analysis of the skewness and kurtosis of the data, the decision was made to transform the data to examine the effect this may have on results from a principle component analysis. (See Appendix F for transformed data skewness and

kurtosis values.) Given the continued deviations from normality demonstrated by scale item four, this was removed from the principle component analysis.

10.4.2.1 *Principle component analysis.*

A principle component analysis was carried out on both the transformed and untransformed data using a varimax rotation. This process identified that both analyses produced identical factor structures which suggests that deviations from normality had not affected these processes. For this reason, the untransformed data were retained in the following analyses (see Appendix G for the two analyses).

Kaiser's criterion recommended a four factor solution, however a parallel analysis recommended a two factor solution. Given the criticism of Kaiser's criterion in retaining too many factors (Field, 2009; Pallant, 2007), the two factor solution was adopted. This analysis was run however, items two and 14 did not adequately load on either factor. Item 12 cross-loaded on the two variables. These items were removed from the analysis and the factor analysis rerun.

10.4.2.2 *Factor rotation and factor loading.*

As the theoretical underpinnings of victim blaming and perpetrator blaming suggest that there should be a relationship between the scale items, a comparison between an orthogonal and oblique rotation was carried out to understand any differences in factor structure (see Appendix H for the direct oblimin analysis). As no differences were demonstrated, a varimax procedure was the most appropriate form of analysis (Pallant, 2007) and thus is reported below.

A principle component analysis was carried out on the ten victim and perpetrator blaming scale items using a varimax rotation. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure demonstrated that the sampling adequacy was at a level designated good, KMO = .70 (Field, 2009). Also, all KMO values for the individual items were above the acceptable level of .5 (Field, 2009). The Bartlett's test of sphericity demonstrated that the correlations between items were large enough for principle component analysis to be a suitable method to use [$\chi^2 (45) = 284.95, p < .001$]. The analysis supported a two factor solution explaining 47.50% of the variance (via parallel analysis). See Table 18 for factor loadings.

Table 18

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Victim and Perpetrator Blaming Scale

		Victim blaming	Perpetrator blaming
Eigenvalue = 3.01			
1.	How much do you blame Sarah for what happened?	.72	-.05
3.	In your opinion, did Sarah communicate that she did not agree to sexual intercourse?	.44	-.10
5.	How much do you consider the incident to be Sarah's fault?	.77	<-.01
9.	Overall to what extent was Sarah responsible for what happened?	.72	-.20
10.	In your opinion, was Sarah sexually provocative?	.63	.04
11.*	To what extent do you believe that the man described in the paragraph believed that Sarah was willing for sexual intercourse to occur?	.57	-.37
Eigenvalue = 1.74			

6.	How much do you blame the man described in the paragraph for what happened?	-.14	.82
7.*	To what extent do you consider Sarah's claim of rape to be credible?	-.11	.53
8.	How much do you consider the incident to be the man described in the paragraph's fault?	-.05	.54
13.	To what extent, do you consider the man described in the paragraph is guilty?	-.01	.86

Note. Factor loadings greater than .40 are in bold.

*items were then reverse coded.

This analysis process meant that the victim blaming scale comprised of scale items one, three, five, nine, ten, and 11. The perpetrator blaming scale consisted of scale items six, seven, eight, and 13.

The inter-correlations between the scale items and the total blaming measures demonstrated highly significant positive relationships (see Table 19.)

Table 19

Correlations between Victim blaming Items and Total Victim blaming and Perpetrator Blaming Items and Total Perpetrator Blaming.

	Victim blaming	Perpetrator blaming
1. How much do you blame Sarah for what happened?	.62*	
3. In your opinion, did Sarah communicate that she did not agree to sexual intercourse?	.49*	
5. How much do you consider the incident to be Sarah's fault?	.68*	
9. Overall to what extent was Sarah responsible for what happened?	.71*	
10. In your opinion, was Sarah sexually provocative?	.67*	

11. ^a	To what extent do you believe that the man described in the paragraph believed that Sarah was willing for sexual intercourse to occur?	.71*
6.	How much do you blame the man described in the paragraph for what happened?	.68*
7. ^a	To what extent do you consider Sarah's claim of rape to be credible?	.74*
8.	How much do you consider the incident to be the man described in the paragraph's fault?	.63*
13.	To what extent, do you consider the man described in the paragraph is guilty?	.75*

* $p < .001$

^a reverse coded

10.4.3 The influence of gender, type of rape, and level of rape myths on victim and perpetrator blaming.

No significant gender differences were found in rape myth acceptance ($p > .05$).

Victim blaming and perpetrator blaming were significantly negatively correlated ($r = -.26, p < .01$) demonstrating a medium effect (Field, 2009). It therefore is appropriate to use a MANOVA to analyse these dependent variables together (Field). A two (male vs. female) by two (stranger rape vs. acquaintance rape) by two (low level of rape myths vs. high level of rape myths) between-subjects MANOVA was carried out. There was a statistically significant difference between stranger rape and acquaintance rape regarding the combined dependent variable [$F(2, 114) = 3.82, p = .03$; Wilks' Lambda = .94; partial $\eta^2 = .06$]. There was a statistically significant difference between low level of rape myths and

high level of rape myths [$F(2, 114) = 13.26, p < .01$; Wilks' Lambda = .81; partial $\eta^2 = .19$].

There was a statistically significant difference between males and females [$F(2, 114) = 3.59, p = .03$; Wilks' Lambda = .94; partial $\eta^2 = .06$]. There was a statistically significant interaction between gender and level of rape myths [$F(2, 114) = 3.64, p = .03$; Wilks' Lambda = .94; partial $\eta^2 = .06$].

When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, significant main effects were found in *victim* blaming for type of rape [$F(7, 115) = 4.71, p = .03$; partial $\eta^2 = .04$] which is a medium effect. Inspection of the mean values demonstrated that victims of acquaintance rape ($M = 2.00, SD = 1.06$) were blamed more than victims of stranger rape ($M = 1.64, SD = 0.69$). There was also a significant main effect for level of rape myths [$F(7, 115) = 22.20, p < .001$; partial $\eta^2 = .16$] which is a large effect. Gender did not have a significant main effect ($p > .05$). There was a significant interaction between gender and level of rape myths [$F(7, 115) = 7.01, p = .01$; partial $\eta^2 = .06$] which is a medium effect. Analysis of the simple effects demonstrated that males blamed the rape victim at a significantly higher level ($t(58) = -5.42, p < .01$) where there was a high level of rape myths ($M = 2.26, SD = 0.99$) compared to where there was a low level of rape myths ($M = 1.20, SD = 0.32$). The effect was a large size ($r = 0.58$). Also, where there was a low level of rape myths ($t(58) = -3.16, p = .003$), females ($M = 1.67, SD = 0.72$) blamed the rape victim significantly more than males ($M = 1.20, SD = 0.32$). The effect size demonstrated a medium effect ($r = .38$).

For *perpetrator* blaming, significant main effects were found for type of rape [$F(7, 115) = 5.06, p = .03$; partial $\eta^2 = .04$] which is a medium effect, and for gender [$F(7, 115) = 7.23, p = .008$; partial $\eta^2 = .06$] which is also a medium effect. An inspection of the mean scores for type of rape demonstrated that perpetrators of stranger rape ($M = 6.87, SD = 0.27$) were blamed more than perpetrators of acquaintance rape ($M = 6.57, SD = 0.54$). For the effect of gender, males ($M = 6.85, SD = 0.26$) were found to engage in higher levels of perpetrator blame than females ($M = 6.59, SD = 0.55$).

10.4.4 Relationship between victim blaming and (i) female rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world.

A hierarchical multiple regression examining the relationship between victim blaming and two predictor variables was carried out. In step one (female rape myth acceptance) the model was significant [$F(1, 121) = 16.29, p < .01$]. In step 2 (female rape myth acceptance and belief in a just world) the model was significant [$F(2, 119) = 15.74, p < .01$]. Both female rape myth acceptance and belief in a just world were significant predictors of victim blaming (please see Table 20 for further details).

Table 20

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Victim blaming

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>β</i>
Step 1			
Female rape myth acceptance	.01	.003	.35*
Step 2			

Female rape myth acceptance	.01	.003	.41*
Belief in a just world	-.06	.02	-.31*

Note. $\Delta R^2 = .11$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .20$ for Step 2 ($p < .01$)

* $p < .001$

10.4.5 Relationship between victim blaming and subfactors of female rape myth acceptance.

To further examine the role of different types of female rape myths, a standard multiple regression was carried out with the seven subfactors ('She asked for it', 'She wanted it', 'He didn't mean to', 'Rape is a trivial event', 'She lied', 'Rape is a deviant event', 'It wasn't really rape') of the female rape myth acceptance scale as predictor variables of victim blaming (see Table 20). The model was significant $F(7, 115) = 4.31, p < .001$. This analysis demonstrated that 'She wanted it' and 'He didn't mean to' were significant predictors of victim blaming.

Table 21

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Subfactors of Female Rape Myth Acceptance Scale Predicting Victim blaming.

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>β</i>
She asked for it	.02	.02	.20
She wanted it	.06	.02	.30*
He didn't mean to	-.06	.02	-.31*
Rape is a trivial event	-.04	.04	-.17
She lied	.01	.02	.07
Rape is a deviant event	.17	.02	.10
It wasn't really rape	.05	.04	.22

Note. $\Delta R^2 = .16$

* $p < .05$

10.4.6 Relationship between perpetrator blaming and (i) female rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world.

A hierarchical multiple regression examining the relationship between perpetrator blaming and two predictor variables was carried out. Rape myth acceptance was entered in step one with belief in a just world added in step two. Neither model was significant ($p > .05$). Thus, rape myth acceptance and belief in a just world were not significant predictors of perpetrator blaming. As rape myth acceptance was not found to be a significant predictor of perpetrator blaming, a further examination of the sub-factors of this scale was not carried out.

10.4.7 Examining the influence of gender role traits on victim and perpetrator blaming.

As the BSRI categorises individuals into four different gender roles according to the strength of belief in their masculine and feminine attributes, a one way ANOVA was carried out with the four gender role groups (masculine, feminine, undifferentiated and androgynous) with victim blaming as the dependent variable. A second one way ANOVA was carried out with the gender role groups with perpetrator blaming as the dependent variable. Gender role was found to be spread amongst the sample as 21.14% masculine, 17.07% feminine, 31.70% undifferentiated, and 30.08% androgynous. There was no significant effect for victim blaming [$F(3, 119) = 0.89, p = .45$]. However, the model was significant for perpetrator blaming [$F(3, 119) = 2.98, p = .03$]. This was a small effect ($r = .16$). Via post-hoc tests, using Tukey, a significant difference ($p = .05$) was found between androgynous and undifferentiated individuals, with an inspection of the mean values

demonstrating that individuals with an androgynous gender role ($M = 6.81$, $SD = 0.42$) blamed the perpetrator at a higher level than undifferentiated individuals ($M = 6.50$, $SD = 0.60$).

Using the Choi et al. (2009) categorisations of femininity, personal and social masculinity, a standard multiple regression was carried with the three variables placed as predictor variables of perpetrator blaming. The model was significant [$F(3, 119) = 3.08$, $p = .03$]. Femininity and Social Masculinity approached significance ($p < .10$) in predicting perpetrator blaming (see Table 22). The same analysis was run with victim blaming as the dependent variable. This model was not significant ($p > .05$).

Table 22

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Femininity, Personal Masculinity, and Social Masculinity Predicting Perpetrator Blaming.

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>β</i>
Femininity	.45	.26	.15*
Personal Masculinity	.12	.32	.04
Social Masculinity	.43	.26	.18*

Note. $R^2 = .07$

* $p < .10$

10.4.8 Relationship between victim and perpetrator blaming and (i) years of service as a police officer and (ii) months in a specialist role.

A hierarchical multiple regression examining the relationship between victim blaming and two predictor variables was carried out. Years of service as police officer was

entered in step one with months in a specialist role added in step two. Neither model was significant ($p > .05$). Thus, years of police service and months in a specialist role were not significant predictors of victim blaming. A second hierarchical multiple regression was carried out with the same predictor variables but with perpetrator blaming as the dependent variable. Again, neither model was significant ($p > .05$). Thus, neither years of police service nor months in a specialist role predicted perpetrator blaming.

10.4.9 The influence of specialist training on (i) victim blaming and (ii) perpetrator blaming.

For victim blaming, to examine the influence of receiving specialist training to deal with rape victims, this was analysed via a two (male vs. female) by two (stranger rape vs. acquaintance rape) by two (low level of rape myths vs. high level of rape myths) by two (received specialist training vs. no specialist training) between-subjects ANOVA was carried out.

Table 23

Cell sizes for the victim blaming analysis of specialist police training.

Gender	Type of rape in the vignette	Levels of rape myths in the vignette	Received specialist training	N
Male	Stranger	Low	No	8
			Yes	6
		High	No	13
			Yes	4
	Acquaintance	Low	No	8
			Yes	6
		High	No	11
			Yes	4

Female	Stranger	Low	No	14
			Yes	4
		High	No	12
			Yes	4
	Acquaintance	Low	No	8
			Yes	2
		High	No	11
			Yes	8

This revealed no significant effects beyond those reported in section 10.4.2.

Training was not a significant main effect nor interacted with any of the other dependent variables. Thus, training did not have a significant effect on victim blaming.

For perpetrator blaming, as there had been significant main effects for gender and type of rape, these variables were included in a two (male vs. female) by two (stranger rape vs. acquaintance rape) by two (received specialist training vs. no specialist training) between-subjects ANOVA. This analysis revealed a significant main effect for gender [$F(1, 115) = 3.61, p < .01$; partial $\eta^2 = .12$]. There was a significant interaction between gender and training [$F(1, 115) = 1.34, p = .02$; partial $\eta^2 = .05$]. A Bonferroni correction was applied to the significance level as four t-tests were being carried out. The required significance level was therefore $p < .013$. Analysis of the simple effects demonstrated one significant difference [$t(36) = 3.12, p < .01$] between male and female specially trained officers such that female trained officers ($M = 6.32, SD = 0.79$) blamed the perpetrator less than male trained officers ($M = 6.90, SD = 0.25$). Calculating the effect size according to Field (2009) revealed a large sized effect ($r = .46$). There was also a significant

interaction between type of rape and training [$F(1, 115) = 1.61, p = .01$; partial $\eta^2 = .06$]. Again, a Bonferroni correction was applied to the significance level as four t-tests were being carried out. The required significance level was therefore $p < .013$. Analysis of the simple effects demonstrated one significant difference [$t(83) = 3.49, p = .001$] such that in untrained officers, the stranger rape perpetrator ($M = 6.87, SD = 0.25$) was blamed more than the acquaintance rape perpetrator ($M = 6.53, SD = 0.61$). The effect size was calculated according to Field (2009) revealed a medium sized effect ($r = .36$).

10.5 Discussion

This study continues to support the important differences in the way in which stranger and acquaintance rape victims are perceived with acquaintance rape victims being blamed more than stranger rape victims (as found also in study one and two). This study has also confirmed the lack of gender differences in rape myth acceptance as found in study one, although this runs counter to the gender difference found in study two. However, within this study an interaction between gender and rape myths offers some interesting insight into how gender may influence victim blaming when combined with other factors. This interaction found that male police officers blamed the rape victim significantly more when there was a high level of rape myths within the scenario compared to when there was a low level of rape myths. This was a large effect. A second significant medium effect was found that where there was a low level of rape myths, female police officers blamed the female rape victim at a higher level than male police officers. These two findings are interesting but problematic when applied back to the real world. For example, the first finding suggests that rape myths such as alcohol intoxication

and revealing clothing may influence male police officers' assessments of a rape victim. Such negative assessments, via blaming attitudes, may result in subjective judgements being made about the victim's credibility (HMCPSP/HMIC, 2007; Jordan, 2004). The second difference is more difficult to explain and needs to be reconfirmed with further samples before firm conclusions are drawn about how this fits in with the prior literature. However, Galton (1975) did suggest that female police officers could be more disbelieving of rape allegations than male counterparts.

This study also demonstrated the consistent relationship found between rape myth acceptance and victim blaming, also found in studies one and two. Specific types of rape myths which contributed towards female victim blaming in this study were 'She wanted it' and 'He didn't mean to'. 'She wanted it' relates to myths that suggest that women secretly want to be raped and that physically force is sexually arousing. Whereas, 'He didn't mean to' relates to myths that excuse men as perpetrators of rape, that men are not in control of their sex drive and so may get 'carried away'. In terms of acceptance of rape myths, higher levels of acceptance were found in the subfactor 'She lied' where a 40% of male police officers (and 34% of female police officers) accepted the myth that "Many so-called rape victims are actually women who had sex and 'changed their minds' afterwards".

Belief in a just world was a significant predictor of victim blaming. This was a negative relationship such that as belief in a just world increases, female victim blaming

decreases and vice versa. This may be a reflection of the sample who may emphasise the importance of justice beliefs, however the effect does run counter to some of the previous literature in this area (that did not involve police officers e.g., Sakalli-Ugurlu et al., 2007; Whatley & Riggio, 1993). This would also run counter to the theory within this area which suggests that the stronger the belief in a just world is, the greater the level of blame is attributed towards the victim to protect this belief (Lerner, 1980). The previous two studies have not demonstrated a significant relationship between belief in a just world and female victim blaming leading to this new negative effect again needing to be confirmed with future samples (e.g., police and non-police). Gender role traits was again not a significant predictor of female victim blaming. This is in agreement with the previous two studies.

For perpetrator blaming, this emphasises the importance of gender and type of rape for this type of blaming showing some parallels with the effects found in victim blaming. So, amongst police officers, perpetrators of stranger rape were blamed more than perpetrators of acquaintance rape. Also, male police officers were found to blame the perpetrator at a higher level than female police officers. Other findings within the study demonstrated that rape myths may not be an importance explanation for perpetrator blaming, as rape myth acceptance did not contribute towards perpetrator blaming. Similarly, belief in a just world was also found to not predict perpetrator blaming. Neither of these two measures have previously been related to perpetrator

blaming and so these findings cannot be related back to the previous literature within the area.

With regards to gender role traits, a small effect was found which suggests that individuals with an androgynous gender role (higher than average masculine and feminine scores) blamed the perpetrator at a higher level than individuals with an undifferentiated gender role (lower than average masculine and feminine scores). This shows some consistency with Quackenbush (1989) who demonstrated that participants who were categorised as androgynous were less victim blaming than participants categorised as masculine or undifferentiated. Since, victim blaming and perpetrator blaming are negatively related, this finding could translate across to perpetrator blaming. Similar to this, use of the Choi et al. (2009) concepts of femininity, personal masculinity and social masculinity found that femininity and social masculinity approached significance in predicting perpetrator blaming. Both of these factors were positive predictors of perpetrator blaming suggesting that a greater adherence to these two concepts increased the level of perpetrator blaming. Social masculinity includes a greater adherence to traits such as assertive, forceful, dominant, and aggressive whereas femininity includes a greater adherence to traits such as affectionate, sympathetic, understanding, and compassionate.

The next section of the discussion will examine the analyses which specifically relate to this sample of police officers. No relationship was found between how long a

police officer had served within a police force and female victim blaming. Neither, was a relationship found between the amounts of months spent working in a specialist role with rape victims and female victim blaming. Finally, no effect was found in specialist rape victim training in affecting levels of victim blaming.

In relation to perpetrator blaming, again there was no effect found for years served as a police officer or for months in a specialist role. However, a significant interaction was found for gender and training. The simple effects demonstrated a large effect where male trained police officers blamed the perpetrator more than female trained police officers. It may be that the gender effect reported earlier in perpetrator blaming may be influencing this effect. There was also a significant interaction between type of rape and training which demonstrated that in untrained police officers, the stranger rape perpetrator was blamed more than the acquaintance rape perpetrator. This was a medium sized effect. This finding is more in line with the previous literature in the field which suggests that perpetrators of stranger rape are attributed greater blame compared with perpetrators of acquaintance rape (Viki et al., 2004).

Overall, this study has demonstrated some interesting effects. For example, it seems that specialist rape training does not affect victim blaming attitudes but may affect perpetrator attitudes. This effect is in an interesting direction, reducing the level of blame attributed towards the perpetrator for female trained police officers. A gender effect, in perpetrator blaming, has not been previously established in the research literature

although Galton (1975) reported that female police officers who specialised in the investigation of rape complaints were more sceptical of rape allegations than male police officers who investigated allegations of rape. This, therefore, may explain a subsequent reduction in perpetrator blaming. In this current study, this suggests that training may have a negative effect amongst female officers. However, final conclusions about this effect must be tentative until further research is conducted. This study has also added further support to the importance of rape myths as this variable produced a significant interaction with gender in victim blaming. However, rape myths do not seem to be such an important explanation for perpetrator blaming as demonstrated by the non-significant effect discussed above.

Having examined female victim blaming in this and the previous three studies, it is now important to extend the research towards examining blaming of male victims. This will be covered in the next study.

11 Study Four: Male Rape Victim and Perpetrator Blaming¹

11.1 Abstract

One of four possible vignettes manipulated by (a) level of rape myth contained within them (low vs. high) and (b) type of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance) was presented to Psychology undergraduates followed by scales measuring victim blaming, perpetrator blaming, belief in a just world, sex-role egalitarian beliefs, and male rape myth acceptance. Victim blaming was predicted by male rape myth acceptance. Perpetrator blaming was predicted by male rape myth acceptance and sex-role egalitarianism. Differences were found in victim and perpetrator blaming in terms of stranger and acquaintance rape and also in relation to manipulating the level of rape myths. Findings are discussed in relation to the previous literature on victim and perpetrator blaming.

11.2 Introduction

There has now been published a wealth of research concerning attitudes toward and judgments of female rape victims. This thesis has furthered our understanding within this area by examining the role of rape myths in victim blaming. In addition, this thesis has increased our understanding of police officers' attitudes towards rape victims in particular in relation to specialist rape training. However, in comparison the area of male rape remains under-researched, but what research there is suggests that there are clear comparisons with the female victim blaming literature. In some previous studies,

¹ This article is published in the Journal of Interpersonal Violence.
Sleath, E., & Bull, R. (2010) Male rape victim and perpetrator blaming. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25, 969-988. doi: 10.1177/0886260509340534

manipulating the gender of the rape victim has shown that male victims of rape can be blamed significantly more than female victims (Davies et al., 2001; Gerber et al., 2004). However, in contrast, other similar studies have found that female victims are attributed more blame than male victims (Schneider et al., 1994; Wakelin & Long, 2003).

As demonstrated in the previous three studies as well as being consistent with the published literature, female victims of acquaintance rape are often held more responsible for being raped than victims of female stranger rape (e.g., Golge et al., 2003; Monson et al., 2000). It is harder to establish this consistency within the previously available male victim blaming literature. The current literature focuses on scenarios that depict solely stranger rapes (Schneider et al., 2004; Whatley & Riggio, 1993), with manipulations of sexual orientation of the victim (Burt & DeMello, 2002; Davies et al., 2001; Davies et al., 2006; Mitchell et al., 1999; Wakelin & Long, 2003) or acquaintance/date rapes (Anderson, 2004; Davies & McCartney, 2003; Gerber et al., 2004). There seems to be a lack of literature that compares the perceptions of male victims of stranger and acquaintance rape.

As well as victim blaming, the present study will also examine perpetrator blaming. This is of clear importance as, in court, juries are required to make assessments of how culpable a defendant is in deciding guilt or innocence. The prior female rape literature (and study three) suggests that blame varies between the victim and perpetrator. For example, where a rape victim is seen as behaving in a way that is blameworthy, this

reduces the level of blame attributed toward the perpetrator (Krahe, 1991). Wakelin and Long (2003) found that male participants attributed less blame to the perpetrator than female participants did.

In terms of male rape myths, defined here as false and stereotypical beliefs about male rape (Kassing et al., 2005), a range of myths have been established within the limited literature. Kassing et al. listed six broad categories into which they fall: (a) men's physical size and strength means they are unlikely to be overpowered or forced into sex, (b) men are the instigators of sexual activity and so would not be targeted for rape, (c) men who are victims of rape lose their manhood, (d) the occurrence of male rape is rare, (e) men are strong enough to cope with the experience of being raped, and (f) male rape only happens in prisons. Rape myths regarding male victims may stem from traditional views of masculinity, which dictate that men should be strong, assertive, sexually dominant, and heterosexual (Davies, 2002). These categories should not be considered to cover the full breadth and diversity of male rape myths. One significant male rape myth not encompassed by these categories is the idea that all male victims of rape (those perpetrated by men) are gay (or appeared gay) and so must have behaved in a way that was unsafe or risky (Kassing et al., 2005). The function of such myths as 'men cannot be raped' or 'sexual assault is not as severe for a man as it is for a woman' can minimise the perceived (by others) impact that rape may have on male victims and serve to blame the victim for his rape (Davies & McCartney, 2003; Groth & Burgess, 1980).

In terms of the empirical research examining male rape myths, this is currently quite limited. Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson (1992) found that participants were most likely to agree with rape myths, such as 'strong men cannot be raped' and that 'a man should be able to escape from his assailant'. However, these authors noted that overall there was no strong evidence to support the idea that male rape myths were widely accepted. This is contrary to that found, thirteen years later, by Kassing et al. (2005) who demonstrated acceptance levels ranging from 53% to 85%, suggesting that male rape myths are quite widely endorsed within society (the study was based in the U.S.). The development of a male rape myth scale currently lags behind that of female rape myth acceptance research. Melanson (1999) developed the scale used within this current study, developing the items from the current research published within the area (e.g., Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992). It is only with the continued development of research within this area that the full scope of male rape myths can be understood.

For studies one to three, this thesis has focussed upon examining the relationship between gender trait measures and victim/perpetrator blaming. The demonstration of some significant findings meant that it was useful to examine gender trait measures up to this point within the thesis (e.g., see findings of study one and three). However, given the findings overall from the first three studies, this examination has demonstrated inconsistent findings and no strong relationship with either victim or perpetrator blaming. Therefore, this study will examine the relationship between gender role attitudes and

blaming attributions rather than the adoption of specific gender role traits. Given that male rape myths may be based within traditional notions about gender roles and masculinity, this may be a valid explanation for why male victims of rape are blamed for their victimisation. Therefore, the present study will instead focus on the importance of gender traditionality rather than the adoption of gender role traits. Male rape victim's reports suggest that societal expectations about men and masculinity discourage such victims from reporting sexual victimization because they fear being labelled as weak or inadequate (Doherty & Anderson, 2004). Simonson and Subich (1999) examined the role of beliefs about gender traditionality in the perceptions of female rape victims. They found that traditionality (in terms of gender role stereotypes) was related to a lesser perception of seriousness of the rape (in the scenarios) and a greater likelihood of blaming the victim. They suggested that beliefs about traditionality may be more predictive of rape-supportive beliefs than is the actual gender of the participants. This will be examined in the present study using the Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale (SRES), which measures attitudes about men and women assuming non-traditional roles.

Research examining the relationship between belief in a just world and victim blaming has been inconsistent in establishing whether this theory is a useful explanation for why rape victims are blamed. This has been further confirmed (regarding female victims) within the findings of studies one to three. Regarding male victims, Whatley and Riggio (1993) found that participants with a high belief in a just world were more likely to blame the male rape victim than those participants with a lower belief in a just world.

Furthermore, Ford et al. (1998) found belief in a just world only affected the responsibility participants allocated to the perpetrator, when the male rape victim was described as heterosexual (as opposed to gay), and that this effect was influenced by the participant's gender (i.e., more responsibility by females but less by males). However, both of these studies used the Rubin and Peplau (1975) Belief in a Just World Scale, which as noted by Whatley and Riggio (1993) can be psychometrically problematic. Therefore, within the present study the effect will be examined via the Dalbert et al. (1987) measure of general belief in a just world.

To ensure comparability amongst the studies presented within this thesis, sexual orientation will not be included as an explicit statement within the scenario. Previous research within this area has demonstrated that male victims explicitly identified as homosexual are blamed more than heterosexual victims (e.g, Davies et al., 2001; Ford et al., 1998; Wakelin & Long, 2003). However, the focus within this thesis has been upon the rape myths introduced within the scenarios. The inclusion of these myths is designed to activate questioning about masculinity and an association with homosexuality rather than explicitly state this. This may possibly reflect a more realistic representation of a rape scenario where the sexual orientation of the victim is not usually explicitly stated. This should therefore ensure that the blaming which occurs is based in the assumptions and stereotypes that people adhere to e.g., that all male rape victims are gay.

Given the above literature, the research hypotheses for this study are:

- i. There will be a gender difference in male victim blaming such that males will blame the male victim more than females.
- ii. Similarly, there will be a gender difference in male rape myth acceptance such that males will accept male rape myths at a higher level than females.
- iii. Male acquaintance rape victims will be blamed more than male stranger rape victims.
- iv. A higher level of rape myths present in the scenario will increase the level of blame attributed towards the rape victim compared to a low level of rape myths.
- v. Rape myth acceptance, belief in a just world, and egalitarian beliefs about gender will predict male victim blaming.
- vi. Rape myths relating to the victim will particularly contribute towards male victim blaming.
- vii. Victim blaming and perpetrator blaming will be related.
- viii. There will be a gender difference in male rape perpetrator blaming such that males will blame the perpetrator less than females.
- ix. Perpetrators of male acquaintance rape will be blamed less than perpetrators of male stranger rape.
- x. A higher level of rape myths present in the scenario will decrease the level of blame attributed towards the perpetrator compared to a low level of rape myths.
- xi. Rape myth acceptance, belief in a just world, and egalitarian beliefs about gender will predict male rape perpetrator blaming.

11.3 Method

As this methodology has been reviewed in the methodology chapter, this will only contain brief details of the methodology employed within this study (see chapter seven).

11.3.1 Design.

The design of this study was between subjects design in which the effects of type of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance), level of rape myths (high vs. low), and gender on male victim blaming and also on male rape perpetrator blaming were examined. The relationships between victim blaming and (i) rape myth acceptance, (ii) belief in a just world, and (iii) egalitarian beliefs about gender were examined. The relationships between rape perpetrator blaming and (i) rape myth acceptance, (ii) belief in a just world, and (iii) egalitarian beliefs about gender was assessed.

11.3.2 Participants.

The sample consisted of 116 Psychology undergraduates (67 females, 49 males). Their mean age was 19.23 years ($SD = 1.18$).

11.3.3 Materials.

Participants read one rape scenario which was manipulated by type of rape (stranger or an acquaintance rape) and level of rape myth (high vs. low) event. Five questionnaires were then presented to participants. These measured male victim blaming ($\alpha = .87$), male perpetrator blaming ($\alpha = .88$), belief in a just world (Dalbert et al., 1987, $\alpha = .77$), gender role beliefs (SRES, $\alpha = .67$), and male rape myth acceptance (MRMS, Melanson, 1999, $\alpha = .85$).

11.3.3.1 Procedure.

Participants were recruited as part of their Experimental Participation Requirement (EPR) as described in chapter seven. Data collection was carried out online with participants indicating consent prior to beginning the study. This then directed the participant to the beginning of the study; participants were firstly presented with a scenario in which the level of rape myths (high vs. low) and the type of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance) were manipulated. Following this, participants filled in the scales.

11.4 Results

The descriptive statistics of the data are presented in Table 24.

Table 24

Descriptive Statistics for Victim Blaming, Perpetrator Blaming, Belief in a Just World, Male Rape Myths, and Sex Role Egalitarianism.

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurtosis</i>	*Following PCA procedure detailed below
Victim blaming*	2.07	1.21	1.03	-.34	
Perpetrator blaming*	6.06	1.27	-1.68	2.58	
Belief in a just world	20.56	5.18	-0.31	-0.09	
Male rape myth acceptance	67.80	17.04	0.54	-0.04	
Sex role egalitarian beliefs	68.80	8.29	0.89	0.45	

11.4.1 Acceptance of Male Rape Myths.

These data were analysed to determine the percentage of male and female participants that showed some level of agreement with male rape myths. As the scale is on a six point scale, any participant indicating a score in the agree range of responses (i.e.,

four and above) was designated as having indicated a level of agreement to the rape myth. Levels of acceptance ranged from 2.99% to 92.54% across the various myths (see Table 25). For example, nearly 47% of male participants felt that the extent of a man's resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped. More than a third (35.82%) of female participants agreed that all male rape is committed by homosexuals.

Table 25

Percentage of Participants (separated by gender) who indicated a Level of Acceptance to the Male Rape Myth.

	Females	Males
It is a terrible experience for a man to be raped by a woman	92.54	77.55
The extent of a man's resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped	55.22	46.94
Any healthy man can successfully resist a rapist if he really wants to	17.91	18.37
If a man obtained an erection while being raped it probably means that he started to enjoy it	13.43	16.32
A man can enjoy sex even if it is being forced upon him	17.91	26.53
Most men who are raped by a woman are very upset by the incident	86.57	79.59
Many men claim rape if they have consented to homosexual relations but have changed their minds afterwards	20.90	22.45
Most men who are raped by a woman are somewhat to blame for not escaping or fighting off the woman	13.43	30.61
If a man engages in kissing and petting and he lets things get out of hand, it is his fault if his partner forces sex on him	17.91	16.33
Male rape is usually committed by homosexuals	35.82	34.69
Most men who are raped by a man are somewhat to blame for not escaping or fighting off the man	4.48	18.37
A man who has been raped has lost his manhood	2.99	16.33

Most men who are raped by a woman are somewhat to blame for not being more careful	2.99	26.53
If a man told me that he had been raped by another man, I would suspect that he is homosexual	5.97	8.16
Most men who have been raped have a history of promiscuity	1.49	10.20
No self-respecting man would admit to being raped	4.48	10.20
Women who rape men are sexually frustrated individuals	35.82	38.77

11.4.2 Analysis of victim and perpetrator blaming scale.

The analysis began by examining the descriptive data of the victim and perpetrator blaming scale items.

Table 26

Descriptive Statistics of Male Rape Victim and Perpetrator Blaming Scale

		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skew	Kurtosis
1.	How much do you blame Michael for what happened?	2.08	1.48	1.43	1.19
2.	If identified, to what extent would you consider the man described in the paragraph's claim of innocence of rape to be credible?	5.57	1.99	-1.25	0.20
3.	In your opinion, did Michael communicate that he did not agree to sexual intercourse?	1.96	1.58	1.88	2.68
4.	Overall to what extent was the man described in the paragraph responsible for what happened?	5.82	1.70	-1.48	1.15
5.	How much do you consider the incident to be Michael's fault?	2.23	1.60	1.29	0.55
6.	How much do you blame the man described in the	6.12	1.45	-2.00	3.64

paragraph for what happened?

7.	To what extent do you consider Michael's claim of rape to be credible?	1.75	1.16	1.60	1.71
8.	How much do you consider the incident to be the man described in the paragraph's fault?	6.03	1.51	-1.72	2.40
9.	Overall to what extent was Michael responsible for what happened?	2.32	1.62	1.18	0.15
10.	In your opinion, was Michael sexually provocative?	2.62	1.98	0.84	-0.67
11.	To what extent do you believe that the man described in the paragraph believed that Michael was willing for sexual intercourse to occur?	5.30	1.83	-0.75	-0.72
12.	Given Michael's behaviour, was it reasonable for the man described in the paragraph to assume that he was interested in sexual intercourse?	5.78	1.75	-1.16	-0.12
13.	To what extent, do you consider the man described in the paragraph is guilty?	6.28	1.27	-2.24	5.23
14.	How likely do you feel that the man described in the paragraph would be found guilty in a court of law?	5.49	1.43	-0.74	-0.37

11.4.2.1 Principle component analysis.

A principle component analysis was carried out on the 14 victim and perpetrator blaming scale items using a varimax rotation. Item 14 did not load sufficiently on any of the factors and so this was removed from the analysis and the test rerun.

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure demonstrated that the sampling adequacy was at a level designated good, KMO = .83 (Field, 2009). Also, all KMO values for the individual items were above the acceptable level of .5 (Field, 2009). The Bartlett's test of sphericity demonstrated that the correlations between items were large enough for

principle component analysis to be a suitable method to use [χ^2 (78) = 1012.98 , $p < .001$].

The analysis supported a three factor solution explaining 70.10% of the variance (via parallel analysis, Kaiser's criterion, and a visual inspection of the scree plot). See Table 27 for factor loadings.

Table 27

Principle component analysis of victim and perpetrator blaming scale

		Victim blaming	Perpetrator blaming
Eigenvalue = 6.05			
1	How much do you blame Michael for what happened?	.67	-.58
3	In your opinion, did Michael communicate that he did not agree to sexual intercourse?	.65	.05
5	How much do you consider the incident to be Michael's fault?	.72	-.53
7	To what extent do you consider Michael's claim of rape to be credible?	.79	-.16
9	Overall to what extent was Michael responsible for what happened?	.79	-.45
Eigenvalue = 1.84			
2	If identified, to what extent would you consider the man described in the paragraph's claim of innocence of rape to be credible?	.02	.47
10	In your opinion, was Michael sexually provocative?	.27	-.72
11	To what extent do you believe that the man described in the paragraph believed that Michael was willing for sexual intercourse to occur?	-.12	.79
12	Given Michael's behaviour, was it reasonable for the man described in the	-.28	.80

paragraph to assume that he was interested in sexual intercourse?

Eigenvalue = 1.23				
4	Overall to what extent was the man described in the paragraph responsible for what happened?	-.08	.24	.86
6	How much do you blame the man described in the paragraph for what happened?	-.23	.18	.86
8	How much do you consider the incident to be the man described in the paragraph's fault?	-.18	.23	.84
13	To what extent, do you consider the man described in the paragraph is guilty?	-.51	.05	.56

Factors one and three were retained for the measures of victim and perpetrator blaming. This means that the victim blaming scale contained items one, three, five, seven, and nine. The perpetrator blaming scale consisted of items four, six, eight, and thirteen.

11.4.3 The influence of gender, type of rape, and level of rape myths on victim and perpetrator blaming.

Males were more accepting of male rape myths [$t(114) = 3.01, p < .01$] than females. This was a medium sized effect ($r = .27$).

The relationship between victim blaming and perpetrator blaming was analysed. This found that there was a significant negative relationship between victim blaming and perpetrator blaming ($r = -.47, p < .001$). Therefore, a two (male vs. female) by two (stranger rape vs. acquaintance rape) by two (low level of rape myths vs. high level of rape

myths) between-subjects MANOVA was carried out. There was a statistically significant difference between stranger rape and acquaintance rape regarding the combined dependent variable [$F(2, 107) = 16.36, p < .01$, Wilks' Lambda = .77, partial $\eta^2 = .23$.] There was a statistically significant difference between low level of rape myths and high level of rape myths [$F(2, 107) = 4.63, p = .01$, Wilks' Lambda = .92, partial $\eta^2 = .08$.] There was a difference approaching significance between males and females on the combined dependent variable [$F(2, 107) = 2.58, p = .08$, Wilks' Lambda = .77, partial $\eta^2 = .05$].

When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, significant differences were found in *victim* blaming for type of rape [$F(7, 108) = 7.75, p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .07$], for level of rape myths [$F(7, 108) = 6.69, p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$], and for gender [$F(7, 108) = 5.20, p = .03$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$]. No other significant differences or interactions were found. An inspection of the mean scores of these differences demonstrates that male participants ($M = 2.38, SD = 1.35$) blamed the rape victim more than female participants ($M = 1.84, SD = 1.06$), that the acquaintance rape victim ($M = 2.38, SD = 1.33$) was blamed more than the stranger rape victim ($M = 1.75, SD = 1.00$), and that the rape victim was blamed more where there was a high level of rape myths within the vignette ($M = 2.34, SD = 1.32$) than when there was a low level of rape myths ($M = 1.77, SD = 1.02$). For *perpetrator* blaming, significant differences were only found for type of rape [$F(7, 108) = 32.81, p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .23$]. An inspection of the mean scores of this demonstrated that the perpetrator was blamed more in the stranger rape ($M = 6.68, SD = 0.69$) than in the acquaintance rape scenarios ($M = 5.44, SD = 1.42$).

11.4.4 Relationship between victim blaming and (i) female rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world.

A hierarchical multiple regression examining the relationship between victim blaming and three predictor variables was carried out. In Step 1 (male rape myth acceptance) the model was significant, $F(1, 114) = 87.47, p < .01$. In Step 2 (male rape myth acceptance and sex-role egalitarian beliefs) the model was significant, $F(2, 113) = 43.82, p < .01$. In Step 3 (male rape myth acceptance, sex-role egalitarian beliefs, and belief in a just world) the model was significant, $F(3, 112) = 29.03, p < .01$. However, only male rape myth acceptance was a significant predictor (see Table 28).

Table 28

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Victim blaming

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>B</i>
Step 1			
Male rape myth acceptance	.05	<.01	.66*
Step 2			
Male rape myth acceptance	.05	<.01	.64*
Sex role egalitarian beliefs	<.01	.01	.06
Step 3			
Male rape myth acceptance	.05	.06	.64*
Sex role egalitarian beliefs	<.01	.06	.07
Belief in a just world	-<.01	.02	-.03

Note. $\Delta R^2 = .43$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .43$ for Step 2; $\Delta R^2 = .42$ for Step 3

* $p < .01$

11.4.5 Relationship between perpetrator blaming and (i) female rape myth acceptance and (ii) belief in a just world.

A hierarchical multiple regression examining the relationship between perpetrator blaming and three predictor variables was carried out. In Step 1 (male rape myth acceptance) the model was significant, $F(1, 115) = 10.78, p < .01$. In Step 2 (male rape myth acceptance and sex-role egalitarian beliefs) the model was significant, $F(2, 113) = 9.07, p < .01$. In Step 3 (male rape myth acceptance, sex-role egalitarian beliefs, and belief in a just world) the model was significant, $F(3, 112) = 6.50, p < .01$. Male rape myth acceptance and sex-role egalitarian beliefs were significant predictors of perpetrator blaming (please see Table 29 for further details).

Table 29

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Rape Perpetrator Blaming.

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>B</i>
Step 1			
Male rape myth acceptance	-.02	<.01	-.29*
Step 2			
Male rape myth acceptance	-.03	<.01	-.40*
Sex role egalitarian beliefs	.04	.02	.25*
Step 3			
Male rape myth acceptance	-.03	<.01	-.41*
Sex role egalitarian beliefs	.03	.01	.22*

Belief in a just world	.03	.02	.11
------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Note. $\Delta R^2 = .08$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .12$ for Step 2; $\Delta R^2 = .13$ for Step 3

* $p < .01$

11.5 Discussion

Male rape myth acceptance was a strong predictor of victim blaming, suggesting that acceptance of stereotypical ideas about male rape is related to a person being more likely to engage in male victim blaming. This is of concern, particularly as it is likely that these myths are accepted widely (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995), as confirmed within this present study with some high levels of acceptance of certain myths. This finding, of relatively high levels of acceptance, is supported by Kassing et al. (2005) and Johnson et al. (1997) demonstrating that rape myth acceptance (regarding both male and female rape) is prevalent. There appears to be parallels with female rape myth research in that the victim's level of resistance is an important factor in determining whether an event is defined or judged as rape. For example, almost half of both the male and female participants believed that the extent of a man's resistance was a major factor in determining whether they were raped. In drawing parallels with the levels of acceptance of female rape myths, the subfactor 'It wasn't really rape' is most similar to this myth. Acceptance levels of study one demonstrated much lower levels of acceptance, e.g., only 2.7% of women (and 4.05% of men) accepted the myth "If a woman claims to have been raped but has no bruises or scrapes, she probably shouldn't be taken too seriously". However, there are also considerable contrasts with the female rape myth literature,

particularly with regards to myths that suggest that men must be gay to be raped and that all male rapists are gay.

The MANOVA analysis for victim blaming demonstrated that the acquaintance rape victim was blamed more than the stranger rape victim. This shows clear parallels with the female rape literature where the victim knowing their assailant for even a brief period of time can influence the levels of blame attributed toward the victim (e.g., Golge et al., 2003; Monson et al., 2000). In addition, this confirms the findings of studies one to three which also demonstrated this effect in female victim blaming. The MANOVA analysis also showed that the rape victim was blamed more when there was a high level of rape myths than where there was a low level. The impact of rape myths on the reporting practices of male victims may mean, as Scarce (1997) suggested, that many victims fear to report their victimisation because they believe that they will be labelled as a closet gay. Male participants were also found to blame the victim at a higher level than female participants. This has been found in previous studies (e.g., Anderson & Lyons, 2005; Wakelin & Long, 2005) but has not always been consistent (e.g., Anderson, 2004).

With regards to perpetrator blaming, this was also predicted by male rape myth acceptance, showing that where acceptance of male rape myths increases, the blaming of the perpetrator decreases. This agrees with the female rape research carried out by Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995), who argued that the function of rape myths are to blame the victim and excuse the perpetrator. This also demonstrates that male rape myths do

not solely relate to myths about the victims of rape but also include myths that relate to the perpetrators of rape. For perpetrator blaming, a significant difference was found for type of rape, which shows that when the victim is known to the perpetrator, the level of blame attributed toward the perpetrator is significantly decreased. This agrees with Krahe (1991) that where the victim is seen as more blameworthy (as acquaintance rape victims often are), the perpetrator is considered less culpable. This should be of concern because of the impact it may have on juries. Any blameworthy behaviour of the victim, such as the drinking of alcohol, may lead juries to excuse the behaviour of the perpetrator, which may influence judgments of guilt or innocence of the defendant.

Belief in just world was not found to be a significant predictor of perpetrator or victim blaming. It seems that although belief in a just world may explain why blaming occurs for victims of some events (such as victims of injustice; Furnham, 1995), it does not seem to consistently be related to why victims of rape are blamed. It appears that high belief in a just world only results in victim/perpetrator blaming in certain specific circumstances. For example, Ford et al. (1998) found that belief in a just world only resulted in a significant effect for female participants attributing responsibility towards the perpetrator with a heterosexual male victim.

Sex-role egalitarian beliefs predicted perpetrator blaming but not victim blaming. This was a positive relationship where perpetrator blaming increased with increasing egalitarian sex-role beliefs, with the converse also being true with blaming decreasing as

traditionality increases. Previously, Simonson and Subich (1999) suggested that traditionality was predictive of rape supportive beliefs in the perceptions of female victims. It does seem that the traditional ideas society hold about men and masculinity may therefore be related to participants excusing the actions of the offender. Because, as noted by Doherty and Anderson (2004), men who become rape victims have failed in their duties as 'real men', the perpetrator may then be attributed less blame.

The present study has established the importance of rape myths in terms of its relationship with levels of blame attributed to both the victims and perpetrators of male rape. It is clear that some myths are quite widely accepted (at least within this sample). Further research in this area needs to develop a greater understanding of the influence of different types of blaming attributed toward male victims of rape as the present study used a general measure of victim blaming. Developing this will contribute to our understanding of whether the character of the victim is focused on or whether the behaviour of the victim is more important. It is also important to note that the victim's sexual orientation was not included in the vignettes, and as such participants' may have made their own assumptions about the rape victim's sexual orientation. As the previous literature has demonstrated that the typical sexual partner for a man may be blamed more for their victimisation (Ford et al., 1998; Mitchell et al., 1999; Wakelin & Long, 2003), an assumption that the victim was gay may have affected the level of blame attributed to the male rape victim.

12 Study Five: Development of a New Measure of Acceptance of Male Rape Myths

12.1 Abstract

This study presents the initial scale development of a new measure of Male Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (MRMAS). The sample consists of 313 participants who completed 50 items measuring male rape myths items, followed by the IRMAS. A principle component analysis was carried out to establish a four factor solution: Masculinity/Invulnerability to Rape, Coping, Association with Homosexuality, and Suffering. Total scores on the MRMAS and its subscales demonstrated a good relationship with the IRMAS and its sub-scales. Significant gender differences were also found between the MRMAS total scores and its subscales demonstrating that males were more accepting of male rape myths than females. Further scale testing is now needed to ensure that the factor structure is sound.

12.2 Introduction

Burt's (1980, p. 217) definition of rape myths as "prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victim, and rapists" was developed with a focus purely upon female rape myths. Research regarding male rape myths is still being developed because of the lack of research attention given to victims of male rape (see Rogers, 1998). From what we do know, it seems that male rape myths are, to some extent, accepted in much the same way that female rape myths are, for example, men are more accepting of rape myths than are females (e.g., Chapleau et al., 2008; Kassing & Prieto, 2003; Struckman-

Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992). These levels of acceptance, across the different types of myths, can range from 53% to 85% suggesting that male rape myths are quite widely endorsed (Kassing et al., 2005). In the previous study, presented in this thesis, levels of acceptance of male rape myths ranged from three to 93%. Kassing et al. found, amongst a community sample of male participants, that male rape myth acceptance increased as age increased, as education decreased, and as more negative attitudes towards gay men increased. Davies and McCartney (2003) completed a study which compared the male rape myth acceptance amongst a sample of heterosexual women, heterosexual men, and gay men. Their study found significant differences amongst the three samples such that heterosexual men accepted the highest level of myths, followed by heterosexual women, and finally gay men who were the least accepting of male rape myths. These studies provide a summary of the very limited literature regarding male rape myths. It is clear that there is considerable scope for further research within this area.

In terms of how these myths are constructed, from what we do understand about male rape myths, these do seem to centre around seven areas: Association with homosexuality, masculinity, invulnerability to rape, coping, hierarchy of suffering, responsibility, and enjoyment of sex (see Kassing et al., 2005 and section 2.2 for greater coverage of these factors). The association with homosexuality centres on male rape being associated with men who have sex with other men and as such is allied with homosexual behaviour (Adler, 2000), whereas the masculinity myths relate to men having

failed as men and, therefore, are weak and inadequate (Doherty & Anderson, 2004). Invulnerability to rape relates to the belief that men cannot be raped (Donnelly & Kenyon, 1996). The remaining myths surround the coping skills of men who are thought to be (i) emotionally stronger than women (Mitchell et al., 1999), (ii) to be attributed responsibility for becoming a male victims of rape (Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992), (iii) to outline a hierarchy in terms of which type of victim would suffer the most (Doherty & Anderson), and (iv) finally to relate how men define rape and sex (Davies, 2002).

Our understanding of rape myths has been considerably aided by the work of Burt (1980) in establishing, early in the research process, a measure of female rape myths. Although, this scale has been superseded by the development of the IRMAS (Payne et al., 1999), the presence of an adequate scale did enable the research area to move forward. Even though the male rape victim perception research has developed somewhat (particularly since the change in rape law in England and Wales to a gender neutral description), such a measure has not been developed for male rape myths. This study will attempt to present the beginning stages of the development of a multi-factor measure of male rape myths. The lack of a complete and comprehensive measure of male rape myths has led to a lack of understanding of the relative importance of different myths in affecting attitudes towards male rape victims. As noted by Payne et al. (1999), in the development of the IRMAS, it is important to develop a multi-factor measure of rape myth acceptance as different types of myths may function differently for groups e.g., males vs. females, victims vs. non-victims. Therefore, this scale development will centre

on the seven myth types as mentioned above (i.e., association with homosexuality, masculinity, invulnerability to rape, coping, hierarchy of suffering, responsibility, and enjoyment of sex.) (See section 6.1.2.2 for a more in-depth discussion of measures of male rape myth acceptance.)

12.3 Method

As this methodology has been reviewed in the methodology chapter, this will only contain brief details of the methodology employed within this study (see chapter seven).

12.3.1 Design.

The aim of this study was to develop a measure of male rape myth acceptance. As such, the relationship between this measure (once factor analysis was completed) was compared with an established measure of female rape myth acceptance to ensure construct validity. Participants' differences were also examined as the previous literature has suggested that males are more accepting of male rape myths than females.

12.3.2 Participants.

This sample consisted of 313 participants (129 males, 184 females). Their mean age was 23.29 years ($SD = 7.91$).

12.3.3 Materials.

A pool of 50 items were produced from a review of the research literature in seven rape myth categories: 'Masculinity', 'Association with Homosexuality', 'Invulnerability to Rape', 'Hierarchy of Suffering', 'Coping', 'Enjoyment of Sex' and 'Responsibility'. A seven point response scale from 7-'very strongly agree' to 1-'very strongly disagree' with a

neutral midpoint of 4-‘neither agree nor disagree’ was employed for comparability with the IRMAS.

12.3.3.1 IRMAS (Payne et al., 1999).

As used within previous studies, reliability analyses of the IRMAS for this present study revealed an alpha of .96.

12.3.4 Procedure.

Participants were first administered the new male rape myth scale items followed by the IRMAS via an online questionnaire. Following completing the questionnaire, participants were given a debriefing statement where they could seek further information or support if the content of the study had raised relevant issues.

12.4 Results

12.4.1 Analysis of the male rape myth items.

A descriptive analysis of the data from each individual item was carried out to first examine the normality of the data (see Table 30).

Table 30

Descriptive Statistics of Male Rape Myth Scale

		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurtosis</i>
1.	It is physically worse for a man to be raped than a woman	3.34	1.39	0.12	-0.07
2.	Male rape victims believe their rape was just sex	2.60	1.40	0.64	-0.21
3.	Male rape doesn't happen	1.72	1.08	1.80	3.88

4.	Because gay men have sex with other men they are more likely to be raped	2.74	1.37	0.35	-0.67
5.	Male victims of rape don't suffer as much emotionally as female victims	2.02	1.28	1.39	1.56
6.	A man who is raped must have brought it on himself in some way	1.72	1.05	1.62	2.85
7.	Any man who is raped could not be a real man	1.44	0.84	2.17	4.98
8.	The perpetrators of male rape are gay men	2.73	1.48	0.40	-0.80
9.	Male rape is only a problem in prisons	2.16	1.15	0.92	0.84
10.	Male rape is a 'gay' crime	2.45	1.42	0.75	-0.09
11.	All men should be able to fight off a male rapist	2.16	1.29	1.19	1.47
12.	Men would find a rape attack physically worse than women	3.23	1.50	0.32	-0.18
13.	A man is responsible for being raped	1.68	0.88	1.10	0.36
14.	Men who are raped must have enjoyed it	1.35	0.74	2.60	8.12
15.	Men are never victims of rape outside the prison environment	1.77	1.03	1.51	2.50
16.	If a man doesn't fight back you can't call it rape	2.21	1.36	1.00	0.24
17.	It is only gay men that rape other men	2.29	1.35	0.93	0.37
18.	A man who is raped is less than a man	1.58	1.00	2.03	4.20
19.	Male rape never occurs outside of prison	1.74	0.94	1.15	1.08
20.	A straight man would find a rape physically worse than a gay man	2.98	1.82	0.54	-0.82
21.	Men are always wanting sex so being raped would be wanted by men	1.46	0.91	2.55	7.95
22.	Men can't be raped	1.43	0.83	2.06	4.37
23.	Men are less emotionally affected by rape than women	2.03	1.23	1.15	0.79
24.	A 'real' man should be able to stop a man from raping him	1.84	1.07	1.18	0.82
25.	Most men who are raped are secretly gay	1.46	0.84	2.28	7.13
26.	Adult men only get raped in prison	1.84	1.10	1.54	3.19
27.	A straight man would be more troubled physically by a rape than a gay man	2.57	1.61	0.84	-0.06
28.	A man is blameworthy for being raped	1.66	0.97	1.64	3.24

29.	Men are never raped	1.49	0.88	2.14	5.90
30.	Men are immune from becoming a victim of rape	1.54	0.82	1.38	1.09
31.	Any man should be able to escape from a male rapist	1.87	1.13	1.40	2.18
32.	Only gay men are raped	1.54	0.84	1.41	1.29
33.	It's physically worse for a straight man to be raped than a gay man	2.57	1.73	0.87	-0.24
34.	Men are better able to recover from rape than women are	2.37	1.36	0.73	-0.15
35.	Men are safe from becoming a victim of rape	1.91	1.08	0.96	0.02
36.	Being raped is just like having sex for men	1.48	0.85	1.92	3.99
37.	A man who is raped must have encouraged the rapist	1.57	0.89	1.63	2.53
38.	Any man who is raped has lost his masculinity	1.80	1.19	1.68	2.77
39.	Any gay man who is raped must have contributed to the assault	1.62	0.91	1.42	1.71
40.	Men cannot be victims of rape	1.46	0.84	1.87	3.57
41.	A man who doesn't resist a rape enough cannot really be considered a rape victim	1.97	1.23	1.30	1.33
42.	Men can deal better with being a victim of rape than women can	2.25	1.32	0.83	0.06
43.	A man who is raped must have been asking for it	1.55	0.89	1.66	2.73
44.	Any gay man who is raped must have let the assault occur	1.65	0.96	1.78	4.27
45.	Any man who is raped failed to protect himself as a man should	1.82	1.18	1.51	0.27
46.	A man who has been raped must be a gay man still 'in the closet'	1.47	0.88	2.14	5.10
47.	All men who are raped are weak	1.60	0.99	1.83	3.36
48.	Male victims of rape must like it because it involved sex	1.45	0.81	2.01	4.55
49.	Any man who rapes another man must be gay	2.68	1.64	0.82	-0.11
50.	Men cope better with being raped than women can	2.26	1.33	0.84	0.09

Following the analysis of the skewness and kurtosis of the data, the decision was made to remove 22 of the items (see below for the items which remained within the

analysis). Field recommends that all data be as close to normal as possible to ensure that the results are generalisable beyond the sample population. Therefore, in removing items in initial data screening, items were retained within the analysis when the values of skewness and/or kurtosis were not considerably higher than the value of one recommended by Field. This ensures that the weaker items were removed and also that only the strongest items are included within the principle component analysis.

12.4.1.1 *Principle component analysis.*

The principle component analysis, using a varimax rotation, was carried out on the data which included items 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 39, 41, 42, 45, 49, and 50. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure demonstrated that the sampling adequacy was at a level designated superb KMO = .94 (Field, 2009). Also, all KMO values for the individual items were above the acceptable level of .5 (Field, 2009). The Bartlett’s test of sphericity demonstrated that the correlations between items were large enough for principle component analysis to be a suitable method to use (χ^2 (378) = 6337.67 , $p < .001$). This analysis supported a four factor solution explaining 64.15% of the variance (via parallel analysis, Kaiser’s criterion, and a visual inspection of the scree plot).

Table 31

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Male Rape Myth Scale Items

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
--	----------	----------	----------	----------

Eigenvalue = 12.10

9.	Male rape is only a problem in prisons	.47	.31	.37	.18
11.	All men should be able to fight off a male rapist	.57	.31	.20	.20
13.	A man is responsible for being raped	.58	.23	.05	.30
16.	If a man doesn't fight back you can't call it rape	.59	.12	.34	.15
19.	Male rape never occurs outside of prison	.67	.25	.25	.16
24.	A 'real' man should be able to stop a man from raping him	.72	.25	.21	.23
30.	Men are immune from becoming a victim of rape	.81	.24	.06	-.01
32.	Only gay men are raped	.82	.27	.09	.10
35.	Men are safe from becoming a victim of rape	.67	.25	.21	.09
39.	Any gay man who is raped must have contributed to the assault	.72	.20	.15	.17
41.	A man who doesn't resist a rape enough cannot really be considered a rape victim	.69	.17	.26	.11
45.	Any man who is raped failed to protect himself as a man should	.69	.28	.34	.18

Eigenvalue = 2.53

5.	Male victims of rape don't suffer as much emotionally as female victims	.33	.77	-.02	.05
23.	Men are less emotionally affected by rape than women	.26	.83	.07	.05
34.	Men are better able to recover from rape than women are	.28	.80	.24	.09
42.	Men can deal better with being a victim of rape than women can	.32	.80	.21	.08
50.	Men cope better with being raped than women can	.28	.83	.20	.09

Eigenvalue = 1.84

8.	The perpetrators of male rape are gay men	.12	.00	.85	.17
10.	Male rape is a 'gay' crime	.30	.13	.67	.25
17.	It is only gay men that rape other men	.31	.11	.80	.05
20.	A straight man would find a rape physically worse than a gay man	.15	.36	.43	.62
49.	Any man who rapes another man must be gay	.28	.21	.74	.18

Eigenvalue = 1.50

1.	It is physically worse for a man to be raped than a woman	.18	-.11	.04	.78
12.	Men would find a rape attack physically worse than women	.11	.06	.11	.84

27.	A straight man would be more troubled physically by a rape than a gay man	.21	.29	.33	.71
33.	It's physically worse for a straight man to be raped than a gay man	.26	.33	.39	.60
2.	Male rape victims believe their rape was just sex	.17	.35	-.04	.23
4.	Because gay men have sex with other men they are more likely to be raped	.26	.34	.22	.28

Note. Factor loadings greater than .40 are in bold.

As items two and four did not load on any of the factors, these items were removed from the analysis. Also, item 20 cross-loaded on two factors and so was also removed from the analysis. A second principle component analysis with a varimax rotation was then performed.

12.4.1.2 *Factor rotation and factor loading.*

As the theoretical underpinnings of rape myth acceptance suggests that there should be a relationship between the scale items, a comparison between an orthogonal and oblique rotation was carried out to understand any differences in factor structure. (See Appendix I for the direct oblimin analysis.) As no differences were demonstrated in the factor structures, a varimax procedure was the most appropriate form of analysis (Pallant, 2007) and thus is reported below.

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure demonstrated that the sampling adequacy was at a level designated superb KMO = .93 (Field, 2009). Also, all KMO values for the individual items were above the acceptable level of .5 (Field, 2009). The Bartlett's test of

sphericity demonstrated that the correlations between items were large enough for principle component analysis to be a suitable method to use ($\chi^2(300) = 5782.08$, $p < .001$). The analysis supported a four factor solution explaining 67.40% of the variance (via parallel analysis, Kaiser's criterion, and a visual inspection of the scree plot).

Table 32

Follow up Factor Analysis of Male Rape Myth Scale Items

		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Eigenvalue = 11.28					
9.	Male rape is only a problem in prisons	.47	.31	.38	.17
11.	All men should be able to fight off a male rapist	.57	.31	.20	.19
13.	A man is responsible for being raped	.59	.21	.07	.28
16.	If a man doesn't fight back you can't call it rape	.59	.13	.33	.15
19.	Male rape never occurs outside of prison	.68	.24	.25	.13
24.	A 'real' man should be able to stop a man from raping him	.72	.24	.21	.21
30.	Men are immune from becoming a victim of rape	.81	.23	.08	-.02
32.	Only gay men are raped	.82	.26	.09	.08
35.	Men are safe from becoming a victim of rape	.67	.25	.21	.08
39.	Any gay man who is raped must have contributed to the assault	.73	.19	.15	.15
41.	A man who doesn't resist a rape enough cannot really be considered a rape victim	.69	.18	.24	.12
45.	Any man who is raped failed to protect himself as a man should	.70	.28	.33	.16
Eigenvalue = 2.42					
5.	Male victims of rape don't suffer as much emotionally as female victims	.34	.75	-.03	.03
23.	Men are less emotionally affected by rape than women	.27	.83	.06	.04
34.	Men are better able to recover from rape than women are	.29	.81	.22	.10

42.	Men can deal better with being a victim of rape than women can	.32	.81	.19	.09
50.	Men are cope better with being raped than women can	.28	.85	.18	.11
Eigenvalue = 1.68					
8.	The perpetrators of male rape are gay men	.11	.00	.87	.16
10.	Male rape is a 'gay' crime	.29	.13	.69	.23
17.	It is only gay men that rape other men	.30	.13	.81	.05
49.	Any man who rapes another man must be gay	.27	.23	.74	.17
Eigenvalue = 1.48					
1.	It is physically worse for a man to be raped than a woman	.18	-.10	.06	.80
12.	Men would find a rape attack physically worse than women	.11	.07	.13	.85
27.	A straight man would be more troubled physically by a rape than a gay man	.23	.30	.32	.71
33.	It's physically worse for a straight man to be raped than a gay man	.29	.34	.38	.58

Note. Factor loadings greater than .40 are in bold.

Factor one seems to relate to masculinity and the invulnerability of men to rape.

Factor two deals with the coping skills of men as rape victims. Factor three covers the association of male rape with homosexuality. Factor four covers the hierarchy of suffering as outlined by Doherty and Anderson (2004).

12.4.1.3 Construct validity.

To examine the inter-item correlations, correlations were carried out between 'Masculinity/Invulnerability to Rape', 'Coping', 'Association with Homosexuality', 'Suffering' and total score on the MRMAS. To ensure that this scale demonstrated construct validity, these sub-factors and total score was also correlated with the sub-factors of the IRMAS as a measure of female rape myths.

Table 33

Correlations Between Sub-factors of the new MRMAS and the IRMAS

	M/I	COP	HOM	SUF	MRMAS	SA	WI	MT	TE	LI	DE	NR	IRMAS
M/I	1.00	.63*	.59*	.53*	.91*	.63*	.57*	.44*	.69*	.48*	.71*	.75*	.73*
COP		1.00	.39*	.38*	.76*	.53*	.47*	.42*	.58*	.41*	.55*	.52*	.60*
HOM			1.00	.52*	.75*	.54*	.44*	.44*	.45*	.41*	.61*	.46*	.59*
SUF				1.00	.73*	.53*	.48*	.46*	.50*	.53*	.48*	.40*	.59*
MRMAS					1.00	.70*	.62*	.54*	.71*	.56*	.75*	.70*	.79*
SA						1.00	.66*	.61*	.66*	.72*	.67*	.67*	.89*
WI							1.00	.56*	.71*	.64*	.63*	.67*	.83*
MT								1.00	.50*	.59*	.59*	.46*	.75*
TE									1.00	.58*	.73*	.78*	.83*
LI										1.00	.54*	.56*	.80*
DE											1.00	.71*	.84*
NR												1.00	.82*
IRMAS													1.00

* $p < .001$, HOM=Association with homosexuality, SUF=Suffering, M/I= Masculinity/Invulnerability to rape, COP=Coping, SA=She asked for it, WI=She wanted it, MT=He didn't mean to, TE=Rape is a trivial event, LI=She lied, DE=Rape is a deviant event, NR= It wasn't really rape.

As gender differences have been demonstrated regarding male rape myth acceptance (e.g., Chapleau et al., 2008), for the MRMAS, a number of independent t-tests were carried out for the total MRMAS score and for the sub-factors of the scale. A Bonferroni correction was applied to the significance level as five t-tests were being carried out. The required significance level was therefore $p = .01$. Significantly higher males scores were found for total MRMAS scores [$t(312) = 6.06, p < .001$], 'Masculinity/Invulnerability to Rape' [$t(312) = 5.14, p < .001$], 'Coping' [$t(312) = 3.30, p = .001$], 'Association with Homosexuality' [$t(312) = 5.24, p < .001$], and 'Suffering' [$t(312) = 5.24, p < .001$].

12.4.1.4 Internal consistency.

Finally to assess the internal consistency of the scale, a Cronbach alpha was completed on the scale as a whole and also separately to each of the subscales. This resulted in an overall $\alpha = .94$ demonstrating good level of reliability. This good level of reliability was also found for each of the subscales, 'Masculinity/Invulnerability to Rape' ($\alpha = .93$), 'Coping' ($\alpha = .93$), 'Association with Homosexuality' ($\alpha = .87$), and 'Suffering' ($\alpha = .83$).

12.5 Discussion

The results of this initial scale development process for a measure of male rape myth acceptance suggests a four factor model of male rape myths. These are 'Masculinity/Invulnerability to Rape', 'Coping', 'Association with Homosexuality', and 'Suffering'. The factor 'Masculinity/Invulnerability to Rape' seems to relate to an expectation that a man would be physically able to fight off a rape attack and that any man who does not has therefore failed as a 'real' man. This factor also engages in the idea that male rape is only a problem within prisons and that outside of that environment men are safe from becoming a victim of rape. The 'Coping' factor seems to relate to the idea that men are much more emotionally stronger than women and thus would not be as emotionally upset as a female victim of rape would be. The 'Association with Homosexuality' factor seems relate to the belief that perpetrators of male rape are gay men and that male rape only occurs within the gay community. Finally, the 'Suffering' factor seems to relate to the hierarchy of suffering as conceptualised by Doherty and Anderson (2004). The hierarchy of suffering is where rape is judged to be a worse experience for certain types of victims (e.g., worse for heterosexual men than homosexual

men or women). Doherty and Anderson (2004) consider this hierarchy particularly problematic as it suggests that people are drawing links between a rape and consensual sexual activity.

This new scale has demonstrated strong construct validity in its relationship with the IRMAS and also in the gender differences found. Internal consistency levels also show a good level of reliability. The development of this scale builds upon the prior research developed within this thesis. Study four clearly identified that although there are useful measures of male rape myth acceptance available, a clearly developed scale which assesses the full range of male rape myths had not yet been developed. In progressing the research within this area, there was a clear need to develop such a scale. This study has clearly established a potentially useful measure of male rape myths which further testing of the factor structure is now needed. This will ensure its stability as well as testing through confirmatory factor analysis.

13 Summary of Findings

This chapter will briefly review the hypotheses and findings of each study newly presented within this thesis.

13.1 Study One

13.1.1 Hypotheses.

Study one examined six hypotheses regarding attitudes towards female rape victims. It was hypothesised that there will be a gender difference in victim blaming such that males would blame the victim more than females. It was also hypothesised that there would be a gender difference in rape myth acceptance such that males will accept rape myths at a higher level than females. Further, it was hypothesised that there would be an effect of type of rape such that the victim of acquaintance rape would be blamed more than the victim of a stranger rape. It was also hypothesised that rape myth acceptance and belief in a just world would predict victim blaming, particularly those rape myths which relate to the victim. Finally, the adoption of a masculine or feminine gender role (Bem, 1981) or the factors as identified by Choi et al. (2009) of femininity, personal masculinity and social masculinity would increase the level of victim blame attributed towards the victim.

13.1.2 Findings.

Study one demonstrated that there were no significant gender effects in the level of blame attributed towards the rape victim or in the level of rape myth acceptance. However, acquaintance rape victims were found to be blamed more than stranger rape victims. Rape myth acceptance but not belief in a just world was related to victim

blaming. Specific myths (i.e., 'She asked for it', 'Rape is a trivial event') did predict victim blaming. An effect approaching significance was found for gender role traits such that androgynous or undifferentiated participants had higher levels of victim blaming than individuals with either a masculine or feminine gender role.

13.2 Study Two

13.2.1 Hypotheses.

Study two examined the six hypotheses put forward in study one in a sample of Law undergraduate students. In addition, it was hypothesised that a high level of rape myths would increase the level of blame attributed towards the rape victim compared to a low level.

13.2.2 Findings.

Study two demonstrated that there was no significant gender difference in the level of blame attributed towards the victim. However, males did accept rape myths at a higher level than females. Two main effects of type of rape and level of rape myths were found in relation to victim blaming. These were that (i) acquaintance rape victims were blamed more than stranger rape victims and that (ii) where there was a high level of rape myths present within the scenario, this significantly increased the level of blame attributed towards the victim. Rape myth acceptance but not belief in a just world was related to victim blaming. Specific myths (i.e., 'She asked for it') did predict victim blaming. There was no significant effect of gender role traits (for either of the methods to assess gender role) on victim blaming.

13.3 Study Three

13.3.1 Hypotheses.

Study three examined the hypotheses put forward in study two with regard to female victim blaming but placed these within a sample of police officers. This study also included a measure of perpetrator blaming and so the relationship between victim blaming and perpetrator blaming was examined. It was hypothesised that males would blame the perpetrator less than females. Perpetrators of stranger rape would be blamed more than perpetrators of acquaintance rape. The perpetrator would be blamed less when there was a high level of rape myths compared to a low level of rape myths. Rape myth acceptance and belief in a just world would relate to perpetrator blaming. The adoption of a masculine or feminine gender role (Bem, 1981) or the factors as identified by Choi et al. (2009) of femininity, personal masculinity and social masculinity were hypothesised to decrease the level of blame attributed towards the perpetrator. Finally, in relation to the difference between the specialist trained police officers and non-specialist trained police officers, it was hypothesised that specially rape trained police officers would blame the victim less and blame the perpetrator more than police officers who had not received the specialist training. Furthermore, the number of months worked in a specialist role with victims and years of job experience would predict victim blaming and perpetrator blaming.

13.3.2 Findings.

Study three demonstrated that there was no significant difference in the level of rape myths accepted by males and females. Victim blaming and perpetrator blaming

were found to be negatively related. The acquaintance rape victim was blamed more than the stranger rape victim. An interaction between level of rape myths and gender demonstrated that males blamed the rape victim significantly more when there was a high level of rape myths compared to when there was a low level of rape myths. When there was a low level of rape myths, females blamed the victim more than males did. Rape myth acceptance and belief in a just world related to victim blaming. Specific myths (i.e., 'She wanted it' and 'He didn't mean to') related to victim blaming. There was no significant effect of gender role traits on victim blaming.

For perpetrator blaming, perpetrators of stranger rape were blamed more than perpetrators of acquaintance rape. Males blamed the perpetrator at a higher level than females. Rape myth acceptance and belief in a just world did not predict perpetrator blaming. A significant difference was found for gender role traits (Bem, 1981) in that individuals with an androgynous gender role blamed the perpetrator at a higher level than undifferentiated individuals. Similarly, using Choi et al.'s concepts of femininity, personal and social masculinity found that femininity and social masculinity approached significance in predicting perpetrator blaming.

There were no significant differences between specially trained officers and non-specially trained officers in terms of victim blaming. For perpetrator blaming, male trained officers blamed the perpetrator more than did female trained officers. Also, for untrained police officers, the perpetrator of stranger rape was blamed more than the

perpetrator of acquaintance rape. Months in a specialist role and years of job experience were not related to victim blaming or perpetrator blaming.

13.4 Study Four

13.4.1 Hypotheses.

Study four examined attitudes towards male victims of rape. Therefore, it was hypothesised that there would be a gender difference in male victim blaming such that males would blame the male victim more than females. It was hypothesised that there would be a gender difference in male rape myth acceptance such that males would accept rape myths at a higher level than females. A high level of rape myths would increase the level of blame attributed towards the rape victim compared to a low level. Male acquaintance rape victims would be blamed more than male stranger rape victims. Rape myth acceptance, belief in a just world and egalitarian beliefs about gender would relate to male victim blaming. Rape myths relating to the victim would be related to male victim blaming.

It was further hypothesised that victim blaming and perpetrator blaming would be related. There would be a gender difference in male rape perpetrator blaming such that males would blame the perpetrator less than females. Perpetrators of male acquaintance rape would be blamed less than perpetrators of male stranger rape. A high level of rape myths would decrease the level of blame attributed towards the perpetrator compared to a low level. Rape myth acceptance, belief in a just world, and egalitarian beliefs about gender would be related to male rape perpetrator blaming.

13.4.2 Findings.

There were a number of significant gender effects in that (i) male participants blamed the male victim more than females and (ii) males accepted male rape myths at a higher level than females. The acquaintance rape victim was blamed more than a stranger rape victim. Furthermore, the rape victim was blamed more where there was a high level of rape myths than where there was a low level of rape myths. Male rape myth acceptance but not belief in a just world or egalitarian beliefs about gender were related to male victim blaming.

Victim blaming and perpetrator blaming were negatively related. For perpetrator blaming, the perpetrator of stranger rape was blamed more than the perpetrator of acquaintance rape. Male rape myth acceptance and egalitarian beliefs about gender but not belief in a just world predicted male perpetrator blaming.

13.5 Study Five

13.5.1 Hypotheses.

This study examined the initial development of a measure of male rape myth acceptance. This measure examined the usefulness of seven myth types in explaining male rape myth acceptance. These categories were: Association with homosexuality, masculinity, invulnerability to rape, coping, hierarchy of suffering, responsibility, and enjoyment of sex.

13.5.2 Findings.

The initial development of this scale demonstrated that four factors seem to be important in explaining male rape myth acceptance. The questionnaire consists of 25 items. Twelve items for factor one ('Masculinity/Invulnerability to Rape'), five items for factor two ('Coping'), four items for factor three ('Association with Homosexuality'), and four items for factor four ('Hierarchy of Suffering'). This scale showed good correlations between the scale's subfactors and the total scores on the scale. It also demonstrated significant correlations with total scores on the IRMAS and its subfactors. Gender differences were also demonstrated such that males were more accepting of male rape myths as a whole and of myths relating to 'Masculinity/Invulnerability to Rape', 'Coping', 'Association with Homosexuality' and 'Hierarchy of Suffering' than were females. An excellent level of internal consistency was found.

14 Discussion

This discussion section contains five sections. The first will discuss the findings across the five studies and relate these to the previous research. The second section will discuss the particular strengths and weaknesses of the methodologies employed within the new studies presented within this thesis. The third section will examine the theoretical implications of the research and how the new research findings can inform theory development. The fourth section will discuss the practical implications of the research. The final section will propose future directions for research.

14.1 Section One: The Findings and Previous Research

14.1.1 Gender differences in blaming and rape myth acceptance.

Gender differences in victim blaming have been found to be inconsistent throughout the new studies presented here. Studies one and two demonstrated no gender differences in the levels of blame attributed towards female victims of rape. This lack of effect was contradicted by the findings of study four which did demonstrate that males were more male victim blaming than females were. Similarly, within study three, an interaction between gender and level of rape myths contained within the scenario was found where males blamed the female rape victim more when there was a high level of rape myths in the scenario compared to when there was a low level of rape myths in the scenario. Also, females blamed the victim more than males when there was a low level of rape myths. The inconsistency of the gender differences in victim blaming is reflected

within the published literature. Although, Pollard (1992) in a review of a considerable number of female victim blaming studies identified gender as a consistent effect, other studies (e.g., Brems & Wagner, 1994; Frese et al., 2004; Newcomb et al., 2008; Viki & Abrams, 2002) have identified a lack of difference in the levels of victim blaming engaged in by men and women. Similarly, within the male victim blaming literature, males are more often found to blame the male victim more than females (e.g., Mitchell et al., 1999). However, again this effect is not consistent with other studies demonstrating no effect of gender (Anderson, 2004; Gerber et al., 2004). This suggests that the findings of the new studies presented in this thesis are in line with the published research such that men can blame rape victims at a higher level than females, but they may not always do so. Since this effect often seems to be reported to be more consistent than it actually can be, further research needs to examine this effect. It was particularly interesting to find in study three that gender interacted with level of rape myths suggesting that the gender effect may be influenced by other elements presented within a scenario.

For perpetrator blaming, study three demonstrated that males blamed the female rape perpetrator at a higher level than did females. However, in study four, no significant difference was found between male and female levels of male perpetrator blaming. Female perpetrator blaming studies have demonstrated gender differences, although these more usually demonstrate that males blame the perpetrator less than females do (e.g., Alicke & Yurack, 1995; Gerber et al., 2004), although there are studies which have found no effect (e.g., Newcomb et al., 2008; Viki et al., 2004). Interestingly, study three

involved a sample of police officers whereas the majority of the studies cited above have involved student participants. Additional research is needed to establish the replication of this effect before further conclusions can be drawn.

The lack of effect of gender differences in male perpetrator blaming may be more easily explained. Participants may have a less clear perception of male rape, which may affect the levels of blame attributed towards the male rape perpetrator (Anderson & Lyons, 2005). Gerber et al. (2004) found no gender difference in the level of blame attributed to the male rape perpetrator which supports the lack of effect found within study four. The processes involved in attributing blame towards the perpetrator still remains under-researched and the mechanisms of this process remain unclear (Felson, 2002).

Findings regarding gender differences within rape myth acceptance were similarly conflicting where study two (sample of law students) found a moderate effect where males were more accepting of female rape myths than females. However, studies one and three found no such effect. In terms of male rape myth acceptance, a small effect was found in study four with males being more accepting of male rape myths than females. Relating this to the previous research suggests again that this inconsistent effect is reflected there, though this may only occur within the female rape myth acceptance research. For example, Jones et al. (1998) found that males were more accepting of female rape myths than females. Indeed in their three factor analysis of the RMAS, men's

acceptance of myths relating to 'disbelief of rape claims' were one standard deviation stronger than women's (see also Anderson et al., 1997; Frese et al., 2004). However, Abrams et al. (2003) found no such effect of gender in female rape myth acceptance. For male rape myth acceptance, the gender differences between males and females seem to be far more predictable with men accepting myths at a higher level than females. All of the (limited number of) published studies which have measured male rape myth acceptance have demonstrated this difference (e.g., Chapleau et al., 2008; Davies & McCartney, 2003; Kassing & Prieto, 2003; Kassing et al., 2005; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992). The findings from study four fit in with the currently quite limited body of research literature, demonstrating a significant gender difference in male rape myth acceptance.

14.1.2 Differences in type of rape perception.

Studies one, two, and three demonstrated consistently that the female victim of acquaintance rape was blamed at a higher level than a female victim of stranger rape. The differences, found in the present studies, have largely been of a medium effect size demonstrating their importance within rape perception research. This finding is one of the most consistent within the research area with the vast majority of research producing the same finding that where there is some prior acquaintance between the victim and perpetrator, this increases the level of blame attributed towards the victim (e.g., Bell et al., 1994; Golge et al., 2003). This level of prior acquaintance can range from only knowing who the perpetrator is, being friends, dating, partners, marital, to ex-partners of the perpetrator. Monson et al. (2000) described a linear relationship by which as the level

of relationship between the female victim and perpetrator increased, the perceived seriousness of the rape decreased. The findings of the present research are therefore quite consistent with the prior published literature.

This difference in how stranger and acquaintance rape is perceived is less easy to establish within the perception of male rape victims. Study four has clearly demonstrated that similar to the female victim blaming literature, a male victim of acquaintance rape was blamed more than a male victim of stranger rape. However, as mentioned earlier, much of the previous research has focussed solely on one type of rape (e.g., stranger rape) instead of comparing the differences between stranger and acquaintance rape, so it is difficult to compare the present finding with earlier research. However, it does seem logical, given the parallels in female victim blaming and male victim blaming (e.g., in gender differences), that the differences in type of rape demonstrated in female victim blaming should extend to male victim blaming.

Some studies have previously found an interaction effect between gender of participant and type of rape (e.g., Monson et al., 2000; Tretault & Barnett, 1987). This was not demonstrated in any of the studies presented within this thesis. This may not be problematic to the validity of the findings because this effect (similar to gender effects alone) has been shown to be inconsistent with a number of studies demonstrating no significant interaction (e.g., Bell et al., 1994; Frese et al., 2004; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Krahe et al., 2007.)

In relation to perpetrator blaming, the opposite effect is found with regards to type of rape, as perpetrators of stranger rape are blamed more than perpetrators of acquaintance rape. This was demonstrated in both studies three and four, suggesting that this effect occurs for both perceptions of male and female rape. These findings concur with Krahe et al. (2007) who found that the levels of perpetrator blaming increased as the level of prior relationship between the victim and perpetrator decreased. Similarly, Golge et al. (2003) and Viki et al. (2004) both found that proposed punishments for the perpetrator increased for perpetrators of stranger rape compared with perpetrators of acquaintance rape. It must be noted that these studies reflect attitudes towards perpetrators of female rape. Establishing that perpetrators of male stranger rape are blamed more than perpetrators of male acquaintance rape has yet to be explored in the published literature, so study four demonstrates a broadening of our knowledge of this research area.

14.1.3 Rape myths and stereotypes.

There were interesting trends in the data in the levels of female rape myth acceptance across studies one to three. These demonstrated that the highest levels of acceptance of specific rape myths was found across the myths 'She lied', 'She asked for it', and 'He didn't mean to'. It was across these three types of myths that there appeared to be greater variance in the levels of acceptance across the groups of psychology students, law students, and police officers. For the myth regarding 'She lied', there did seem to be a greater level of acceptance of these types of myth within the police officers. This is

most clearly indicated across the myth item “Women who are caught having an illicit affair sometimes claim that it was rape” where the level of acceptance for the police officers was approximately twice that of the psychology students. An opposite pattern seemed to occur for the other two myth types of ‘She asked for it’ and ‘He didn’t mean to’. For these types of myths, the two groups of students appeared to accept the myths at a higher level than the police officer sample. For example, within the myth type ‘He didn’t meant to’, the item “Rape happens when a man’s sex drive gets out of control” showed that the psychology students accepted this myth at three times the level over that displayed by police officers (see section 14.1.7 below for further discussion of the levels of acceptance of rape myths in police officers).

In terms of the relationship between rape myth acceptance and victim blaming, rape myth acceptance demonstrated a strong relationship with victim blaming within this thesis. Female rape myth acceptance significantly predicted female victim blaming in studies one, two, and three. Male rape myth acceptance significantly predicted male victim blaming in study four. The importance of acceptance of rape myths in relating to victim blaming is clearly underlined by the continued effects found. Frese et al. (2003) found similar effects in that participants with high rape myth acceptance attributed greater levels of responsibility towards the victim. Levels of acceptance of female rape myths ranged from 0 to 65.08% across studies one to three. The greater levels of acceptance were found in the myth ‘She asked for it’ and the myth ‘He didn’t mean to’. For male rape myth acceptance, the majority of studies confirm (as with study four) that

male rape myth acceptance is an important predictor of male victim blaming (e.g., Chapleau et al., 2008). In terms of the levels of acceptance of rape myths, study four demonstrated that these can range from 3 to 93%. In examining the levels of acceptance of certain myths, it was particularly problematic to note that 18% of women and 26% of men believe that a man can enjoy sex even if it is being forced upon him and that a third of participants believed that male rape is committed by homosexual men. These levels of acceptance, across female and male myths, clearly demonstrate that these stereotypes are in evidence within our society.

Specific myths were related to female victim blaming, however which types of myths demonstrated significant relationships did vary slightly in each sample. Study one demonstrated a significant relationship between female victim blaming and (i) 'She asked for it' and (ii) 'Rape is a trivial event'. Study two demonstrated significant relationships between female victim blaming and 'She asked for it'. Study three demonstrated significant relationship between female victim blaming and (i) 'She wanted it' and (ii) 'He didn't mean to'. Thus, the two myths 'She asked for it' and 'He didn't mean to' demonstrated the most consistent relationship with female victim blaming. Since the individual relationships between types of rape myths and victim blaming has not been established before, these findings cannot be compared with the published literature. However, as different myths may function in different ways (Payne et al., 1999), it could be that the myths which are important to each sample could be relative to that sample. The relationship between specific myths and victim blaming has not been researched in

this level of detail before and it will be interesting to examine the myths which relate to male victim blaming with the further development of the MRMAS.

Rape myth acceptance does not seem to be such a consistent predictor of perpetrator blaming. Study three demonstrated no relationship between female rape myth acceptance and perpetrator blaming. The reason for this may be that the IRMAS's greater focus on myths which relate to the victim, explains this lack of effect of female rape myth acceptance on female perpetrator blaming. It would be interesting to further explore the relationship between myths which relate to perpetrators and how these may predict female perpetrator blaming (e.g., the 'He didn't mean to' factor within the IRMAS). For male rape myth acceptance, study four demonstrated a significant relationship between male rape myth acceptance and male rape perpetrator blaming. Given that victim blaming and perpetrator blaming are negatively related (see studies three and four), and the findings of Frese et al. (2003) which demonstrates high rape myth acceptance is related to higher victim blaming, it seems logical that the opposite effect occurs for perpetrator blaming.

As well as the relationship between victim and perpetrator blaming and rape myth acceptance, the level of rape myths presented within scenarios also demonstrated a significant effect upon the level of blame attributed towards the victim but not the perpetrator. Studies two and four demonstrated this main effect for both female and male victim blaming, with the high level of rape myths increasing the level of blame

attributed towards the victim. These findings are consistent with the literature which has demonstrated the effect of rape myths on people's attitudes about rape victims. For example, Sims et al. (2007) found that a female date rape victim was attributed more responsibility when alcohol was present. Correspondingly, a female rape victim is attributed greater blame if they are dressed in revealing clothing compared to more modest clothing (e.g., Maurer & Robinson, 2008).

Studies three and four demonstrated no effect of level of rape myths on perpetrator blaming. This is understandable since the myths manipulated within the scenarios specifically related to the victim. This lend further support to the idea put forward by Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) that different specific rape myths may function in different ways. Rape myths which relate to the victim do not seem to affect perpetrator blaming (as demonstrated in studies three and four). However, it is more likely that myths which relate more specifically to the perpetrator would affect these blame levels.

14.1.4 Belief in a just world.

In assessing general belief in a just world's relationship with victim blaming, only study three in a sample of police officers, demonstrated a significant relationship between belief in a just world and victim blaming. This is counter to what was expected, given how frequently belief in a just world has been related to a negative perception of rape victims. However, as noted by Correia et al. (2001), belief in a just world research relating to the perception of rape victims has demonstrated more contradictory findings than when

examining other types of victims, with the results of studies being very specific and gender oriented. For example, Murray et al. (2005) found a relationship between belief in a just world and female victim blaming only amongst female participants. Similarly, Kleinke and Meyer (1990) found that female participants with a high belief in a just world demonstrated less negative beliefs towards the female rape victim. In addition, a number of studies have demonstrated no relationship between victim blaming and belief in a just world which emphasises the unreliable nature of this effect (e.g., Brems & Wagner, 1994; Lambert & Raichle, 2000; Rye et al., 2006).

These studies relate to female victim blaming, however the research examining the perception of male rape victims is similarly inconsistent with Whatley and Riggio (1993) finding that a high belief in a just world increased the level of blame attributed towards the victim, whereas Ford et al. (1998) found more complex results. Blame attributed towards the male rape victim was only influenced by belief in a just world when the victim was described as heterosexual, and that participant gender influenced the relationship, such that females attributed more responsibility and males attributed less responsibility. These conflicting findings suggest that belief in a just world may not represent a strong underpinning for why rape victims may be attributed blame for being victimised. However, the limitations of this research in activating just world beliefs will be explored below (see also Hafer & Begue, 2005).

Belief in a just world also demonstrated no significant relationship with perpetrator blaming (see study three). The relationship between belief in a just world and perpetrator blaming has been little examined. Murray et al. (2005) found that only amongst female participants was a high belief in a just world associated with a more negative perception of the perpetrator, whereas, Rye et al. (2006) found no such effect of belief in a just world. This topic is little studied and given the opportunity that blaming the perpetrator has in restoring the justice to a situation, this area needs further development (Hafer & Begue, 2005).

14.1.5 Gender role traits and gender role beliefs.

Similar to belief in a just world, the role of gender role traits and gender traditionality in victim and perpetrator blaming has also been questioned by the new research studies in this thesis. In relation to gender role traits, study one demonstrated an effect, approaching significance, using the BSRI (Bem, 1981) whereby participants identified as androgynous or undifferentiated participants had somewhat higher levels of victim blaming than individuals with either a masculine or feminine gender role. To contextualise these gender role trait categories, to be identified as androgynous an individual would self-identify as having a higher than average adherence to traits on both the masculine and feminine factors. In opposition, an undifferentiated individual would identify as having a lower than average adherence to masculine and feminine traits. Both androgynous and undifferentiated individuals have been previously identified as engaging in higher levels of victim blaming compared to other gender roles (e.g., Kopper, 1996; Quackenbush, 1989) however, this effect was not confirmed within further studies (e.g.,

Szymanski et al., 2001). The Choi et al. (2009) concepts of femininity, personal and social masculinity demonstrated no relationship with victim blaming throughout studies one, two, and three. This may reflect the lack of effect or may be a result of the lower levels of reliability (see study two).

In relation to perpetrator blaming, again the inconsistency of the BSRI was demonstrated with only study three demonstrating a significant difference whereby individuals identified as androgynous blamed the perpetrator at a higher level than undifferentiated individuals. Similarly, use of Choi et al.'s (2009) concepts of femininity, personal and social masculinity, in study three, found that femininity and social masculinity approached significance in predicting perpetrator blaming. Both of these factors were positively related to perpetrator blaming such that as individuals' adherence to the traits increased, so did the level of perpetrator blaming. Social masculinity relates to traits such as dominant and aggressive whereas the femininity traits relate to traits such as compassionate and understanding. These three concepts (Choi et al.) have not previously been related to perpetrator blaming and since the relationship only approached significance, these effects must be interpreted cautiously.

These findings using the BSRI suggest that it may not be the adherence to gender role traits that most affects attitudes towards rape victims but rather the adoption of traditional ideals about gender. This was explored using the SRES as a measure of traditional ideas about gender, but this did not demonstrate a significant relationship with

victim blaming in study four (relating to male victims). This is counter to the previous findings in the area as both Simonson and Subich (1999) and Yamawaki and Tschanz (2005) both found significant relationships between gender traditionality and the attitudes towards the rape victim. These studies found that the more traditional a person was, the more likely the seriousness of the rape was minimised as was the effects of the rape on the victim. However, non-significant effects have been found with gender role traditionality, with Ryckman et al. (1992) finding no difference in the levels of responsibility attributed towards the rape victims between traditional and non-traditional participants (see also Ben-David & Schneider, 2005). However, Yamawaki (2007) only found gender role traditionality to be a significant predictor in attitudes towards a date rape scenario as opposed to a stranger rape scenario. This led Yamawaki to suggest that gender role traditionality is only important in judging victims who may be believed to have violated gender role ideals (e.g., the date rape victim). This may mean that for those participants who judged a stranger rape, the influence of gender role traditionality was not activated leading potentially to the non-significant results. As the SRES has not been used extensively within the rape perception literature, there is clearly scope to examine how and with which types of victims these egalitarian ideas about gender may demonstrate the strongest relationship.

For perpetrator blaming, egalitarian ideas about gender were significantly related to perpetrator blaming in study four (male victims). There has previously only been one study examining perpetrator blame and gender role traditionality. This found that gender

role traditionality predicted excusing the rapist within the date rape scenario but not within the stranger rape scenario (White & Yamawaki, 2009). Prior research regarding gender role beliefs have focussed much more upon the role of victims and so it is difficult to draw firm conclusions about the findings within this thesis with regards to perpetrator blaming. It would seem most likely that gender role beliefs would be associated with perpetrators of rape being held less responsible particularly when the victim is male (Anderson & Lyons, 2005), however this has yet to be more firmly established.

14.1.6 Measurements of blaming and rape myth acceptance.

From the factor analyses carried out in this thesis, it is clear that items which most reliably measure blame are words which have been previously theoretically associated with the concept of blame (Shaver, 1985) e.g., responsibility, fault. This is similar for both measures of victim blaming and perpetrator blaming. Other items which have demonstrated a satisfactory measure of victim blaming include items which assess the level of respondents' sympathy towards the victim and how much control the victim is thought to have over the situation. The reliability of these types of scale items reflect their use within victim blaming measures within the published literature (e.g., Abrams et al., 2003; Brems & Wagner, 1994; Gerber et al., 2004; Viki & Abrams, 2002). In terms of the theoretical research regarding blame, the factor loading demonstrated within studies, one, three, and four, offer some support for Shaver's (1985) discussion of the underpinnings of blame through the pathway of the attribution of responsibility. Study one demonstrated the highest factor loadings on the victim blame scale to be items that

measured blame, responsibility, sympathy, and fault attributed towards the victim. This was replicated in both studies three and four again with items that assessed blame, responsibility, and fault. However, this does lead to some questions regarding Shaver's argument of blame and responsibility being two separate concepts. Although well argued in a theoretical sense, it seems that lay populations perceive these two concepts in a very similar way. This is a point acknowledged by Shaver in that how attribution theorists perceive these words may not be the same as the lay population. This perception of responsibility and blame as similar concepts is also echoed within the literature as definitions of blame are intertwined with responsibility (e.g., Bell et al., 1994). Future research within this area would benefit from a more thorough discussion of blame and its related concepts (see section 14.5)

There does appear to be a need for the development of a measure whose sole purpose is in assessing blaming attributed towards rape victims/perpetrators. Although other related measures have been developed, these measure do demonstrate some overlap with the rape myth literature such as where the attitude assesses items such as victim clothing (e.g., Attitudes towards Rape Victims Scale, Ward, 1988). Also, items such as these are only reflective of attitudes towards female victims of rape and so create an additional limitation on their usage. Good practice would also suggest that a measure which also has multiple items which assess responsibility towards the victim would also be of use since some studies have been found to only use one item of a questionnaire to assess blaming (e.g., Idisis et al., 2007). Items which assess blaming, responsibility, and

fault can easily be used to more comprehensively measure the blaming attitudes towards either the victim or the perpetrator.

As outlined in the review of male rape myth acceptance, there has been a lack of a thorough measure of the full range of male rape myths. Study five has demonstrated an initial scale development process of a much more in-depth measure than either of these measures represent. In the final principle component analysis, this questionnaire consists of 25 items with a four factor solution. These factors are 'Masculinity/Invulnerability to Rape' (12 items), 'Coping' (five items), 'Association with Homosexuality' (four items), and 'Hierarchy of Suffering' (four items). The initial development of this scale seems to suggest that it has good construct validity with its association with the IRMAS as well as internal consistency. Also, the scale demonstrates gender differences in the expected direction. This scale appears to fulfil a much broader understanding of the range of male rape myths. For example, the factor 'Masculinity/Invulnerability to Rape' deals with the myths that a man should be able to successfully physically resist a rape and that if he did not, then he has failed as a real man. Subsequent scale development needs to establish the factor structure within different populations as well as a confirmatory factor analysis to examine the scale structure.

The development of such an indepth scale has been long overdue within an area which has had a comprehensive measure of female rape myth acceptance for over ten years (e.g., the IRMAS). Previous male rape myth acceptance scales such as the

Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson (1992) scale had overlaps with victim blaming and only contained three factors. The Melanson (1999) scale was an improvement because it measured a broader range of myths relating to homosexuality, enjoyment of sex, coping but whilst adequate for use, its overlap of some items with blaming meant that this scale was not faultless. This new scale was formed on the basis of a review of the available male rape myths and thus may provide a more thorough coverage of the important male rape myths within our society. The research area of male rape victim perception research is still behind that of female victims (e.g., Rogers, 1998). The development of this more comprehensive scale may enable the field to move forward in gaining a better understanding of people's concepts of male rape myths.

14.1.7 Victim blaming within the criminal justice system.

The findings from study three have demonstrated that police officers tend to hold similar beliefs to other populations in relation to victim blaming (see also Brown et al., 2007). Victim blaming was significantly related to rape myth acceptance, with gender and the level of rape myths within the scenario influencing the level of blame attributed towards the victim. Similar effects were also found with regard to type of rape in that the acquaintance rape victim was blamed more than the stranger rape victim. This research extends our understanding of police officers' beliefs about rape and also furthers our understanding of the effects of training and job experience. Police officers' beliefs about rape are thought to function in the same way as they do for individuals within the general population (Edward & MacLeod, 1999). For example, Bollingmo et al. (2008)

demonstrated that police officer ratings of a rape victim's credibility were affected by the emotions displayed by the victim with a visibly upset, distressed victim being perceived as most credible. This effect has also been demonstrated within samples of lay persons and judges suggesting that police officers' perceptions of rape victims are similar to lay persons (see also Brown et al., 2007).

In terms of the trends within the rape myth acceptance data, prior to this research little has been known about police officers' level of acceptance of rape myths. Lonsway et al. (2001) used rape myth acceptance as a measure of effectiveness within their evaluation study of police training, however the results did not analyse the acceptance of the levels of rape myths in any detail. In relation to the myths assessing 'He didn't mean to' and 'She asked for it', it is a positive outcome to suggest that police officers demonstrate lower levels of acceptance of these myths compared to the two groups of Psychology and Law students. The universal perception of police officers with regards to rape tends to be very negative so it is interesting to establish some findings which suggest that police officers may in fact accept these types of myths at a lower level than other samples. However, the other findings within this section suggest that police officers within study three demonstrated comparatively high levels of acceptance but that this seemed to be limited within myths that suggest that victims of rape lie about their victimisation. This is a point echoed by Jordan (2001) who found that one of the major points commented upon by the sample of rape victims was the level of disbelief demonstrated by police officers in response to their complaints of rape. Victims identified

this response as being likely to result in police officers having an inflated perception of the likelihood of false allegations of rape.

In extending our understanding of police officer samples, this study examined the differences in victim blaming and perpetrator blaming in police officers who had received specialist training to deal with rape victims compared to police officers who had not received specialist training. The results of the study demonstrated no differences in victim blaming between these two samples. This is consistent with previous findings by Lonsway et al. (2001) who carried out an evaluation of police officer rape victim training in the U.S. and found that this did not alter levels of rape myth acceptance amongst the police officers. The new research presented in this thesis also examined the relationship between job experience and victim blaming. Job experience was measured by years of service within the police force and secondly by months completed working within a specialist role with rape victims. It was suggested (in chapter five) that experience with rape victims would enable police officers to not use rape myths and sexual scripts in their judgements of rape victims because they have a clearer conceptualisation of rape and the experience of rape victims (see Crome and McCabe, 2001). Job experience and its relationship with victim blaming has not been previously assessed. However, Page (2007) found that experienced police officers accepted rape myths at a lower level compared to inexperienced police officers. No relationship with victim blaming and job experience was found in study three (female victims).

In reflecting on these non-significant findings, it may be beneficial to further consider the point as to whether police officers do actually come into contact with a broad range of examples of rape victim (e.g., acquaintance vs stranger, violent vs. non-violent, injury vs. no injury). As established in chapter five, there does seem to be certain types of rape or certain elements within a rape which ensure that reporting to the police is much more likely to occur. For example, Du Mont et al. (2003) found that victims who suffered physical injury or experienced physical force were much more likely to report to the police. Similarly, Campbell et al. (2001) found that female stranger rape victims were much more likely to report their rape to the police compared with female acquaintance rape victims. This prior research, overall, suggests an effect of the 'real' rape stereotype whereby victims compare what happens to them with this stereotype in making their decision to report their rape to the police. This effect has been found also in cases of male rape. Hodge and Canter (1998) found significant differences between a self-report sample of male rape victims compared to a police reported sample. The police data contained more reports of stranger sexual assaults on heterosexual victims as opposed to the self-report data which contained more reports of acquaintance rape on gay victims. These findings suggest that police encounter more stereotypical examples of rape where victims are more likely to have been raped by a stranger, been physically injured, and encountered a more serious level of violence. This type of victim fits the stereotype of the 'real rape' (Estrich, 1987) and therefore may mean that the police (as with the general public) do not actually encounter a full range of the different types of rape victims.

Therefore, the experience that they have with rape victims may only serve to confirm the stranger rape stereotype rather than dispelling it.

Perpetrator blaming demonstrated no significant differences between police officers who had received the specialist training and police officers who had not. There were, however, significant effects of male trained police officers blaming the perpetrator more than female trained police officers and, secondly, perpetrators of stranger rape being blamed more than acquaintance rape victims by police officers who had not received specialist training. The second finding is clearly in line with the literature reviewed above on perpetrator blaming whereby the perpetrator of stranger rape is blamed more than the perpetrator of acquaintance rape (e.g., Golge et al., 2003; Krahe et al., 2007; Viki et al., 2004). The first finding is less easy to explain and, because this is a sample that is under-researched, there is very little to compare this finding with.

14.2 Strengths and Limitations of the New Research Studies Presented in this Thesis

14.2.1 Strengths.

This thesis sought to extend our previous understanding of rape perception research. The new research studies have extended our research knowledge in relation to the perception of rape of male rape victims and perpetrators of male rape. Previous research in this area had solely focussed upon only one type of rape presented within the scenarios (e.g., Davies et al., 2006). The new research presented in this thesis has demonstrated that similar to female victims of rape, male victims of acquaintance rape

are blamed more than male victims of stranger rape, and that the 'cross effect' occurs with perpetrators of male stranger rape being blamed more than perpetrators of acquaintance rape. This is of some considerable importance given that we know that rape victims are far more likely to be raped by someone that they know (HMCPSI/HMIC, 2007).

Our understanding of the relationship between blaming and rape myth acceptance has been extended within this thesis. For example, our understanding of the specific types of myths and how they relate to female victim blaming has been examined in greater depth. Much of the previous research in this area has solely examined general rape myth acceptance and so this new research furthers our understanding of what specific myths particularly relate to female victim blaming. These findings also fit in with the level of rape myth manipulation which affected levels of victim blaming but not perpetrator blaming, which further supports the idea that it is specific myths which relate to blaming as opposed to a generalised acceptance of rape myths. In terms of the relationship between rape myth acceptance and perpetrator blaming, this has been little researched previously and the findings of the new research suggests that it does not have a significant relationship with perpetrator blaming in female rape. However, a significant effect was found within male rape. This merits further research to examine how rape myths may relate differently to male and female rape.

This new research also suggests that there is little consistent relationship between general belief in a just world and victim or perpetrator blaming. This belief system has

often been used as reasoning for the underpinning of victim blaming. However, the previous findings as well as this thesis's findings suggest that this is not a reliable explanation for why rape victims are held responsible for being victimised. Research has little examined the relationship between belief in a just world and perpetrator blaming, and the findings of this thesis suggest that this belief system does not have a relationship with perpetrator blaming.

The examination of traditional beliefs about gender as opposed to gender role has furthered our understanding of how attitudes within society may affect the way in which rape victims are perceived. However, the new findings from this study suggest that neither gender role nor traditional ideas about gender (as measured by the SRES) relate to victim blaming, questioning the importance of this concept in trying to explain victim blaming. However, there is some merit in examining these effects in relation to perpetrator blaming.

This thesis has also involved the development of a new measure of male rape myths. As noted above much of the benefits of using the IRMAS relates to its underlying factors and how these can be examined. However, previously no such measure has been available for male rape myth acceptance. Further development is needed to confirm the validity of this measure, however the initial assessment of this scale suggests that it may be a useful tool in assessing the acceptance of different types of male rape myths.

Finally, this thesis extends our limited understanding of victim blaming within police officers. Blaming attitudes towards rape victims were demonstrated that reflect those previously demonstrated within the general population. The potential lack of effect of the specialist rape training tentatively suggests that this training needs to be reformulated to give a better balance between investigative needs and a more victim centred approach.

14.2.2 Limitations.

In examining the limitations of this research, it is first important to note that the attitudes measured within this study were measured via self-report. As such they may be affected by social desirability, particularly since the content relates to judging the responsibility of rape victims and perpetrators. This may be particularly true of the police officer samples given their role within society to uphold justice. (However, the data they provided did not seem to indicate this.) Some of these effects may have been mitigated by the completion of the questionnaire in an online environment, particularly as Joinson (1999) suggested that web based surveys may actually increase disclosure and candid responding. This point is something upon which the rape perception research area needs to reflect, as a whole in how online methodologies may be best utilised in this research area.

The use of student samples within the studies may have concealed some of the effects of victim blaming which occur within the general population. Much of the research within the rape perception research is student based which does make it

appropriate to compare the research findings demonstrated in this thesis with the published literature. How reflective these research findings as a whole with the general public and society has not been adequately answered within the research area. Although, some studies have used general population samples (e.g., Davies & McCartney, 2003) in which the findings have paralleled those demonstrated within the student population based literature. In reality, the published findings are not generally questioned with regards to their ecological validity beyond that which is applied to much psychology research carried out in undergraduate populations. Indeed, Foley and Pigott (2000) found no differences in between a student and non-student population in their attributions of responsibility towards the victim.

In considering why there was no significant relationship found between belief in a just world and victim/perpetrator blaming, this may have occurred for two reasons. The first is that the measure used within this study examined a general belief in a just world. As such, it may instead be more appropriate to assess justice beliefs about the world that relate to the individual (i.e., personal beliefs about just world). Since, beliefs about rape are based on an individual's conception of rape (Schuller & Stewart, 2000), it may be that personal belief in a just world relates more importantly with blaming attitudes compared to a general belief about the justness of the world. A second reason which may explain why non-significant relationships were found is based on the vignettes used within the studies. Hafer and Begue (2005) argue that belief in a just world is preconscious, therefore a brief vignette scenario may not be sufficient enough to activate a threat to a

person's belief in a just world. If participants are not emotionally engaged in the vignette scenario, the threat to the belief system may not be activated and therefore participants may instead respond in a way which reflects societal beliefs and norms (Hafer & Begue). This argument suggests that the non-significant relationship between belief in a just world and victim blaming may be as a result of the threat not being activated.

Regarding gender roles, the BSRI continues to cause some controversy in its underlying structure and construct measurement (Colley et al., 2009). This measure may therefore have obscured the effects of the adoption of gender role traits and its role in victim blaming. This was guarded against in the use of the current Choi et al. (2009) structures of femininity, social masculinity, and personal masculinity. However, this structure itself needs to be further validated. The questionable levels of internal consistency within study two do question the usefulness of this factor structure.

The findings from study four may also need to be interpreted cautiously because sexual orientation was not included as a factor. This may have led some participants to make assumptions about the male victim's sexual orientation which in turn may have affected their levels of blame attributed towards the victim. Links have previously been made in the literature regarding a more negative perception of a male rape victim as homophobic belief increased (e.g., Anderson, 2004). Within this thesis, a decision was made to not include sexual orientation as a factor as the focus was upon manipulating the presence of rape myths within the scenarios. This was followed in the design of study

four such that the scenario was designed to elicit questions about masculinity and suggest an association with homosexuality rather than explicitly state it. This may then have activated the blaming that people engage in relating to the assumptions and stereotypes that people adhere to e.g., that all male rape victims are gay.

There should also be some caution in interpreting those statistics with low power. This was an issue with study two where the ANOVA analysis was underpowered and potentially in chapter nine where cell sizes were small. However, it must be noted that the findings of these studies are in line with the other studies presented within this thesis suggesting that the analysis may have detected reliable effects.

Finally, there may be an issue with the measurement of blame. Item selections were guided by those used within the current literature (see chapter six). However, introducing items which assessed credibility in study three may have clouded the measurement of blame as a single construct. This may be indicated by the lower factor loadings demonstrated for the item which assessed credibility (e.g., see study three, perpetrator blame measure). This may have contributed overall to the lower level of reliability that was demonstrated by the perpetrator blame measure within this study. This means that the findings in relation to perpetrator blame should be interpreted cautiously within this study.

14.3 Theoretical Implications.

This next section will discuss the theoretical implications of the findings of this thesis, relating the findings discussed above to the current theoretical positions within the rape perception framework literature.

14.3.1 Gender differences in victim blaming and rape myth acceptance.

Gender differences in female victim blaming have been explained theoretically in terms of the capacity of men and women to empathise and adopt the perspective of a female rape victim. As females are perceived to be better able to empathise with a female victim, they are less likely to engage in negative behaviours such as blaming (Mitchell et al., 1999). Similar to this idea, Anderson et al. (2004) suggested that the socialisation of men facilitates men in attributing higher responsibility to the female rape victim than women would. Explanations for the underpinning of male victim blaming differences have suggested, via the sex role expectation hypothesis, that men endorse more traditional ideals about masculinity and this contributes towards attributing more blame towards the victim. In relation to the findings within this thesis, a lack of consistent gender effects in victim blaming may be explained in terms of a change in societies' attitudes about rape victim. Anderson (2007) suggested that there is some indication that some societies' beliefs about rape are beginning to change, with a greater awareness of rape within the media. As well as this, a reduction in acceptance of rape myths within society generally may argue for a change in how society conceptualises rape (Anderson). It is interesting that significant gender effects were demonstrated in a police officer

sample and also in the study which examined attitudes towards a male victim of rape as opposed to a traditional female rape victim.

In explaining female rape myth acceptance, Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) suggest that female rape myths function in different ways for men and women. Men use them to justify sexual violence whereas females use rape myths to deny their own personal vulnerability. Jones et al. (1998) suggest that men and women's beliefs about female rape may actually be more similar than previously conceived. However, it is how much these myths are accepted which may differ. The gender differences in female rape myth acceptance may be explained in similar ways to female victim blaming. For example, since females are better able to empathise with the female rape victim (see Mitchell et al., 1998), this may explain why females are more able to reject female rape myths than males are. The lack of a consistent effect again is supported by Anderson's (2007) suggestion that there may be change in the way in which some societies view rape.

For male rape myths, there are less clear theoretical explanations. Kassing et al. (2005) suggest that there are no well developed theories regarding male rape myths, but that beliefs about gender roles are likely to explain many of the male rape myths. This is, understandably, similar to explanations for female rape myths whereby traditional sexual scripts may affect the acceptance of female rape myths in their endorsement of ideas such as women as gatekeepers of sexual contact and men as having a higher sex drive than females (Littleton & Axsom, 2003). Men may accept rape myths at a higher level

than females because of how it can enable a denial of personal vulnerability, for example myths such as men cannot be raped (Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992). Traditional ideals about masculinity may also inhibit men from rejecting male rape myths, as cultural expectations suggest that men who become a victim of rape have failed in their duties as real men (Davies et al., 2001). The studies within the thesis have demonstrated significant differences in how men and women accept male rape myths and so it may be that the (possible) broadening of attitudes about rape (Anderson, 2007) has not yet occurred for male rape. This may be particularly apparent because individuals do not have such a clear conception of male rape (Anderson & Lyons, 2005).

14.3.2 Rape myths and stereotypes.

The importance of rape myth acceptance and its relationship with victim blaming has been clearly demonstrated within this research, with a consistent relationship in both male and female victim blaming. Level of rape myths within the scenarios affected victim blaming, most likely because the myths being manipulated related to the victim. These myths did not, however, affect the levels of perpetrator blame, underlining the importance of specific myths and how they relate to blaming. This view was supported by Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) and Payne et al. (1999) who suggest that it is unlikely that all rape myths function in the same way. However, this has been little tested within the research literature and so merits further exploration.

What we have understood from this work is that myths such as 'She asked for it' and 'He didn't mean to' demonstrate the most consistent relationship with victim

blaming. However, it may be that the myths which are important for each sample assessed may vary, given the point raised by Payne et al. (1999), which suggests that different myths will function in different ways for the individual. Understanding which particular myths are most related to male victim blaming has yet to be established within the literature. The development of the more in-depth measure of male rape myth acceptance as reported in study five may enhance our understanding of the important types of male rape myths.

14.3.3 Type of rape

Why acquaintance rape is perceived differently to stranger rape may be explained via traditional sexual scripts within society. Society's expectations about sexual behaviours between men and women suggest that if a woman agrees to a date or some other sexual interaction (e.g., kissing), that this is somehow indicative of how willing that woman is to engage in sexual intercourse (Monson et al., 2000). This links with the idea of women as gatekeepers of their own sexual behaviour, therefore any sexual behaviour which occurs must have been as a result of some agreement on the side of the woman (Pollard, 1992). Further, Littleton and Axsom (2003) demonstrated that sexual scripts of a typical seduction and typical rape significantly overlap suggesting that people may misinterpret some elements of a rape as consensual sexual activity. These perspectives may well explain why acquaintance rape is perceived differently to stranger rape. Since, in stranger rape, there is no prior contact between the victim and perpetrator, the victim may therefore be less likely to be attributed responsibility as it is more difficult to position them as having agreed to sexual behaviour, having not met the perpetrator previously

(e.g., Monson et al., 2000). In addition, Crome and McCabe (2001) suggest that it is in circumstances where people have no experience of a situation (e.g., rape), that they are most likely to use scripts which socialisation has provided for them. For victims of acquaintance rape, the prior relationship between the victim and perpetrator (however brief) seems to raise questions about whether the woman may have agreed to sexual intercourse, and therefore increases the level of responsibility attributed towards them (e.g., Golge et al., 2003). This would also explain why the perpetrators of stranger rape are blamed more than the perpetrators of acquaintance rape (e.g., in studies three and four). As there is no prior negotiation for sexual contact (as per Pollard, 1992), blame is more easily attributable towards the perpetrator of stranger rape.

14.3.4 Belief in a just world.

Belief in a just world has demonstrated a very inconsistent relationship with victim blaming and none with perpetrator blaming. Its only significant relationship was within study three in a sample of police officers. According to the theory underpinning belief in a just world, this belief allows people to feel less personally vulnerable within the everyday world (Furnham, 2003). This is why it has emerged as a strong explanation for victim blaming, however as noted by Correia et al. (2003), the findings for victim blaming are far more unclear than it is for other types of victims. This may be because of other beliefs, such as rape myths, within society are related to the perception of rape victims. As Lerner (1980) suggested, the need to blame the victim varies from situation to situation and it is what happens to the innocent victim that most threatens the belief in a just world. It may

be that rape myths deny rape victims the status of an innocent victim, with myths such as rape victim precipitation (Scully, 1990) facilitating this process.

Belief in a just world processes also suggest that people prefer to restore justice to situations by punishing the perpetrator (perceived as being guilty) as opposed to blaming the victim (potentially perceived as being the innocent) (Foley & Pigott, 2000). This was not demonstrated within this thesis. As the scenarios within the thesis focussed much more upon the behaviour of the victim, this may not have allowed participants to direct their attention upon the perpetrator. A scenario which focuses more upon the characteristics of the perpetrator may enable participants to focus upon them as the perpetrators of injustice and so attribute more blame to them in their attempt to restore justice to the situation (Hafer & Begue, 2005).

14.3.5 Gender role traits and gender role beliefs.

Gender role socialisation is thought to be an important explanation for why rape victims are perceived negatively (Ben-David & Schneider, 2005). The adoption of normative roles for men and women guide behaviour in sexual interactions, whereby men are expected to be dominant, powerful, and sexually aggressive whereas females are passive yet controlling their sexual behaviour (Burt, 1980). The adoption of masculine or feminine gender role traits may therefore have been expected to result in a more negative perception of the rape victim since this is an individual who has violated their gender role (Harrison et al., 2008). However, the results of this thesis do not support this view that the adoption of gender role traits such as dominance are associated with a

more negative perception of the victim. One finding approached significance in study one in relation to adherence to androgynous and undifferentiated traits, however this was not confirmed by the further studies. Questions were also raised about the role of gender role traditionality in relating to victim blaming as this did not demonstrate any significant effects. This does run counter to expectations, as many explanations for victim blaming have focussed upon traditional views of men and women. For example, Cuklanz (1996) argued that our perceptions of rape victims have developed from traditional views of women as property of their husbands.

In terms of perpetrator blaming, a significant effect was demonstrated in study three although, as with victim blaming, this finding was not confirmed within the other studies reported within this thesis. However, this research does raise an interesting prospect in the role of gender role traditionality and its relationship to perpetrator blaming (of male perpetrators of male rape). This may be explained through the association of the act of male rape with homosexuality. Homosexuality is perceived to be a violation of gender role and as such is thought to increase male victim blaming (Jones, 2000). An extension of this would be to argue that the less traditional a person is in their beliefs about gender role (i.e., the more egalitarian they are), the more they are likely to engage in perpetrator blaming which is what was demonstrated in study four.

This thesis has examined the relationship of blaming with both gender role traits and also attitudes about gender role. As established previously, these two concepts do

have a relationship but it is only a very small one (Archer, 1989). In establishing that neither of these concepts of gender have a consistent relationship with victim or perpetrator blaming, this thesis has called into question the utility of gender based concepts in explaining blaming attributions towards rape victims or perpetrators. Prior research has demonstrated some relationship between gender role traits/attitudes about gender (e.g., Quackenbush, 1989; Simson & Subich, 1999). However, the research findings have been inconsistent (e.g., Ben-David & Schneider, 2005; Golge et al., 2003). This suggests that theoretical approaches such as Bem's Sex Role Socialization Analysis of Rape may not hold true. This theory argues that through socialisation process rape is seen as an extreme but normal extension of traditional gender role interactions (Burt, 1980). This would therefore suggest that individuals who adhere to traditional gender role traits or traditional attitudes about gender would differ in blaming from individuals who do not adhere to these traits and/or beliefs because a rape victim is an individual who has violated their socially proscribed role. However, the findings of this thesis do not support this approach suggesting that gender concepts may not provide a strong explanation for why victims of rape are attributed blame.

14.4 Practical Implications

The findings of this research have practical implications for education programmes regarding rape within our society and potentially for informing current practice for rape victims within the criminal justice system. Rape myths have demonstrated a strong significant relationship with victim blaming throughout the findings of this thesis. The implications of such a relationship can be far reaching. For example, Frese et al. (2004)

found that participants with a high rape myth acceptance were less likely to recommend that the victim report the incident to the police. Similarly, Davies and Rutland (2007) suggest that it is these myths and preconceptions about rape that are a considerable barrier towards male victims of rape reporting their victimisation to the police. The underreporting of rape still remains very high within England and Wales with estimates that 87-95% of all rape incidents are not reported to the police. This trend is repeated across other countries such as the U.S. suggesting that it is not only in the U.K. where underreporting occurs (see Kolivas & Gross, 2007). The argument that rape myths or stereotypes are one reason why this underreporting occurs may be demonstrated in the findings that suggest that only certain types of rape are ever reported. For example, Campbell et al. (2001) found that female rape victims who were raped by a stranger were much more likely to report their rape to the police than victims of acquaintance rape. Similarly, Peterson and Muehlenhard (2004) argue that rape myths serve to define rape more narrowly than legal definitions which means that victims may not even define what happened to them as rape. The range of rape myths available within our society each provide a reasoning for why the victim may not define what happened to them as rape. For example, the rape myth that women actually want to be forced into sexual intercourse provides an obstacle in a rape victim's interpretation of what happened to them. This may lead them to question whether they had actually consented to sexual intercourse.

Not only does general rape myth acceptance relate to victim blaming, within this thesis it has been demonstrated that the level of rape myths within the scenario also increases the level of blame attributed towards the victim. This is most problematic in how these myths misrepresent rape, that factors such as clothing of the victim and alcohol intoxication can increase the level of blame attributed towards the victim. In relation to the role of alcohol within rape, Feist et al. (2007) demonstrated that in a third of rape cases, alcohol is involved with varying levels of intoxication. However, Sims et al.'s (2007) findings demonstrated that a rape victim drinking alcohol was attributed more blame than a victim who was not. This demonstrates how codes of 'appropriate behaviour' for men and women are still being applied within society (Temkin, 2000), but which misrepresent the realities of the behaviour of men and women within our society. Another example of how the characteristics of a rape can increase the level of blame attributed towards the victim is in type of rape. This thesis has demonstrated how victims of acquaintance rape are blamed more than victims of stranger rape, although analyses of rape statistics have demonstrated repeatedly that rape victims are far more likely to be raped by someone that they know as opposed to a stranger (Feist et al., 2007; Harris & Grace, 1999). The influence of rape myths and type of rape are clear targets for education within our society particularly since these myths are thought to be held quite widely (Amnesty International UK, 2005). To provide a far clearer understanding of the reality of rape may reduce the importance of these codes of appropriate behaviours (Temkin, 2000), thus enabling rape victims to feel more empowered to report their victimisation.

The second implication in this research is in how it informs our understanding of attitudes held by individuals within the criminal justice system (or who may enter the criminal justice system in the future). In relation to legal professionals, these are a difficult population to sample and so law students were a viable alternative (see Krahe et al., 2008). Study two demonstrated that Law students engage in victim blaming in a similar way to the trends demonstrated within the other studies reported in this thesis. This is particularly problematic because of their potential future role in decision making about rape cases, but is not necessarily surprising. Temkin (2000) in a qualitative study found that legal professionals were using codes of 'appropriate behaviour' for women and that any step outside this behaviour was held up as evidence that the victim may have in fact consented to sexual intercourse.

In terms of how this research informs our understanding of police officer samples, rape victims state that their decision to report or not to the police is considerably influenced by expected negative treatment by the police (Winkel & Vrij, 1993). However, given this important role the police have in often being the first criminal justice professional that the victim will come into contact with, there has been very little research examining their attitudes and behaviour (Frazier & Haney, 1996; Page, 2007). This research has demonstrated, unsurprisingly, that the attitudes of police officers reflect that of the general population, with similar effects found in study three compared to studies one and two. This fits in with the previous research in the area which suggests that police officers are also influenced by rape myths and stereotypes about rape

(Koppelaar et al., 1997). The more practical implications of this study were demonstrated in the lack of differences in the attitudes of police officers who had received specialist rape training compared to those who had not. Similarly, job experience did not relate to victim blaming. This is consistent in with previous limited research in the area (e.g., Lonsway et al., 2001; Page). This does seem problematic as it would be expected that training which related to dealing with rape victims would impact upon negative stereotypes about rape victims. However, specialist rape training may not focus on these aspects of dealing with rape victims. As previously suggested above, the content of this training currently tends to focus upon forensic medical examination and interviewing skills (Cheshire Constabulary, 2009). As noted by Jordan (2008), there is considerable tension in the investigation of a case of rape between the needs of the victim and the police procedures for investigating cases of rape. The police's focus (not unreasonably) is upon carrying out the best investigation that they can and arresting the person responsible for carrying out the crime. This focus upon evidence gathering, however, may not be the response that the rape victim needs in terms of their recovery (Jordan). These findings tentatively suggest, since rape myth acceptance is related to victim blaming, that there should be a greater focus within police specialist rape training in dispelling these myths rather than a sole focus on the investigative elements of dealing with rape victims in the criminal justice system.

14.5 Future Directions

This research can be extended in several directions. First of all, with regards to rape myth acceptance, further research should examine how people use different types of

rape myths. For example, in cases of acquaintance rape do certain myths relate to victim blaming compared with stranger rape? Similarly, this research could be extended in examining rape myths and their relationship with perpetrator blaming. Also, it would be interesting to examine the additive or individual weight of rape myths within scenarios. This could enable further understanding of what particular type of myths increase blame attributed towards the victim most significantly, as well as understanding the cumulative effect of such myths. For example, does blaming continue to increase in a linear manner or is there a 'ceiling effect' to victim blaming such that participants find it socially unacceptable to further increase the level of blame attributed towards the victim?

Secondly this research could be extended to examine personal belief in a just world. As discussed earlier, it does not seem that general belief in just world is related to victim blaming. However, a belief that the world is just for the individual may be related to victim blaming. In addition, it would be interesting to explore Hafer and Begue's (2005) critique about the activation of a threat to belief in a just world by manipulating the vignette methodology. This could examine what factors within the vignette function to create a threat to a belief in a just world.

Thirdly, this research will also need to further development the male rape myth measure. The measure needs to be tested with regards to its factor structure within different populations and also to use confirmatory factory analysis to test the goodness of

fit. This further research will therefore establish the utility of this measure within the area of male rape myth research.

Finally, research needs to be carried out to examine the theoretical underpinnings of the concept of blame. This research has provided support for Shaver's (1985) use of responsibility related words, however, further research needs to test Shaver's (1985) assertion of blame and responsibility being separate concepts.

15 Conclusion

The findings from this thesis demonstrate the inconsistency of the gender effect within victim blaming as well as the consistency of the increased level of blaming attributed towards victims of acquaintance rape. The importance of rape myths in their relationship with victim blaming was consistent throughout the thesis demonstrating the importance of these very negative stereotypes in the rape perception research. The thesis has extended our understanding of the relationship between specific rape myths and victim blaming, but also demonstrated the lack of relationship between rape myths and perpetrator blaming. Two frequently cited explanations of victim blaming have been examined. The first, belief in a just world has been shown to not be a strong predictor of victim blaming. The second, gender role traits/egalitarian beliefs about gender has similarly been shown to not predict victim blaming. In turn these explanations have been related to perpetrator blaming, but neither of the factors have demonstrated a strong consistent relationship with perpetrator blaming.

The structure of male rape myths has been examined in the development of a new measure of male rape myth acceptance and four myths make up this construct: 'Masculinity/Invulnerability to Rape', 'Coping', 'Association with Homosexuality' and 'Suffering'. This thesis has informed our understanding of police officer attitudes about rape victims, providing evidence that they reflect the same beliefs as the general

population. Receiving specialist rape training does not seem to affect the levels of victim blaming that police officers engage in, suggesting that this training may need to be reformulated to address these negative stereotypes about rape victims. It is, in particular, these applied findings which could have the most practical implications in improving the environment for rape victims within the criminal justice system.

16 References

Abdullah-Khan, A. (2008). *Male rape: The emergence of a social and legal issue*.

Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

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, 111-125. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.111

Addington, L.A., & Rennison, C.A. (2008). Rape co-occurrence: Do additional crimes affect victim reporting and police clearance of rape? *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 24, 205-226. doi: 10.1007/s10940-008-9043-9

Adler, Z. (2000). Male victims of sexual assault – Legal issues. In G.C. Mezey & M.B. King (Eds.), *Male victims of sexual assault* (2nd Ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Agbayani, P., & Min, J.W. (2006). Examining the validity of the Bem Sex Role Inventory for use with Filipino Americans using confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity*, 15, 55-80. doi: 1300/J051v15n01-03

Aguiar, P., Vala, J., & Correia, I. (2008). Justice in our world and in that of others: Belief in a just world and reactions to victims. *Social Justice Research, 21*, 50-68. doi: 10.1007/s11211-007-0059-3

Alicke, M.D., & Yurak, T.J. (1995). Perpetrator responsibility and judgements of acquaintance rape. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25*, 1900-1921. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1995.tb01823.x

Allison, J.A., & Wrightsman, L.S. (1993). *Rape: The misunderstood crime*. London: Sage.

Alsop, R., Fitzsimons, A., & Lennon, K. (2002). *Theorizing gender*. Bodmin: MPG Books, Ltd.

Amnesty International UK. (2005). *Sexual assault research summary report*. Retrieved from http://www.amnesty.org.uk/news_details.asp?NewsID=16618

Anderson, I. (1999). Characteriological and behavioural blame in conversations about female and male rape. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 18*, 377-394. doi: 10.1177/0261927X99018004002

Anderson, I. (2001). Perceived motivation for rape: Gender differences in beliefs about female and male rape. *Current Research in Social Psychology, 6*, 1-12. Retrieved from <http://www.uiowa.edu/~grpproc/crisp/crisp.html>

Anderson, I. (2004). Explaining negative rape victim perception: Homophobia and the male rape victim. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 10, 1-14. Retrieved from <http://www.uiowa.edu/~grpproc/crisp/crisp.html>

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

Anderson, I., & Doherty, K. (2008). *Accounting for rape: Psychology, feminism and discourse analysis in the study of sexual violence*. Hove, East Sussex: Routledge.

Anderson, I., & Quinn, A. (2009). Gender differences in medical students' attitudes towards male and female rape victims. *Psychology, Health and Medicine*, 14, 105-110. doi: 10.1080/13548500802241928

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

Anderson, K. B., Cooper, H., & Okamura, L. (1997). Individual differences and attitudes towards rape: A meta-analytical review. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 23, 295-316. doi: 10.1177/0146167297233008

Anderson, V. N., Simpson-Taylor, D., & Herman, D. J. (2004). Gender, age and rape-supportive rules. *Sex Roles*, 50, 77-90. doi: 10.1023/B:SERS.0000011074.76248.3a

Archer, J. (1989). The relationship between gender-role measures: A review. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 173-184.

Archer, J., & Rhodes, C. (1989). The relationship between gender-related traits and attitudes. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 149-157.

Auster, C. J., & Ohm, S. C. (2000). Masculinity and femininity in contemporary American society: A re-evaluation using the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Sex Roles*, 43, 499-528. doi: 10.1023/A:1007119516728

Bandura, A., & Bussey, K. (2004). On broadening the cognitive, motivational, and sociocultural scope of theorising about gender development and functioning: comment on Martin, Ruble, & Szkrybalo (2002). *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 691-701. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.130.5.691

- Barter, C., & Reynold, E. (1999). The use of vignettes in qualitative research. *Social Research Update*, 25, Retrieved from <http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU25.html>
- Bavelas, J., & Coates, L. (2001). Is it sex or assault? Erotic versus violent language in sexual assault language in sexual assault trial judgments. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 10, 29-40. doi: 10.1023/A:1009477518196
- Beale, C. (1994). *Boys and girls: The development of gender roles*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Beere, C.A., King, D.W., Beere, D.B., & King, L.A. (1984). The Sex Role Egalitarianism Scale: A measure of attitudes towards equality between the sexes. *Sex Roles*, 10, 563-576. doi: 10.1007/BF00287265
- Beere, L.A., King, D.W., Gudanowski, D.M., & Taft, C.T. (1997). Latent structure of the sex-role egalitarianism scale: Confirmatory scale analysis. *Sex Roles*, 36, 221-234. doi: 10.1007/BF02766269
- Begue, L., & Bastounis, M. (2003). Two spheres of belief in justice: extensive support for the bidimensional model of belief in a just world. *Journal of Personality*, 71, 435-463. doi: 10.1111/1467-6494.7103007

Bell, S.T., Kuriloff, P.J., & Lottes, I. (1994). Understanding attributions of blame in stranger rape and date rape situations: An examination of gender, rape, identifications, and students' social perceptions of rape victims. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24, 1719-1734. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1994.tb01571.x

Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S. L. (1981). *Bem Sex Role Inventory: Professional manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Ben-David, S., & Schneider, O. (2005). Rape perceptions, gender role attitudes, and victim-perpetrator acquaintance. *Sex Roles*, 53, 385-399. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-6761-4

Bohner, G. (2001). Writing about rape: Use of the passive voice and other distancing text features as an expression of perceived responsibility of the victim. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 515-529. doi:10.1348/014466601164957

Bollingmo, G.C., Wessel, E.O., Eilertsen, D.E., & Magnussen, S. (2008). Credibility of the emotional witness: A study of ratings by police investigators. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 14, 29-40. doi: 10.1080/10683160701368412

Brems, C., & Wagner, P. (1994). Blame of victim and perpetrator in rape versus theft. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 134*, 363-374. Retrieved from <http://www.heldref.org/pubs/soc/about.html>

Bridges, J. S. (1991). Perceptions of date and stranger rape: A difference in sex role expectations and rape-supportive beliefs. *Sex Roles, 24*, 291-307.
doi:10.1007/BF00288303

Briere, J., Malamuth, N.M., & Check, J.V.P. (1985). Sexuality and rape supportive beliefs. *International Journal of Women's Studies, 8*, 398-403. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/02775395>

British Film Institute. (2003). *Police*. Retrieved from <http://www.screenonline.org.uk/tv/id/464502/>

Brown, A., & Testa, M. (2008). Social influences on judgments of rape victims: The role of the negative and positive social reactions of others. *Sex Roles, 58*, 490-500.
doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9353-7

Brown, J.M., Hamilton, C., O'Neill, D. (2007). Characteristics associated with rape attrition and the role played by skepticism or legal rationality by investigators and

prosecutors. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 13, 355-370. doi:
10.1080/10683160601060507

Buchanan, T., & Smith, J.L. (1999). Using the internet for psychological research:
Personality testing on the world wide web. *British Journal of Psychology*, 90, 125-
144. Retrieved from
<http://bpsoc.publisher.ingentaconnect.com/content/bpsoc/bjp>

Buddie, A. M., & Miller, A. G. (2001). Beyond rape myths: A more complex view of the
perceptions of rape victims. *Sex Roles*, 45, 139-160. doi:
10.1023/A:1013575209803

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

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), 39-57. doi: 10.1300/J082v43n02_03

Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and
differentiation. *Psychological Review*, 106, 676-713. doi: 10.1037/0033-
295X.106.4.676

Campbell, R. (1998). The community response to rape: Victims' experiences with the legal, medical, and mental health systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 26, 355-378. doi: 10.1023/A:1022155003633

Campbell, R., & Johnson, C.R. (1997). Police officers' perceptions of rape: Is there consistency between state law and individual beliefs. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 255-275. doi: 10.1177/088626097012002007

Campbell, R., Wasco, S.M., Ahrens, C.E., Sefl, T., & Barnes, H.E. (2001). Preventing the "Second Rape": Rape survivors' experiences with community services providers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16, 1239-1259. doi: 10.1177/088626001016012002

Caringella, S. (2009). *Addressing rape reform in law and practice*. New York, USA: Columbia University Press.

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, 600-615. doi: 10.1177/0886260507313529

Check, J. (1985). *The Hostility Toward Women Scale*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
University of Manitoba.

Cheshire Contabulary. (2009). Retrieved from
<http://www.cheshire.police.uk/showcontent.php?pageid=1939>

Choi, N., & Fuqua, D.R. (2003). The structure of the Bem Sex Role Inventory: A summary report of 23 validation studies. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 63, 872-887. doi:10.1177/0013164403258235

Choi, N., Fuqua, D.R., & Newman, J.L. (2008). The Bem Sex Role Inventory: Continuing theoretical problems. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 68, 881-900. doi: 10.1177/0013164408315267

Choi, N., Fuqua, D.R., & Newman, J.L. (2009). Exploratory and confirmatory studies of the structure of the Bem Sex Role Inventory short form with two divergent samples. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 69, 696-705. doi: 10.1177/0013164409332218

Clay-Warner, J., & Burt, C.H. (2005). Rape reporting after reforms: Have times really changed? *Violence Against Women*, 11, 150-176. doi: 10.1177/1077801204271566

Coates, L., & Wade, A. (2004). Telling it like it isn't: Obscuring perpetrator responsibility for violent crime. *Discourse and Society*, 15, 499-526. doi: 10.1177/0957926504045031

Colley, A., Mulhern, G., Maltby, J., & Wood, A.M. (2009). The short form of the BSRI: Instrumentality, expressiveness and gender associations among a United Kingdom sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46, 384-387. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2008.11.005

Correia, I., & Vala, J. (2003). When will a victim be secondarily victimized? The effect of observers' belief in a just world, victim's innocence and persistence of suffering. *Social Justice Research*, 16, 379-400. doi: 10.1023/A:1026313716185

Correia, I., Vala, J., & Aguiar, P. (2001). The effects of belief in a just world and victim's innocence on secondary victimisation, judgements of justice and deservingness. *Social Justice Research*, 14, 327-342. doi: 10.1023/A:1014324125095

Correia, I., Vala, J., & Aguiar, P. (2007). Victim's innocence, social categorisation and the threat to the belief in a just world. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 31-38. doi: doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2005.12.010

Coughlin, A.M. (2008). Interrogation stories. *University of Virginia Legal Working Paper Series. University of Virginia Public Law and Legal Theory Working Paper Series.*

Working Paper 88. Retrieved from

http://law.bepress.com/uvalwps/uva_publiclaw/art88

Cowan, G., & Curtis, S. (1994). Predictors of rape occurrence and victim blame in the William Kennedy Smith case. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24*, 12-20. Doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1994.tb00550.x.

Coxell, A., King, M., Mezey, G., & Gordon, D. (1999). Lifetime prevalence, characteristics, and associated problems of non-consensual sex in men: cross sectional survey. *British Medical Journal, 318*, 846-850. Retrieved from www.bmj.com

Criminal Justice and Public Order Act. (1994). Retrieved from

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1994/33/contents>

Crome, S.A., & McCabe, M.P. (2001). Adult rape scripting within a victimological perspective. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 6*, 395-413. doi: 10.1016/S1359-1789(00)00013-6

Cuklanz, L.M. (2000). *Rape on prime time*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Dalbert, C., Montada, L., & Schmitt, M. (1987). Glaube an eine gerechte Welt als Motiv: Validierungskorrelate zweier Skalen (Belief in a just world as motive: Validity correlates of two scales). *Psychologische Beiträge*, 29, 596-615. Retrieved from <http://www.psychologie-aktuell.com/index.php?id=200>
- Dalbert, C., & Yamauchi, L. A. (1994). Belief in a just world and attitudes toward immigrants and foreign workers: A cultural comparison between Hawaii and Germany. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24, 1612-1626. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1994.tb01565.x
- D'Amico, E. J., Neilands, T. B., & Zambarano, R. (2001). Power analysis for multivariate and repeated measures designs: A flexible approach using the SPSS MANOVA procedure. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, 33, 479–484. Retrieved from <http://brm.psychonomic-journals.org/content/by/year>
- Dancey, C.P., & Reidy, J.G. (2008). *Statistics without maths: Using SPSS for windows* (4th edition). Harlow, U.K.: Prentice Hall.
- Davies, M. (2002). Male sexual assault victims: A selective review of the literature and implications for support services. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 7, 203-214. doi: 10.1016/S1359-1789(00)00043-4

- Davies, M., & McCartney, S. (2003). Effects of gender and sexuality on judgements of victim blame and rape myth acceptance in depicted male rape. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 13, 391-398. doi: 10.1002/casp.741
- Davies, M., Pollard, P., & Archer, J. (2001). The influence of victim gender and sexual orientation on judgements of the victim in a depicted stranger rape. *Violence and Victims*, 16, 607-619. Retrieved from <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/springer/vav>
- Davies, M., Pollard, P., & Archer, J. (2006). Effects of perpetrator gender and victim sexuality on blame towards male victims of sexual assault. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146, 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, 367-377. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2006.01.002
- Davies, M., Rogers, P., & Bates, J. (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, 533-544. doi: 10.1080/00918360802345339

Davies, M., & Rutland, F. (2007). Male rape: The scope of the problem. *Forensic Update*, 89, 29-32. Retrieved from <http://www.bps.org.uk/dfp/psychologists/forensic-update.cfm>

Davies, M., Smith, R., & Rogers, P. (2009). Police perceptions of rape as a function of victim gender and sexual. *Police Journal*, 82, 4-12. Retrieved from <http://www.vathek.com/pj/home.php>

Davies, M., Walker, J., Archers, J., & Pollard, P. (2010). A comparative study of long-term psychological functioning in male survivors of stranger and acquaintance rape. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict, and Peace Research*, 2, 25-33. doi: 10.5042/jacpr.2010.0534.

Dillman, D. A., & Bowker, D. K. (2001). *The Web questionnaire challenge to survey methodologists* Retrieved from <http://survey.sesrc.wsu.edu/dillman/papers.htm>

Doherty, K., & Anderson, I. (2004). Making sense of male rape: Constructions of gender, sexuality and experience of rape victims. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 14, 85-103. doi: 10.1002/casp.765

Donnelly, D., & Kenyon, S. (1996). "Honey, we don't do men": Gender stereotypes and the provision of services to sexually assaulted males. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 11, 441-448. doi: 10.1177/088626096011003009

- Du Mont, J., Miller, K.-L., & Myhr, T.L. (2003). The role of "real rape" and "real victim" stereotypes in the police reporting practices of sexually assaulted women. *Violence Against Women, 9*, 466-486. doi: 10.1177/1077801202250960
- Edward, K.E., & MacLeod, M.D. (1999). The reality and myth of rape: Implications for the criminal justice system. *Expert Evidence, 7*, 37-58. doi: 10.1023/A:1008917714094
- Eigenberg, H.M. (2000). Correctional officers' definitions of rape in male prisons. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 28*, 435-449. doi: 10.1016/S0047-2352(00)00057-X
- Ehrlich, S. (2001). *Representing rape: Language and sexual consent*. London: Routledge.
- Estrich, S. (1987). *Real rape*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Feild, H.S. (1978). Attitudes toward rape: A comparative analysis of police, rapists, crisis counselors, and citizens. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 36*, 156–179. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.36.2.156
- Feist, A., Ashe, J., Lawrence, J., McPhee, D., & Wilson, R. (2007). Investigating and detecting recorded offences of rape. Home Office online report 18/07. Retrieved from <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs07/rdsolr1807.pdf>

Felson, R.B. (2002). Sexual coercion and the law. In R.B. Felson (Ed.), *Violence and gender re-examined*. Washington DC, U.S.: APA.

Field, A.P. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd edition). London: Sage.

Filipas, H.H., & Ullman, S.E. (2001). Social reactions to sexual assault victims from various support sources. *Violence and Victims*, 16, 673-392. Retrieved from <http://www.springerpub.com/product/08866708>

Finch, E., & Munro, V.E. (2005). Juror stereotypes and blame attribution in rape cases involving intoxicants. *British Journal of Criminology*, 45, 25-38. doi: 10.1093/bjc/azh055

Foley, L. A., & Pigott, M. A. (2000). Belief in a just world and jury decision in a civil rape trial. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 935-951. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2000.tb02504.x

Ford, T. M., Liwag-McLamb, M. G., & Foley, L. A. (1998). Perceptions of rape based on sex and sexual orientation of victim. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 13, 253-263.

- Frazier, P.A., & Haney, B. (1996). Sexual assault cases in the legal system: Police, prosecutor, and victim perspectives. *Law and Human Behavior*, 20, 607-628. doi: 10.1007/BF01499234
- Freetly, A. J. H., & Kane, E. W. (1995). Men's and women's perceptions of non-consensual sexual intercourse. *Sex Roles*, 33, 785-803. doi: 10.1007/BF01544779
- Frese, B., Moya, M., & Megias, J. L. (2004). Social perception of rape: How rape myth acceptance modulates the influence of situational factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19, 143-161. doi: 10.1177/0886260503260245
- Fricker, R.D., & Schonlau, M. (2002). Advantages and disadvantages of internet research surveys: Evidence from the literature. *Field Methods*, 14, 347-367.
- Furnham, A. (1985). Just world beliefs in an unjust society: A cross cultural comparison. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 15, 363-366. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420150310
- Furnham, A. (1995). The just world, charitable giving and attitudes towards disability. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 19, 577-583. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(95)00090-S

Furnham, A. (2003). Belief in a just world: Research progress over the past decade.

Personality and Individual Differences, 34, 795-817. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00072-7

Furnham, A., & Procter, E. (1992). Sphere-specific just world beliefs and attitudes to AIDS.

Human Relations, 45, 265-280. doi:10.1177/001872679204500303

Galton, E.R. (1975). Police processing of rape complaints: A case study. *American Journal*

of Criminal Law, 4, 15-30. Retrieved from

<http://www.utexas.edu/law/journals/ajcl/>

Gerber, G.L., Cronin, J.M., & Steigman, H.J. (2004). Attributions of blame in sexual assault

to perpetrators and victims of both genders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*,

34, 2149-2165. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02694.x

Gilmartin-Zena, P. (1988). Gender differences in students' attitudes toward rape.

Sociological Focus, 21, 279-292.

Golge, Z. B., Yavuz, M. F., Mudderrisoglu, S., & Yavuz, M. S. (2003). Turkish university

students' attitudes toward rape. *Sex Roles*, 49, 653-661. doi:

10.1023/B:SERS.0000003135.30077.a4

Gray, J.M. (2006). Rape myth beliefs and prejudiced instructions: Effects on decisions of guilt in a case of date rape. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 11*, 75-80. doi: 10.1348/135532505X68250

Groth, N., & Burgess, A. W. (1980). Male rape: Offenders and victims. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 137*, 806-810.

Grubb, A., & Harrower, J. (2008). Attribution of blame in cases of rape: An analysis of participant gender, type of rape and perceived similarity to the victim. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 13*, 396-405. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2008.06.006

Grubb, A., & Harrower, J. (2009). Understanding attribution of blame in cases of rape: An analysis of blame in cases of rape: An analysis of participant gender, type of rape and perceived similarity to the victim. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 15*, 63-81. doi: 10.1080/135526008026411649

Hafer, C. L. (2000). Do innocent victims threaten the belief in a just world? Evidence from a modified stroop task. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 165-173. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.79.2.165

- Hafer, C.L., & Begue, L. (2005). Experimental research on just-world theory: Problems, developments, and future challenges. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 128-167.
doi:10.1037/0033-2909.131.1.128
- Hafer, C., & Correy, B. (1999). Mediators of the relation between beliefs in a just world and emotional responses to negative outcomes. *Social Justice Research*, 12, 189-204. doi: 10.1023/A:1022144317302
- Harris, J., & Grace, S. (1999). A question of evidence? Investigating and prosecuting rape in the 1990s. *Home Office Research Study 196*. Retrieved from <http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs/hors196.pdf>
- Harrison, L., Howerton, D., Secarea, A., & Nguyen, C. (2008). Effects of ingroup bias and gender role violations on acquaintance rape attributions. *Sex Roles*, 59, 713-725.
doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9472-9
- Hellman, C.M., Mulenburt-Trevino, E.M., & Worley, J.A. (2008). The belief in a just world: An examination of reliability estimates across three measures. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 90, 399-401. doi:10.1080/00223890802108238
- Helwig, A. (1998). Gender-role stereotyping: Testing theory with a longitudinal sample. *Sex Roles*, 38, 403-423. doi: 10.1023/A:1018757821850

Hetherington, E. M., & Parke, R. D. (1993). *Child psychology: A contemporary viewpoint*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Hickson, F.C.I., Davies, P.M., Hunt, A.J., Weatherburn, P., McManus, T.J., & Coxon, A.P.M. (1994). Gay men as victims of non-consensual sex. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 23, 281-293. doi:10.1007/BF01541564

Hill, M.S., & Fischer, A.R. (2001). Does entitlement mediate the link between masculinity and rape-related variables? *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48, 39-50. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.48.1.39

Hillier, L., & Foddy, M. (1993). The role of observer attitudes in judgements of blame in cases of wife assault. *Sex Roles*, 29, 629-645. doi: 10.1007/BF00289209

HMCPSI/HMIC. (2007). *Without Consent: A report on the joint review of the investigation and prosecution of rape offences*. London: Home Office. Retrieved from http://www.hmic.gov.uk/SiteCollectionDocuments/Thematics/THM_20070101_2.pdf

Hodge, S., & Canter, D. (1998). Victims and perpetrators of male sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 13, 222-240. doi: 10.1177/088626098013002004

- Hoffman, R. M., & Borders, L. D. (2001) Twenty-five years after the Bem Sex Role Inventory: A reassessment and new issues regarding classification variability. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 34*, 39-55. Retrieved from <http://mec.sagepub.com/>
- Holt, C.L., & Ellis, J.B. (1998). Assessing the current validity of the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Sex Roles, 39*, 929-941. doi:10.1023/A:1018836923919
- Howard, J.A. (1984a). Societal influences on attribution: Blaming some victims more than others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*, 494-505. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.47.3.494
- Howard, J. (1984b). The "normal" victim: The effects of gender stereotypes on reactions to victim. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 47*, 270-281. doi:10.2307/3033824
- Idisis, Y., Ben-David, S., & Ben-Nachum, E. (2007). Attribution of blame to rape victims among therapists and non-therapists. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 25*, 103-120. doi:10.1002/bsl.721

- Isely, P.J., & Gehrenbeck-Shim, D. (1997). Sexual assault of men in the community. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 25, 159-166. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1520-6629(199703)25:2<159::AID-JCOP5>3.0.CO;2-T
- Jackson, T., Witte, T., & Petretic-Jackson, P. (2001). Intimate partner and acquaintance violence and victim blame: Implications for professionals. *Brief Treatment and Intervention*, 1, 153-168. doi:10.1093/brief-treatment/1.2.153
- Janoff-Bulman, R., & Timko, C. (1985). Cognitive biases in blaming the victim. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 21, 161-177. doi:10.1016/0022-1031(85)90013-7
- Johnson, K. K. P., Hegland, J. E., & Schofield, N. A. (1999). Survivors of rape: Functions and implications of dress in a context of coercive power. In K. K. P. Johnson & S. J. Lennon (Eds.), *Appearance and power* (pp. 11–32). New York: Berg.
- Johnson, B.E., Kuck, D.L., & Schander, P.R. (1997). Rape myth acceptance and sociodemographic characteristics: A multidimensional analysis. *Sex Roles*, 36, 693-707. doi: 10.1023/A:1025671021697
- Joinson, A. (1999). Social desirability, anonymity, and internet based questionnaires. *Behavior, Research Methods, Instruments and Computers*, 31, 433-438. Retrieved from <http://brm.psychonomic-journals.org/content/by/year>

Jones, I.H. (2000). Cultural and historical aspects of male sexual assault. In G.C. Mezey & M.B. King (Eds.), *Male victims of sexual assault* (2nd Ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jones, M.E., Russell, R.L., & Bryant, F.B. (1998). The structure of rape attitudes for men and women: A three-factor model. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 32, 331-350. doi:10.1006/jrpe.1998.2217

Jordan, J. (2008). *Serial survivors: Women's narratives of surviving rape*. Federation Press: Sydney, Australia.

Jordan, J. (2004). Beyond belief? Police, rape and women's credibility. *Criminal Justice*, 4, 29-59. doi:10.1177/1466802504042222

Jordan, J. (2001). Worlds apart? Women, rape and the police reporting process. *British Journal of Criminology*, 41, 679-706. doi:10.1093/bjc/41.4.679

Kanekar, S., & Kolsawalla, M.B. (1981). Factors affecting responsibility attributed to a rape victim. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 113, 285-286.

Kassing, L.R., Beesley, D., & Frey, L.L. (2005). Gender role conflict, homophobia, age, and education as predictors of male rape myth acceptance. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 27*, 311-328. Retrieved from <http://amhca.metapress.com/>

Kassing, L.R., & Prieto, L.R. (2003). The rape myth and blame-based beliefs of counselors-in training towards male victims of rape. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 81*, 455-461. Retrieved from <http://www.counseling.org/publications/journals.aspx>

Kaufman, A., Divasto, P., Jackson, R., Voorhees, D., & Christy, J. (1980). Male rape victims: Noninstitutionalised assault. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 137*, 221-223.

Kaukinen, C. (2002). The help-seeking decisions of violent crime victims: An examination of the direct and conditional effects of gender and the victim-offender relationship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 432-456. doi: 10.1177/0886260502017004006

Kaukinen, C., & DeMaris, A. (2009). Sexual assault and current mental health: The role of help-seeking and police response. *Violence Against Women, 15*, 1331-1357. doi: 10.1177/1077801209346713

Kelly, L., Lovatt, J., & Regan, L. (2005). *A gap or a chasm? Attribution in reported rape: Home Office Research Study, 293*. London: Home Office.

Kimerling, R., Rellini, A., Kelly, V., Judson, P.L., & Learman, L.A. (2002). Gender differences in victim and crime characteristics of sexual assaults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 526-532. doi: 10.1177/0886260502017005003

King, L.A., & King, D.W. (1986). Validity of the sex-role egalitarianism scale: Discriminating egalitarianism from feminism. *Sex Roles, 15*, 207-213. doi: 10.1007/BF00287485

King, L. A., & King, D. W. (1993) *Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale manual*. Sigma Assessment Systems, Inc: Port Huron.

King, L., & King, D. (1997). Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale: Development, psychometric properties, and recommendations for future research. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 71-87. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00101.x.

King, L.A., King, D.W., Gudanowski, D.W., & Taft, C.T. (1997). Latent structure of the sex-role egalitarianism scale: Confirmatory factor analysis. *Sex Roles, 36*, 221-234. doi: 10.1007/BF02766269.

- King, M., & Woollett, E. (1997) Sexually assaulted males: 115 men consulting a counselling service. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 26, 579-588. doi:10.1023/A:1024520225196.
- Kleinke, C. L., & Meyer, C. (1990). Evaluation of rape victim by men and women with high and low belief in a just world. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 14, 343-353. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1990.tb00024.x
- Kolivas, E.D., & Gross, A.M. (2007). Assessing sexual aggression: Addressing the gap between rape victimization and perpetration prevalence rates. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12, 315-328. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2006.10.002
- Koppelaar, L., Lange, A., & van de Velde, J-W. (1997). The influence of positive and negative victim credibility on the assessment of rape victims: An experimental study of the expectancy-confirmation bias. *International Review of Victimology*, 5, 61–85. Retrieved from <http://www.sheffield.ac.uk/law/research/clusters/ccr/irv>
- Kopper, B. (1996). Gender, gender identity, rape myth acceptance, and time of initial resistance on the perception of acquaintance rape blame and avoidability. *Sex Roles*, 34, 81-93. doi:10.1007/BF01544797

Kormos, K.C., & Brooks, C.I. (1994). Acquaintance rape: Attributions of victim blame by college students and prison inmates as a function of relationship status of victim and assailant. *Psychological Reports, 74*, 545-546.

Krahe, B. (1991). Police officers' definitions of rape: A prototype study. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 1*, 223-244.
doi:10.1002/casp.2450010305.

Krahe, B., Schutze, S., Fritsche, I., & Waizenhofer, E. (2000). The prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization among homosexual men. *Journal of Sex Research, 37*, 142-150. Retrieved from
<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t775653667~db=all>

Krahe, B., Temkin, J., & Bieneck, S. (2007). Schema-driven information processing in judgments about rape. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 21*, 601-619.
doi:10.1002/acp.1297

Krahe, B., Temkin, J., Bieneck, S., & Berger, A. (2008). Prospective lawyers' rape stereotypes and schematic decision making about rape cases. *Psychology, Crime and Law, 14*, 461-479. doi: 10.1080/10683160801932380

Lambert, A. J., Burroughs, T., & Nguyen, T. (1999). Perceptions of risk and the buffering hypothesis: The role of just world beliefs and right wing authoritarianism.

Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25, 643-656.

doi:10.1177/0146167299025006001

Lambert, A. J., & Raichle, K. (2000). The role of political ideology in mediating judgements of blame in rape victims and their assailants: A test of the just world, personal responsibility and legitimization hypotheses. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 853-863. doi:10.1177/0146167200269010

doi:10.1177/0146167200269010

Lea, S. J., Lanvers, U., & Shaw, S. (2003). Attrition in rape cases: Developing a profile and identifying relevant factors. *British Journal of Criminology*, 43, 583-599. doi:

10.1093/bjc/43.3.583

Lees, S. (1997). *Carnal knowledge: Rape on trial*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Lerner, M. J. (1980). *The belief in a just world*. New York: Plenum Press.

Lerner, M. J. (1997). What does the belief in a just world protect us from: The dread of death or the fear of undeserved suffering? *Psychological Inquiry*, 8, 29-33.

doi:10.1207/s15327965pli0801_5

Lipkus, I. (1991). The construction and preliminary validation of a global belief in a just world scale and the exploratory analysis of the multidimensional belief in a just world scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 1171-1178.

doi:10.1016/0191-8869(91)90081-L

Littleton, H.L., & Axsom, D. (2003). Rape and seduction script of university students: Implications for rape attributions and unacknowledged rape. *Sex Roles*, 49, 465-475. doi: 10.1023/A:1025824505185

Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1995). Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: A theoretical and empirical re-examination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 704-711. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.704

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

Loo, R. (2002). A psychometric and cross-national examination of a belief in a just world scale. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32, 1396-1406. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb01443.x

Maes, J. (1998). Immanent justice and ultimate justice: Two ways of believing in justice. In L. Montada, & M. Lerner (Eds.), *Responses to victimization and belief in a just world* (pp. 43-53). New York: Plenum.

Maier, S.L. (2008). "I have heard horrible stories..." Rape victim advocates' perceptions of the revictimization of rape victims by the police and medical system. *Violence Against Women*, 14, 786-808. doi: 10.1177/1077801208320245

Martin, C., Ruble, D., & Szkrybalo, J. (2002). Cognitive theories of early gender development. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 903-933. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.128.6.903

Martin, C., Ruble, D., & Szkrybalo, J. (2004). Recognizing the centrality of gender identity and stereotype knowledge in gender development and moving toward theoretical integration: Reply to Bandura and Bussey (2004). *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 702-710. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.130.5.702

Maurer, T.W., & Robinson, D.W. (2008). Effects of attire, alcohol and gender on perceptions of date rape. *Sex Roles*, 58, 423-434. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9343-9

- McCormick, J. S., Maric, A., Seto, M. C., & Barbaree, H. E. (1998). Relationship to victim predicts sentence length in sexual assault cases. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 13, 413-421. doi: 10.1177/088626098013003007
- McHugh, M.C., & Hanson-Frieze, I. (1997). The measurement of gender role attitudes: A review and commentary. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 1-16. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00097.x
- Melanson, P. K. (1999). Belief in male rape myths: A test of two competing theories (Doctoral dissertation, Queen's University, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59, 5620-5644.
- Mezey, G.C., & King, M.B. (2000). *Male victims of sexual assault* (2nd Ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mezey, G., & King, M. (1989). The effects of sexual assault on men: A survey of 22 victims. *Psychological Medicine*, 19, 205-209. doi: 10.1017/S0033291700011168
- Mitchell, D., Hirschman, R., & Hall, G.C.N. (1999). Attributions of victim responsibility, pleasure and trauma in male rape. *Journal of Sexual Research*, 36, 369-373. doi: 10.1080/00224499909552009

Mohiyeddini, C., & Montada, L. (1998). BJW and self-efficacy in coping with observed victimization. In L. Montada, & M. Lerner (Eds.), *Responses to victimization and belief in a just world* (pp. 43-53). New York: Plenum.

Monson, C.M., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Binderup, T. (2000). Does "no" really mean "no" after you say "yes"? Attributions about date and marital rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*, 1156-1174. doi: 10.1177/088626000015011003

Moran, G., & Comfort, J.C. (1982). Scientific juror selection: Sex as a moderator of demographic and personality predictors of impaneled felony juror behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*, 1052-1063. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.43.5.1052

Mosher, D., & Sirkin, M. (1984). Measuring a macho personality constellation. *Journal of Research in Personality, 18*, 150-163. doi:10.1016/0092-6566(84)90026-6

Murnen, S., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If 'boys will be boys,' then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles, 46*, 359-375. doi:10.1023/A:1020488928736

- Murray, J.D., Spadafore, J.A., & McIntosh, W.D. (2005). Belief in a just world and social perception: Evidence for automatic activation. *Journal of Social Psychology, 145*, 35-47. doi: 10.3200/SOCP.145.1.35-48
- Myhill, A., & Allen, J. (2002). *Rape and sexual assault of women: the extent and nature of the problem. Findings from the British Crime Survey*. Home Office Research Study 237. London: Home Office.
- Newcomb, P.A., van den Eynde, J., Hafner, D., & Jolly, L. (2008). Attributions of responsibility for rape: Differences across familiarity of situation, gender, and acceptance of rape myths. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*, 1736-1754. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9343-9
- Norton, R., & Grant, T. (2008). Rape myth in true and false rape allegations. *Psychology, Crime and Law, 14*, 275-285. doi: 10.1080/10683160701770286
- O'Connor, W.E., Morrison, T.G., & Morrison, M.A. (1996). The reliability and factor structure of the global belief in a just world scale. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 136*, 667-668. <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/00224545.asp>

Office for Criminal Justice Reform. (2006). Convicting rapists and protecting victims:

Justice for victims of rape. Retrieved from

http://www.cjonline.gov.uk/downloads/application/pdf/Rape_consultation.pdf

Oh, E., & Neville, H. (2004). Development and validation of the Korean rape myth

acceptance scale. *The Counselling Psychologist*, 32, 301-331. doi:

10.1177/0011000003261351

Ozkan, T., & Lajunen, T. (2005). Masculinity, femininity, and the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Sex*

Roles, 52, 103-110. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-1197-4

Page, A.D. (2007). Behind the blue line: Investigating police officers; attitudes toward

rape. *Journal of Police and Community Psychology*, 22, 22-32. doi: 10.1007/s11896-

007-9002-7

Page, A.D. (2008). Gateway to reform? Policy implications of police officers' attitudes

towards rape. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33, 44-58. doi:

10.1007/s12103-007-9024-9

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual*. Maidenhead, U.K.: McGraw-Hill.

- 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, 27-68. doi: 10.1006/jrpe.1998.2238
- Peterson, Z. D., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (2004). Was it rape? The function of women's rape myth acceptance and definitions of sex in labelling their own experiences. *Sex Roles*, 51, 129-144. doi: 10.1023/B:SERS.0000037758.95376.00
- Pettitt, F.A. (2002). A comparison of world wide web and paper-and-pencil personality questionnaires. *Behaviour Research methods, Instruments and Computers*, 34, 50-54.
- Pino, N.W., & Meier, R.F. (1999). Gender differences in rape reporting. *Sex Roles*, 40, 979-987. doi: 10.1023/A:1018837524712
- Pollard, P. (1992). Judgements about victims and attackers in depicted raped: A review. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 307-326. Retrieved from <http://www.bps.org.uk/publications/journals/journaltitles/bjisp.cfm>
- Quackenbush, R. (1989). A comparison of androgynous, masculine sex-typed, and undifferentiated males on dimensions of attitudes toward rape. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 23, 318-342. doi:10.1016/0092-6566(89)90005-6

Ratner, P.A., Johnson, J.L., Shoveller, J.A., Chan, K., Martindale, S.L., Schilder, A.J., Botnick, M.R., & Hogg, R.S. (2003). Non-consensual sex experienced by men who have sex with men: Prevalence and association with mental health. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 49, 67-74. Doi: 10.1016/S0738-3991(02)00055-1

Rentoul, L., & Applebloom, N. (1997). Understanding the psychological impact of rape and serious sexual assault of men: A literature review. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 4, 267-274. Retrieved from <http://www.wiley.com/bw/journal.asp?ref=1351-0126>

Riedel, R. (1993). Effects of pretrial publicity on male and female jurors and judges in a mock rape trial. *Psychological Reports*, 73, 819-832. Retrieved from <http://www.ammonsscientific.com/AmSci/>

Roach-Higgins, M. E., & Eicher, J. B. (1992). Dress and identity. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 10, 1–8. doi: 10.1177/0887302X9201000401

Rogers, P. (1998). Call for research into male rape. *Mental Health Practice*, 1, 34. doi: <http://mentalhealthpractice.rcnpublishing.co.uk/>

Rowe, G., Poortinga, W., & Pidgeon, N. (2006). A comparison of responses to internet and postal surveys in a public engagement context. *Science Communication*, 27, 352-375.

Rubin, Z., & Peplau, A. (1973). Belief in a just world and reactions to another's lot. *Journal of Social Issues*, 29, 73-93. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1973.tb00104.x

Rubin, Z., & Peplau, A. (1975). Who believes in a just world? *Journal of Social Issues*, 31, 65-89. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1975.tb00997.x

Rumney, P. (2001). Male rape in the courtroom: Issues and concerns. *Criminal Law Review*, 1, 205-213.

Ryckman, R., Kaczor, L., & Thornton, B. (1992). Traditional and nontraditional women's attributions of responsibility to physically resistive and non-resistive rape victims. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22, 1453-1463. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1992.tb00960.x

Rye, B.J., Greatrix, S.A., & Enright, C.S. (2006). The case of the guilty victim: The effects of gender of victim and gender of perpetrator on attributions of blame and responsibility. *Sex Roles*, 54, 639-649. doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9034-y

Sakalli-Ugurlu, N., Yalcun, Z.S., & Glick, P. (2007). Ambivalent sexism, belief in a just world, and empathy as predictors of Turkish students' attitudes towards rape victims. *Sex Roles*, 57, 889-895. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9313-2

Scarce, M. (1997). *Male on male rape*. New York: Plenum Press.

Schmitt, M. (1998). Methodological strategies in research to validate measures of belief in a just world. In L. Montada, & M. Lerner (Eds.), *Responses to victimization and belief in a just world* (pp. 163-173). New York: Plenum.

Schneider, L. J., Ee, J., & Aronson, H. (1994). Effects of victim gender and physical vs. psychological trauma/injury on observers' perceptions of sexual assault and its aftereffects. *Sex Roles*, 30, 793-808. doi: 10.1007/BF01544232

Schuller, R. A., & Stewart, A. (2000). Police responses to sexual assault complaints: The role of perpetrator/complainant intoxication. *Law and Human Behavior*, 24, 535-551. doi: 10.1023/A:1005519028528

Scully, D. (1990). *Understanding sexual violence: A study of convicted rapists*. London: Harper Collins.

Sexual Offences Act. (2003). Retrieved from

http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2003/ukpga_20030042_en_1

Shaver, K.G. (1985). The attribution of blame: Causality, responsibility and blameworthiness. Springer: Verlag.

Shechory, M., & Idisis, Y. (2006). Rape myths and social distance toward sex offenders and victims among therapists and students. *Sex Roles, 54*, 651-658. doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9031-1

Sheldon, J. P., & Parent, S. L. (2002). Clergy's attitudes and attributions of blame towards female rape victims. *Violence Against Women, 8*, 233-256. doi: 10.1177/10778010222183026

Simonson, K., & Subich, L.M. (1999). Rape perception as a function of gender-role traditionality and victim-perpetrator association. *Sex Roles, 40*, 617-634. doi: 10.1023/A:1018844231555

Sims, C.M., Noel, N.E., & Maisto, S.A. (2007). Rape blame as a function of alcohol presence and resistance type. *Addictive Behaviors, 32*, 2766-2775. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2007.04.013

Smiler, A. (2004). Thirty years after the discovery of gender: Psychological concepts and measures of masculinity. *Sex Roles*, 50, 15-26. doi: 10.1023/B:SERS.0000011069.02279.4c

Spence, J. X, Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1974). The personal attributes questionnaire: A measure of sex role stereotypes and masculinity/femininity. *JSAS Catalogue of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 4, 1 - 42.

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1975). A short version of the attitudes towards women scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 2, 219-220.

Struckman-Johnson, C., & Struckman-Johnson, D. (1992). Acceptance of male rape myths among college men and women. *Sex Roles*, 27, 85-100. doi: 10.1007/BF00290011

Szymanski, L., Devlin, A., Chrisler, J., & Vyse, S. (1993). Gender role and attitudes toward rape in male and female college students. *Sex Roles*, 29, 37-57.
doi:10.1007/BF00289995

Tabachnik, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (2005). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th edition). Harlow, U.K. Pearson Education.

Taylor, J. (2002). Introduction: Psychology and the internet. *Social Science Computer Review*, 20, 233-240. Retrieved from <http://ssc.sagepub.com/>

Temkin, J. (2000). Prosecuting and defending rape: Perspectives from the bar. *Journal of Law & Society*, 27, 219-248. Retrieved from <http://www.wiley.com/bw/journal.asp?ref=0263-323x>

Tenenbaum, H., & Leaper, C. (2002). Are parents' gender schemas related to their children's gender-related cognitions? A meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 38, 615-630. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.38.4.615

Tomaka, J., & Blascovich, J. (1994). Effects of justice beliefs on cognitive appraisal of and subjective, physiological and behavioural responses to potential stress. *Journal of Personality and Applied Social Psychology*, 67, 732-740. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.732

Torrey, M. (1991). When will we be believed? Rape myths and the idea of a fair trial in rape prosecutions. *University of California Davis Law Review*, 24, 1013-1071. Retrieved from <http://lawreview.law.ucdavis.edu/>

Tretreault, P. A., & Barnett, M. A. (1987). Reactions to stranger and acquaintance rape.

Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11, 353-358. doi:10.1111/j.1471-

6402.1987.tb00909.x

Truman, D., Tokar, D., & Fischer, A. (1996). Dimensions of masculinity: Relations to date

rape supportive attitudes and sexual aggression in dating situations. *Journal of*

Counseling & Development, 74, 555-562. Retrieved from

<http://www.counseling.org/publications/journals.aspx>

Tuten, T.L., Urban, D.J., & Bosnjak, M. (2002). Internet surveys and data quality: A review.

In B. Batinic, U-D. Reips, & M. Bosnjak. *Online Social Sciences* (pp. 7-26). Hogrefe &

Huber Publishers: Kirkland, WA.

Ullman, S.E. (1996). Social reactions, coping strategies, and self-blame attributions in

adjustment to sexual assault. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20, 505-526. doi:

10.1111/j.1471-6402.1996.tb00319.x

Ullman, S.E. (2007). A 10 year update of "review and critique of empirical studies of rape

avoidance". *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34, 411-429. doi:

10.1177/0093854806297117

Vearnals, S., Campbell, T. (2001). Male victims of sexual assault: A review of psychological consequences and treatment. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy, 16*, 279-286. doi: 10.1080/14681990123228

Viki, G.T., & Abrams, D. (2002). But she was unfaithful: Benevolent sexism and reactions to rape victims who violate traditional gender role expectations. *Sex Roles, 47*, 289-293. doi: 10.1023/A:1021342912248

Viki, G. T., Abrams, D., & Masser, B. (2004). Evaluating stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent sexism in perpetrator blame and recommended sentence length. *Law and Human Behavior, 28*, 295-303. Doi: 10.1023/B:LAHU.0000029140.72880.69

Wakelin, A., & Long, K.M. (2003). Effects of victim gender and sexuality on attributions of blame to rape victims. *Sex Roles, 49*, 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*, 69-80. doi: 10.1007/s10508-005-1001-0

Ward, C. (1988). The Attitudes towards Rape Victims Scale: Construction, validation and cross-cultural applicability. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12*, 127-146. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1988.tb00932.x

Wenger, A., & Bornstein, B. (2006). The effects of victim's substance use and relationship closeness on mock jurors' judgments in an acquaintance rape case. *Sex Roles, 54*, 547-555. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9014-2

Whatley, M.A., & Riggio, R.E. (1993). Gender differences in attributions of blame for male rape victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 8*, 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*, 1116-1136. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00474.x

Whitehead, A. (2005). Man to man violence: How masculinity may work as a dynamic risk factor. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 44*, 411-422. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2311.2005.00385.x

Wiener, R.L., & Vodanovich, S.J. (2001). The evaluation of culpability for rape: A model of legal decision making. *The Journal of Psychology, 120*, 489-500. Retrieved from <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/608965862-9150526/title~content=t914957657>

Williams, G. (2003). Blame and responsibility. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 6, 427-445. Retrieved from

<http://www.springer.com/social+sciences/applied+ethics/journal/10677>

Willis, C.E. (1992). The effect of sex role stereotype, victim and defendant race, and prior relationship on rape culpability attributions. *Sex Roles*, 26, 213-226. doi: 10.1007/BF00289708

Winkel, F.W., & Vrij, A. (1993). Rape reporting to the police: Exploring the social psychological impact of a persuasive campaign on cognitions, attitudes, normative expectations and reporting intentions. *International Review of Victimology*, 2, 277-294.

Wolfrat, U., & Dalbert, C. (2003). Personality, values and belief in a just world. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 1911-1918. Doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00040-0

Yamawaki, N. (2007). Rape perception and the function of ambivalent sexism and gender-role traditionality. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22, 406-423. doi: 10.1177/0886260506297210

Yamawaki, N., & Tschanz, B.T. (2005). Rape perception differences between Japanese and American college students: On the mediating influence of gender role traditionality. *Sex Roles*, 52, 379-392. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-2680-7

17 Appendices

17.1 Appendix A: Vignettes

Table A1

Vignettes used for Female Rape Victim Blaming Studies

Stranger Rape	Low level of rape myths	High level of rape myths
	<p>Sarah is a university student. Late that night she was walking home alone from the library, half a mile from where she lived. She was wearing a coat, long skirt and flat shoes. Her path went through a small park. A man called out to Sarah. Sarah continued walking. Then the man grabbed hold of her. He began to undress Sarah. Sarah asked the man to let her go. The man began to push her down to the ground. Sarah tried to push the man away. The man then physically forced her into sexual intercourse.</p>	<p>Sarah is a university student. She had been drinking alcohol with her friends in a bar. Late that night she was walking home alone, half a mile from where she lived. She was wearing a short skirt, high heels and a low cut top. Her path home went through a small park. A man called out to Sarah. Sarah continued walking. The man grabbed hold of her. He began to undress Sarah. Sarah asked the man to let her go. The man began to push her down to the ground. Sarah tried to push the man away. The man then physically forced her into sexual intercourse.</p>
Acquaintance Rape	Low level of rape myths	High level of rape myths
	<p>Mark and Sarah are both university students who met at a party at a mutual friend's house, half a mile from where Sarah lived. They got on well that evening. Sarah was wearing a coat, long skirt and flat shoes. Late that night, Mark and Sarah walked back to Sarah's room. Their path went through a small park. When they got to the room, they hugged and Mark kissed Sarah on the mouth. Mark began to undress her. Sarah asked Mark to stop. Mark</p>	<p>Mark and Sarah are both university students who met at a party at a mutual friend's house, half a mile from where Sarah lived. They got on well that evening. They both drank alcohol, laughed at each other's jokes, and flirted. Sarah was wearing a short skirt, high heels and a low cut top. Late that night, Sarah invited Mark back to her room. Their path went through a small park. When they got to her room, they hugged and Sarah kissed Mark</p>

began to push her back onto the bed. Sarah tried to push him away. Mark then physically forced her into sexual intercourse.	on the mouth. Mark began to undress her. Sarah asked Mark to stop. Mark began to push her back onto the bed. Sarah tried to push him away. Mark then physically forced her into sexual intercourse.
---	---

Table A2

Vignettes used for Male Rape Victim Blaming Studies

Stranger Rape	Low level of rape myths	High level of rape myths
	Michael is a university student. Michael is of average build. Late that night he was walking home alone from the library, half a mile from where he lived. His path went through a small park. A man called out to Michael. Michael continued walking. Then the man grabbed hold of him. He began to undress Michael. Michael asked the man to let him go. The man began to push him down to the ground. Michael tried to push the man away. The man then physically forced him into sexual intercourse.	Michael is a university student. Michael is of slight build. He had been drinking alcohol with his friends in a bar. Late that night he was walking home alone, half a mile from where he lived. His path home went through a small park. A man called out to Michael. Michael continued walking. The man grabbed hold of him. He began to undress Michael. Michael asked the man to let him go. The man began to push him down to the ground. Michael tried to push the man away. The man then physically forced him into sexual intercourse.

**Acquaintance
Rape**

Simon and Michael are both university students who met at a party at a mutual friend's house, half a mile from where Michael lived. Michael is of average build. They got on well that evening. Late that night, Simon and Michael walked back to Michael's room. Their path went through a small park. When they got to the room, they hugged and Simon kissed Michael on the mouth. Simon began to undress Michael. Michael asked Simon to stop. Simon began to push Michael back onto the bed. Michael tried to push him away. Simon then physically forced him into sexual intercourse.

Simon and Michael are both university students who met at a party at a mutual friend's house, half a mile from where Michael lived. Michael is of slight build. They got on well that evening. They both drank alcohol, laughed at each other's jokes, and flirted. Late that night, Michael invited Simon back to his room. Their path went through a small park. When they got to his room, they hugged and Michael kissed Simon on the mouth. Simon began to undress Michael. Michael asked Simon to stop. Simon began to push him back onto the bed. Michael tried to push him away. Simon then physically forced him into sexual intercourse.

17.2 Appendix B: Ethical Approval

17.2.1 Ethical approval for studies one and two.

From: Moran, Dr P.M.
To: ers6@leicester.ac.uk
Subject: FW: PC_ethics
Date: 24 January 2005 16:39:44

Dear Emma,

your project outlined below has been approved by the School of Psychology, University of Leicester,

Please keep a copy of this e-mail as proof of acceptance and for your records,

we wish you every success with your study,

Yours Sincerely,
P.Moran (Chair Ethics Committee)

-----Original Message-----

From: Web Server Account [mailto:websrvr@www.le.ac.uk]

Sent: 21 January 2005 10:02

To: pmm8@leicester.ac.uk

Subject: PC_ethics

Proposer: Emma Sleath

Email: ers6@le.ac.uk

Status: Demonstrator/PhD Student (1st year)

Supervisor: 1st Supervisor Prof. Ray Bull, 2nd Supervisor Dr. Lorraine Sheridan

Title: Victim blame: The effects of rape myth acceptance, belief in a just world and adherence to gender roles

Summary: This research will concern young adults (student-based sample from Law and Psychology department). The sample for experiment one will be Psychology student based because the research findings in this area are not particularly clear. Study two will examine Law Student attitudes. Many studies have not focussed on both male and female victims as well as different types of rape (stranger vs acquaintance). and are also not U.K. based. I am also going to explore the effect of descriptions within vignettes with variation in the amount of rape myths included in the description. I am interested at examining several factors, which may affect the way in which people attribute blame to rape victims. I will be exploring rape myth acceptance, Belief in a Just World and adherence to gender roles as well as examining the effects of gender of participants, gender of victim and type of rape (stranger/acquaintance). This will be presented via a vignette study with the following questionnaires: Belief in a Just World (Dalbert, 1987), Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Payne, Kimberly, Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1999) and Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974). Participants will be probably be recruited via EPR. Participants will be given an informed consent form prior to their filling out of the questionnaire and also informed of their right to withdraw at any time during the study and afterwards. They will also be given information regarding where to seek help should they need it after filling in the questionnaire (see below) within the debriefing statement once they have completed the questionnaire.

Women

Leicester Rape Crisis: If you need to talk to someone about how you are feeling, call this helpline:
Telephone: (0116) 2624344

Minicom: (0116) 2623976

Opening Times:

Tuesday - Friday 10-4pm

Wednesday evening -6.30-9.30pm

At other times an answer machine is available and someone will get back to you as soon as possible.

Telephone Counselling Helpline: (0116) 255 8852

The helpline is staffed by trained volunteers during the daytime and during an evening. Helpline counsellors are specially trained to listen carefully and to give support and information about our and other services in your area.

Men

For over ten years, Survivors UK has been offering help and support to adult male victims of sexual abuse and rape. Please note face to face counselling and support groups only run in London though please ring the helpline and they will try to put you in contact with someone in your local area.

www.survivorsuk.org.uk

Helpline: 0845 1221201

Email: info@survivors.org.uk

The helpline is open:

Tuesday & Thursday 7.00pm to 10.00pm

For both men and women

Juniper Lodge Helpline (0116) 273 3330

Lodge 1

Leicestershire General Hospital,

Gwedden Road

Leicester

LE5 4PW

Telephone support, face-to-face counselling, information from specially trained police officers or a medical examination is offered to all clients. The Lodge is a dedicated centre that is fully furnished and decorated in a comfortable and non-threatening manner. It is located within the Leicester General Hospital Grounds in a convenient but discreet location. The Lodge is easily accessible by public transport and by car.

Prior Approval: No

Animals: ok

under 16: ok

Special Needs: ok

Mental Disorders: ok

Disadvantaged: ok

Detained: ok

Deception: ok

Debrief: ok

Right to withdraw: ok

Confidential: ok

Invasive: ok

Other matters: ok

read principles: ok

17.2.2 Ethical approval for study three.

From: Moran, Dr P.M.

To: ers6@leicester.ac.uk

Subject: FW: PC_ethics

Date: 21 February 2005 15:02:15

Dear Emma,

your project outlined below has been approved by the School of Psychology, University of Leicester,

Please keep a copy of this e-mail as proof of acceptance and for your records,

we wish you every success with your study,

Yours Sincerely,
P.Moran (Chair Ethics Committee)

-----Original Message-----

From: Web Server Account [mailto:websrvr@www.le.ac.uk]

Sent: 17 February 2005 09:53

To: pmm8@leicester.ac.uk

Subject: PC_ethics

Proposer: Emma Sleath

Email: ers6@le.ac.uk

Status: Demonstrator/PhD Student (1st year)

Supervisor: 1st Supervisor Prof. Ray Bull, 2nd Supervisor Dr. Lorraine Sheridan

Title: Examining victim blaming in a police sample: The effects of rape myth acceptance, belief in a just world and adherence to gender roles

Summary: This research will involve a sample of police officers using the design which has previously received ethical approval (24/01/05). The design will look at attitudes towards female victims of rape whilst manipulating different types of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance) and the effect of descriptions within vignettes with variation in the amount of rape myths included in the description. I am interested at examining several factors, which may affect the way in which people attribute blame to rape victims. I will be exploring rape myth acceptance, Belief in a Just World and adherence to gender roles as well as examining the effects of gender of participants, type of rape (stranger/acquaintance) and whether they have received specialist rape training or not. The study will be presented via a vignette study with the following questionnaires: Belief in a Just World (Dalbert et al., 1987), Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Payne, Kimberly, Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1999) and Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1981). Participants will be recruited via a gatekeeper within the police force. Participants will be given an informed consent form prior to their filling out of the questionnaire and also informed of their right to withdraw at any time during the study and afterwards. They will also be given information regarding where to seek help should they need it after filling in the questionnaire (see below) within the debriefing statement once they have completed the questionnaire.

Women

Leicester Rape Crisis: If you need to talk to someone about how you are feeling, call this helpline:

Telephone: (0116) 2624344

Minicom: (0116) 2623976

Opening Times:

Tuesday - Friday 10-4pm

Wednesday evening -6.30-9.30pm

At other times an answer machine is available and someone will get back to you as soon as possible.

Telephone Counselling Helpline: (0116) 255 8852

The helpline is staffed by trained volunteers during the daytime and during an evening. Helpline

counsellors are specially trained to listen carefully and to give support and information about our and other services in your area.

Men

For over ten years, Survivors UK has been offering help and support to adult male victims of sexual abuse and rape. Please note face to face counselling and support groups only run in London though please ring the helpline and they will try to put you in contact with someone in your local area.

www.survivorsuk.org.uk

Helpline: 0845 1221201

Email: info@survivors.org.uk

The helpline is open:

Tuesday & Thursday 7.00pm to 10.00pm

For both men and women

Juniper Lodge Helpline (0116) 273 3330

Lodge 1

Leicestershire General Hospital,

Gwedden Road

Leicester

LE5 4PW

Telephone support, face-to-face counselling, information from specially trained police officers or a medical examination is offered to all clients. The Lodge is a dedicated centre that is fully furnished and decorated in a comfortable and non-threatening manner. It is located within the Leicester General Hospital Grounds in a convenient but discreet location. The Lodge is easily accessible by public transport and by car.

Prior Approval: No

Animals: ok

under 16: ok

Special Needs: ok

Mental Disorders: ok

Disadvantaged: ok

Detained: ok

Deception: ok

Debrief: ok

Right to withdraw: ok

Confidential: ok

Invasive: ok

Other matters: ok

read principles: ok

17.2.3 Ethical approval for study four.

From: Colman, Prof A.M.

To: ers6@leicester.ac.uk

Subject: RE: PC_ethics

Date: 28 November 2006 16:51:10

Dear Emma

Your project (Perception of male victim of forced sexual intercourse) has been approved by the School of Psychology Ethics Committee.

Please keep a copy of this e-mail as proof of acceptance and for your records.

We wish you every success with your study.

Andrew M. Colman
Ethics Committee Chair

-----Original Message-----

From: Web Server Account [mailto:websrvr@www.le.ac.uk]

Sent: 28 November 2006 08:39

To: amc@leicester.ac.uk

Subject: PC_ethics

Proposer: Emma Sleath

Email: ers6@le.ac.uk

Status: Staff/PhD student

Supervisor: Professor Ray Bull

Title: Perception of male victim of forced sexual intercourse

Summary: This research is examining the impact of male rape myths upon male rape victim blame. The sample will be student based recruited via EPR and the questionnaire will be web based. Participants will be presented with 1 of 4 possible scenarios manipulated by type of rape and also the level of rape myths present within the scenario. Following the scenario, participants will fill in a victim blame questionnaire as well as a measure of belief in a just world, a measure of acceptance of male rape myths and finally a measure of their gender role (Sex Role Egalitarianism scale). Participants are warned of the content of the study prior to signing up and also are directed to an initial webpage which also warns them of the content as well as asking them to tick a box to indicate their consent in completing the study. They are clearly informed of the contact details of the researcher should they wish to seek further help following completing the study, withdraw from the study or if they would like to ask any questions about the research.

Prior Approval: No

Animals: ok

under 16: ok

Special Needs: ok

Mental Disorders: ok

Disadvantaged: ok

Detained: ok

Deception: ok

Debrief: ok

Right to withdraw: ok

Confidential: ok

Invasive: ok

Other matters: ok

read principles: ok

17.2.4 Ethical approval for study five.

From: De Lillo, Dr C.

To: "ers6@le.ac.uk"

Cc: Kocik, J.

Subject: FW: PC_ethics2008 - Emma Sleath

Date: 20 March 2009 16:41:25

Dear Emma Sleath,

Your project "Male rape myth scale" has been approved by the Psychology Research Ethics Committee.

This e-mail is the official document of ethical approval and should be printed out and kept for your records or attached to the research report if required - this includes all undergraduate and postgraduate research. This approval is valid for three years. For research projects lasting more than one year a yearly statement must be sent to the Chair of the Psychology Research Ethics Committee confirming that the research project has not been changed.

We wish you every success with your study.

Carlo De Lillo

Psychology Research Ethics Committee Chair

-----Original Message-----

From: www-data [mailto:webserver-admin@leicester.ac.uk]

Sent: 13 March 2009 08:40

To: cdl2@leicester.ac.uk

Subject: PC_ethics2008 - Emma Sleath

Proposer: Emma Sleath

email: ers6@le.ac.uk

status: Phd Student

statusother:

supervisor: Ray Bull

title: Male rape myth scale

date: 13/03/09

nsubs: 200

startdate: asap

duration: 3

projectaim: To develop a new male rape myth acceptance scale.

recruitmethod: Online questionnaire

recruitcriteria: Over 18 only

preapproval: none

informedconsent: yes

modifiedconsentform: The title of this research is male rape myths and is being carried out by Emma Sleath at the University of Leicester. The reason for carrying out this survey is to develop a measure

of attitudes towards male victims of rape. I am collecting data from students and members of the general public to enable me to compare these attitudes.

Completing this survey will involve completing two questionnaires. One which measures attitudes towards female victims of rape and one which measures attitudes towards male victims of rape.

This should take you a maximum of 25 minutes.

CONSENT STATEMENT

1. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw from the research at any time, without giving any reason.

2. I am aware of what my participation will involve.

3. I understand that I will read statements which will ask me to assess my attitude towards a victim of rape

4. All questions that I have about the research have been satisfactorily answered.

describe: Y

tellvoluntary: Y

obtainwrittenconsent: Y

observe: na

maywithdraw: Y

allowomit: N

tellconfidential: Y

debrief: Y

mislead: N
distress: N
animals:
kids: N
sen: N
patients: N
custody: N
criminals: N
teachersownstudents: N
gatekeeperrequired: N
covertobservation: N
sensitivediscussion: Y
drugsorprocedures: N
samplesobtained: N
painlikely: N
psychologicalstress: N
prolongedtesting: N
financialinducements: N
recruitvianhs: N

route: B

routeAdesc:

routeBdesc: This study involves the development of a new scale, measuring acceptance of male rape myths. Rape myths are stereotypes about rape victims, the perpetrators of rape and also about where rape occurs. Typical myths revolve around ideas that victims somehow contribute to their own victimisation or that perpetrators are not responsible for their actions. An example of an item on the male rape myth scale is 'All men who are raped are weak'. Also presented within the study is the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance scale (Payne, Kimberly, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999) which measures the acceptance of female rape myths. This will be used as a comparison to the male rape myth scale. The study will involve an online questionnaire with recruitment targeted at adults from the general public. Participants will be warned before starting the study that they will read statements that ask them to indicate a degree of agreement/disagreement towards an attitude regarding a rape victim. Participants are informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any point, prior to, during or after completing the questionnaire. The final page of the questionnaire gives participants information as to where they can seek help if they have ever been a victim of sexual crime. Participants can also request feedback from the researcher.

Women

Leicester Rape Crisis: If you need to talk to someone about how you are feeling, call this helpline:

Telephone: (0116) 2624344

Minicom: (0116) 2623976

Opening Times:

Tuesday - Friday 10-4pm

Wednesday evening -6.30-9.30pm

At other times an answer machine is available and someone will get back to you as soon as possible.

Telephone Counselling Helpline: (0116) 255 8852 The helpline is staffed by trained volunteers during the daytime and during an evening. Helpline counsellors are specially trained to listen carefully and to give support and information about our and other services in your area.

Men

For over ten years, Survivors UK has been offering help and support to adult male victims of sexual abuse and rape. Please note face to face counselling and support groups only run in London

though please ring the helpline and they will try to put you in contact with someone in your local area.

www.survivorsuk.org.uk

Helpline: 0845 1221201

Email: info@survivors.org.uk

The helpline is open:

Tuesday & Thursday 7.00pm to 10.00pm

For both men and women

Juniper Lodge Helpline (0116) 273 3330

Lodge 1

Leicestershire General Hospital,

Gwedden Road

Leicester

LE5 4PW

RouteBsupp: * Recruiting previous victims of sexual violence

Participants are strongly recommended at the beginning of the study to not take part if they have been a previous victim of sexual crime. Participants are further warned on the second page, what the content of the study will involve them to do.

Start date : As soon as possible

Duration : 3 months

supervisoragreed:

supervisorcomments:

studentsignature:

supervisorsignature:

17.3 Appendix C: Descriptive Statistics of Transformed Victim Blaming Scale for Study One

Table C1 represents the descriptive statistics for the transformed victim blaming scale items.

Table C1

Descriptive Statistics of Transformed Victim Blaming Scale Data

		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Skew</i>	<i>Kurtosis</i>
1.	How much do you blame Sarah for what happened?	1.26	0.40	1.36	0.74
2.*	How much do you blame the man described in the paragraph for what happened?	1.13	0.29	2.93	10.35
3.	How much control do you think Sarah had over the situation?	1.45	0.39	0.62	-.31
4.*	How much control do you think the man described in the paragraph had over the situation?	1.29	0.36	1.46	2.17
5.	Do you think that this incident could have been avoided?	1.61	0.48	1.81	-1.03
6.	How much sympathy do you feel for Sarah?	1.18	0.32	1.23	2.70
7.	Who is responsible for what happened?	1.23	0.32	1.20	0.54
8.	Whose fault do you think it is, that thinks turned out the way that they did?	1.32	0.41	0.17	0.94

*Reverse coded

17.4 **Appendix D: Principle Component Analysis using Transformed and Untransformed Data from the Victim Blaming Scale for Study One**

This data is a comparison of two principle component analyses comparing the findings from the transformed and untransformed victim blaming scale items.

17.4.1 **Untransformed data.**

A principle component analysis was carried out on the untransformed seven victim blaming scale items using a varimax rotation. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure demonstrated that the sampling adequacy was at a level designated good, KMO = .76 (Field, 2009). Also, all KMO values for the individual items were above the acceptable level of .5 (Field, 2009). The Bartlett’s test of sphericity demonstrated that the correlations between items were large enough for principle component analysis to be a suitable method to use (χ^2 (21) = 257.62 , $p < .001$. The analysis supported a two factor solution explaining 58.38% of the variance (via Kaiser’s criterion and a visual inspection of the scree plot). Please see Table D1 for factor loadings.

Table D1

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Untransformed Victim Blaming Scale

	Victim blaming
--	-------------------

Eigenvalue = 2.95

1. How much do you blame Sarah for what happened?	.78	-.24
3. How much control do you think Sarah had over the situation?	.55	-.03
6. How much sympathy do you feel for Sarah?	.77	.18
7. Who is responsible for what happened?	.75	.14
8. Whose fault do you think it is, that things turned out the way that they did?	.73	.02

Eigenvalue = 1.14

4. How much control do you think the man described in the paragraph had over the situation?	.35	.80
5. Do you think that this incident could have been avoided?	.47	-.62

Note. Factor loadings greater than .40 are in bold.

17.4.2 Transformed data.

A principle component analysis was carried out on the transformed seven victim blaming scale items using a varimax rotation. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure demonstrated that the sampling adequacy was at a level designated good, KMO = .78 (Field, 2009). Also, all KMO values for the individual items were above the acceptable level of .5 (Field, 2009). The Bartlett's test of sphericity demonstrated that the correlations between items were large enough for principle component analysis to be a suitable method to use ($\chi^2 (21) = 288.79$, $p < .001$). The analysis supported a two factor solution explaining 60.14% of the variance (via Kaiser's criterion and a visual inspection of the scree plot). Please see Table D2 for factor loadings.

Table D2

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Transformed

Victim Blaming Scale

	Victim blaming	
Eigenvalue = 3.47		
1. How much do you blame Sarah for what happened?	.77	-.34
3. How much control do you think Sarah had over the situation?	.55	.08
6. How much sympathy do you feel for Sarah?	.79	.10
7. Who is responsible for what happened?	.77	.01
8. Whose fault do you think it is, that things turned out the way that they did?	.77	-.09
Eigenvalue = 1.34		
4. How much control do you think the man described in the paragraph had over the situation?	.42	.77
5. Do you think that this incident could have been avoided?	-.42	.66
Eigenvalues	3.47	1.34
% of variance	43.40	16.74

Note. Factor loadings greater than .40 are in bold.

17.5 Appendix E: Principle Component Analysis for Victim Blaming Scale using Direct Oblimin Rotation

A principle component analysis was carried out on the six victim blaming scale items using a direct oblimin rotation. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure demonstrated that the sampling adequacy was at a level designated good, KMO = .75 (Field, 2009). Also, all KMO values for the individual items were above the acceptable level of .5 (Field, 2009). The Bartlett's test of sphericity demonstrated that the correlations between items were large enough for principle component analysis to be a suitable method to use ($\chi^2(15) = 231.41$, $p < .001$). The analysis supported a one factor solution explaining 46.61% of the variance (via Kaiser's criterion, parallel analysis and a visual inspection of the scree plot). As this was a one factor solution, no rotation of the data was completed (see Table E1 for factor loadings).

Table E1

Component Matrix of Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Direct Oblimin Rotation of Victim Blaming Scale

	Victim blaming
Eigenvalue = 2.80	
1. How much do you blame Sarah for what happened?	.77
3. How much control do you think Sarah had over the situation?	.55

4.	How much control do you think the man described in the paragraph had over the situation?	.41
6.	How much sympathy do you feel for Sarah?	.79
7.	Who is responsible for what happened?	.76
8.	Whose fault do you think it is, that thinks turned out the way that they did?	.73

Note. Factor loadings greater than .40 are in bold.

17.6 Appendix F: Descriptive Statistics of Transformed Victim Blaming and Perpetrator Blaming scale for Study Three

Table F1 summarised the descriptive data for the transformed victim blaming scale data.

Table F1

Descriptive Statistics of Transformed Victim Blame Scale Data

		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skew	Kurtosis
1.	How much do you blame Sarah for what happened?	1.13	0.27	1.98	2.82
2.	If identified, to what extent would you consider the man described in the paragraph's claim of innocence of rape to be credible?	1.29	0.53	1.59	1.03
3.	In your opinion, did Sarah communicate that she did not agree to sexual intercourse?	1.22	0.39	2.11	4.15
4.	Overall to what extent was the man described in the paragraph responsible for what happened?	1.11	0.30	3.58	14.23
5.	How much do you consider the incident to be Sarah's fault?	1.18	0.36	2.38	5.50
6.	How much do you blame the man described in the paragraph for what happened?	1.07	0.17	2.72	7.91
7.	To what extent do you consider Sarah's claim of rape to be credible?	1.16	0.32	2.68	8.12
8.	How much do you consider the incident to be the man described in the paragraph's fault?	1.11	0.26	2.90	10.29
9.	Overall to what extent was Sarah responsible for what happened?	1.23	0.40	1.98	3.58
10.	In your opinion, was Sarah sexually provocative?	1.38	0.54	1.00	-0.50

	To what extent do you believe that the man				
11.	described in the paragraph believed that Sarah was willing for sexual intercourse to occur?	1.45	0.57	0.70	-1.15
	Given Sarah's behaviour, was it reasonable for the				
12.	man described in the paragraph to assume that she was interested in sexual intercourse?	1.32	0.53	1.36	0.29
	To what extent, do you consider the man described				
13.	in the paragraph is guilty?	1.13	0.26	2.10	3.75
	How likely do you feel that the man described in the				
14.	paragraph would be found guilty in a court of law?	1.79	0.47	-0.13	-0.73

17.7 Appendix G: Principle Component Analysis using Transformed and Untransformed Data from the Victim Blaming and Perpetrator Blaming Scale for Study Three

The two principle component analyses report a comparison between the transformed and untransformed data on the victim blaming and perpetrator blaming scale items.

17.7.1 Untransformed data.

A principle component analysis was carried out on the untransformed 13 victim blaming and perpetrator blaming scale items using a varimax rotation. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure demonstrated that the sampling adequacy was at a level designated good, KMO = .72 (Field, 2009). Also, all KMO values for the individual items were above the acceptable level of .5 (Field, 2009). The Bartlett's test of sphericity demonstrated that the correlations between items were large enough for principle component analysis to be a suitable method to use ($\chi^2 (78) = 426.44$, $p < .001$). Kaiser's criterion recommended a four factor solution however parallel analysis and an inspection of the scree plot suggests a two factor solution. Therefore, the analysis was rerun specifying the extraction of two factors. See Table G1 for the factor loadings.

Table G1

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Untransformed Victim Blaming and Perpetrator Blaming Scale

		Victim blaming	Perpetrator blaming
Eigenvalue = 3.68			
1.	How much do you blame Sarah for what happened?	.67	.03
3.	In your opinion, did Sarah communicate that she did not agree to sexual intercourse?	.42	-.05
5.	How much do you consider the incident to be Sarah's fault?	.75	.08
9.	Overall to what extent was Sarah responsible for what happened?	.74	-.16
10.	In your opinion, was Sarah sexually provocative?	.61	.06
11.	To what extent do you believe that the man described in the paragraph believed that Sarah was willing for sexual intercourse to occur?	-.64	.35
Eigenvalue = 1.78			
6.	How much do you blame the man described in the paragraph for what happened?	-.19	.79
7.	To what extent do you consider Sarah's claim of rape to be credible?	.12	-.50
8.	How much do you consider the incident to be the man described in the paragraph's fault?	-.07	.52
13.	To what extent, do you consider the man described in the paragraph is guilty?	-.04	.85
2.	If identified, to what extent would you consider the man described in the paragraph's claim of innocence of rape to be credible?	-.34	.19
12.	Given Sarah's behaviour, was it reasonable for the man described in the paragraph to assume that she was interested in sexual intercourse?	-.68	.39
14.	How likely do you feel that the man described in the paragraph would be found guilty in a court of law?	.03	.32

Note. Factor loadings greater than .40 are in bold.

Transformed data

A principle component analysis was carried out on the transformed 13 victim blaming and perpetrator blaming scale items using a varimax rotation. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure demonstrated that the sampling adequacy was at a level designated good, KMO = .75 (Field, 2009). Also, all KMO values for the individual items were above the

acceptable level of .5 (Field, 2009). The Bartlett's test of sphericity demonstrated that the correlations between items were large enough for principle component analysis to be a suitable method to use ($\chi^2 (78) = 465.46$, $p < .001$). Kaiser's criterion supported a four factor solution. However, parallel analysis and a visual inspection of the scree plot suggests a two factor solution. Therefore, the analysis was rerun specifying the extraction of two factors which explained 44.20%. Please see Table G2 for factor loadings.

Table G2

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation of Transformed Victim Blaming and Perpetrator Blaming Scale

		Victim blaming	Perpetrator blaming
Eigenvalue = 3.95			
1.	How much do you blame Sarah for what happened?	.71	-.02
3.	In your opinion, did Sarah communicate that she did not agree to sexual intercourse?	.44	.12
5.	How much do you consider the incident to be Sarah's fault?	.77	-.06
9.	Overall to what extent was Sarah responsible for what happened?	.75	.20
10.	In your opinion, was Sarah sexually provocative?	.64	-.01
11.	To what extent do you believe that the man described in the paragraph believed that Sarah was willing for sexual intercourse to occur?	.59	.37
Eigenvalue = 1.79			
6.	How much do you blame the man described in the paragraph for what happened?	.17	.78
7.	To what extent do you consider Sarah's claim of rape to be credible?	.16	.59
8.	How much do you consider the incident to be the man described in the paragraph's fault?	.11	.58
13.	To what extent, do you consider the man described in the paragraph is guilty?	.03	.84

2.	If identified, to what extent would you consider the man described in the paragraph's claim of innocence of rape to be credible?	.30	.27
12.	Given Sarah's behaviour, was it reasonable for the man described in the paragraph to assume that she was interested in sexual intercourse?	.65	.42
14.	How likely do you feel that the man described in the paragraph would be found guilty in a court of law?	-.01	.31

Note. Factor loadings greater than .40 are in bold.

17.8 Appendix H: Principle Component Analysis for Victim Blaming Scale using Direct Oblimin Rotation

A principle component analysis was carried out on the ten victim and perpetrator blaming scale items using a direct oblimin rotation. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure demonstrated that the sampling adequacy was at a level designated good, KMO = .69 (Field, 2009). Also, all KMO values for the individual items were above the acceptable level of .5 (Field, 2009). The Bartlett's test of sphericity demonstrated that the correlations between items were large enough for principle component analysis to be a suitable method to use ($\chi^2 (45) = 284.95$, $p < .001$). Kaiser's criterion extracted four factors, however the parallel analysis recommended a two factor solution explaining 47.50% of the variance. This two factor solution was retained and the analysis rerun.

Table H1

Pattern Matrix of Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Direct Oblimin

Rotation of Victim Blaming and Perpetrator Blaming Scale

		Victim blaming	Perpetrator blaming
Eigenvalue = 3.01			
1.	How much do you blame Sarah for what happened?	.73	.04
3.	In your opinion, did Sarah communicate that she did not agree to sexual intercourse?	.43	-.05
5.	How much do you consider the incident to be Sarah's fault?	.79	.10

9.	Overall to what extent was Sarah responsible for what happened?	.71	-.11
10.	In your opinion, was Sarah sexually provocative?	.64	.12
11.	To what extent do you believe that the man described in the paragraph believed that Sarah was willing for sexual intercourse to occur?	.54	-.31
Eigenvalue = 1.74			
6.	How much do you blame the man described in the paragraph for what happened?	-.05	.82
7.	To what extent do you consider Sarah's claim of rape to be credible?	-.06	.52
8.	How much do you consider the incident to be the man described in the paragraph's fault?	.01	.55
13.	To what extent, do you consider the man described in the paragraph is guilty?	.11	.88

Note. Factor loadings greater than .40 are in bold.

Table H2

*Structure Matrix of Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Direct Oblimin
Rotation of Victim Blaming and Perpetrator Blaming Scale*

		Victim blaming	Perpetrator blaming
Eigenvalue = 3.01			
1.	How much do you blame Sarah for what happened?	.72	-.13
3.	In your opinion, did Sarah communicate that she did not agree to sexual intercourse?	.44	-.15
5.	How much do you consider the incident to be Sarah's fault?	.77	-.09
9.	Overall to what extent was Sarah responsible for what happened?	.73	-.28
10.	In your opinion, was Sarah sexually provocative?	.61	-.03
11.	To what extent do you believe that the man described in the paragraph believed that Sarah was willing for sexual intercourse to occur?	.61	-.33

Eigenvalue = 1.74			
6.	How much do you blame the man described in the paragraph for what happened?	-.24	.83
7.	To what extent do you consider Sarah's claim of rape to be credible?	-.18	.53
8.	How much do you consider the incident to be the man described in the paragraph's fault?	-.12	.55
13.	To what extent, do you consider the man described in the paragraph is guilty?	-.09	.86

Note. Factor loadings greater than .40 are in bold.

17.9 Appendix I: Principle Component Analysis for Male Rape Myth Scale using Direct Oblimin Rotation

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure demonstrated that the sampling adequacy was at a level designated superb KMO = .93 (Field, 2009). Also, all KMO values for the individual items were above the acceptable level of .5 (Field, 2009). The Bartlett's test of sphericity demonstrated that the correlations between items were large enough for principle component analysis to be a suitable method to use ($\chi^2 (300) = 5782.08, p < .001$). The analysis supported a four factor solution explaining 67.40% of the variance (via parallel analysis, Kaiser's criterion and a visual inspection of the scree plot). An inspection of the factor loadings from the pattern matrix showed the same factor loadings as the varimax rotation reported in the above analysis.

Table I1

Pattern Matrix of Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Direct Oblimin

Rotation of Male Rape Myth Scale

		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Eigenvalue = 11.28					
9.	Male rape is only a problem in prisons	.48	.28	.18	.05
11.	All men should be able to fight off a male rapist	.53	.05	.16	.09
13.	A man is responsible for being raped	.61	-.10	.05	.21
16.	If a man doesn't fight back you can't call it rape	.60	.21	-.06	.04

19.	Male rape never occurs outside of prison	.69	.10	.05	.01
24.	A 'real' man should be able to stop a man from raping him	.74	.04	.04	.10
30.	Men are immune from becoming a victim of rape	.93	-.10	-.01	-.15
32.	Only gay men are raped	.91	-.10	.03	-.04
35.	Men are safe from becoming a victim of rape	.70	.07	.06	-.04
39.	Any gay man who is raped must have contributed to the assault	.80	-.02	-.03	.04
41.	A man who doesn't resist a rape enough cannot really be considered a rape victim	.73	.09	-.03	.00
45.	Any man who is raped failed to protect himself as a man should	.68	.17	.08	.03
Eigenvalue = 2.42					
8.	The perpetrators of male rape are gay men	-.08	.93	-.08	.04
10.	Male rape is a 'gay' crime	.13	.67	.01	.11
17.	It is only gay men that rape other men	.14	.83	.00	-.10
49.	Any man who rapes another man must be gay	.07	.72	.13	.05
Eigenvalue = 1.68					
5.	Male victims of rape don't suffer as much emotionally as female victims	.15	-.17	.78	-.03
23.	Men are less emotionally affected by rape than women	.01	-.06	.89	-.03
34.	Men are better able to recover from rape than women are	-.01	.10	.86	.01
42.	Men can deal better with being a victim of rape than women can	.04	.07	.85	.01
50.	Men are cope better with being raped than women can	-.02	.05	.91	.03
Eigenvalue = 1.48					
1.	It is physically worse for a man to be raped than a woman	.12	-.07	-.19	.84
12.	Men would find a rape attack physically worse than women	-.05	-.01	.03	.89
27.	A straight man would be more troubled physically by a rape than a gay man	.00	.18	.25	.68
33.	It's physically worse for a straight man to be raped than a gay man	.06	.26	.28	.53

Note. Factor loadings greater than .40 are in bold.

Table I2

*Structure Matrix of Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Direct Oblimin**Rotation of Male Rape Myth Scale*

	Scale items	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
9.	Male rape is only a problem in prisons	.63	.52	.50	.32
11.	All men should be able to fight off a male rapist	.69	.38	.51	.34
13.	A man is responsible for being raped	.66	.26	.41	.40
16.	If a man doesn't fight back you can't call it rape	.68	.48	.37	.31
19.	Male rape never occurs outside of prison	.77	.44	.49	.30
24.	A 'real' man should be able to stop a man from raping him	.82	.42	.50	.38
30.	Men are immune from becoming a victim of rape	.83	.27	.47	.15
32.	Only gay men are raped	.86	.31	.52	.25
35.	Men are safe from becoming a victim of rape	.75	.39	.48	.25
39.	Any gay man who is raped must have contributed to the assault	.79	.35	.44	.31
41.	A man who doesn't resist a rape enough cannot really be considered a rape victim	.76	.41	.43	.29
45.	Any man who is raped failed to protect himself as a man should	.82	.52	.54	.35
8.	The perpetrators of male rape are gay men	.31	.88	.18	.31
10.	Male rape is a 'gay' crime	.49	.78	.33	.40
17.	It is only gay men that rape other men	.49	.86	.33	.24
49.	Any man who rapes another man must be gay	.50	.82	.42	.35
5.	Male victims of rape don't suffer as much emotionally as female victims	.52	.13	.81	.13
23.	Men are less emotionally affected by rape than women	.49	.21	.87	.15
34.	Men are better able to recover from rape than women are	.55	.38	.89	.24
42.	Men can deal better with being a victim of rape than women can	.57	.36	.90	.23
50.	Men cope better with being raped than women can	.55	.34	.92	.24
1.	It is physically worse for a man to be raped	.27	.21	.04	.81

	than a woman				
12.	Men would find a rape attack physically worse than women	.27	.28	.19	.87
27.	A straight man would be more troubled physically by a rape than a gay man	.47	.50	.46	.80
33.	It's physically worse for a straight man to be raped than a gay man	.53	.55	.51	.70
Eigenvalues		11.28	2.42	1.68	1.48

Note. Factor loadings greater than .40 are in bold.

17.10 Appendix J: Copy of paper published of study four

This is the author's final draft of the article published as Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 2010, 25 (6), pp. 969–988 (© The Author 2010). The final published version is available at <http://www.sagepub.com/>, DOI: 10.1177/0886260509340534.

Male rape victim and perpetrator blaming

Emma Sleath and Ray Bull

University of Leicester

Address Correspondence To:

Emma Sleath,
Forensic Section
106 New Walk
University of Leicester,
Leicester,
LE1 7EA, U.K.

Email: ers6@le.ac.uk

Abstract

One of four possible vignettes manipulated by (i) level of rape myth contained within them (low vs. high) and (ii) type of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance) were presented to participants followed by scales measuring victim blame, perpetrator blame, belief in a just world, sex role egalitarian beliefs and male rape myth acceptance. Victim blaming was predicted by male rape myth acceptance. Perpetrator blaming was predicted by male rape myth acceptance and sex role egalitarianism. Differences were found in victim and perpetrator blaming in terms of stranger and acquaintance rape and also in relation to manipulating the level of rape myths. Findings are discussed in relation to the previous literature on rape victim and perpetrator blaming.

There has now been published a wealth of research concerning attitudes towards and judgements of female rape victims. However, comparatively, the research area regarding male rape victims remains under-researched. This has led to a suggestion by Rogers (1998) that this research is almost twenty years behind that of female rape victims. What research there is suggests that there are clear comparisons with concerns reported by female rape victims. In particular, in relation to worries that they will be blamed for being victimised and also related to barriers to reporting their rape to the criminal justice system. The underreporting of female rape is currently a considerable problem for the criminal justice system within the U.K. with a suggestion that 75% to 95% of all rapes do not come to the attention of the police. This is followed by a high level of attrition throughout the criminal justice process culminating with a rape conviction rate of around one in 20 cases (HM Crown Prosecution Service Inspectorate & HM Inspectorate of Constabulary, 2007). Male rape is also considered to be underreported (Hodge & Canter, 1998) perhaps even more so than for female rape. As Walker, Archer, and Davies (2005, p. 69) note “few male rapes appear in police files and other official records”. In Walker et al.’s (2005) study, five out of their sample of 40 male rape victims has reported their rape to the police. Four reported subsequently regretting it as they found the police to be unsympathetic and disinterested. Of perhaps even greater concern is the comments given by the one participant whose case did go to court. This participant suggested that the court case was a worse ordeal than the rape itself with the suggestion that he felt that he was being blamed as the assailant rather than the victim.

It is apparent that male victims labour to contend with many of the same issues that female victims report including the concern that they will be, at least partly, blamed for being raped. Rape victim blaming is, as it suggests, attributing responsibility to the victim of rape. In previous experimental studies, manipulating the gender of the victim has shown that male victims of rape are often blamed significantly more than female victims (Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001; Gerber, Cronin, & Steigman, 2004). In contrast, other similar studies have found that female victims of rape are attributed more blame than are male victims of rape (Schneider, Ee, & Aronson, 1994; Wakelin & Long, 2003).

There has been some support for the suggestion that the typical sexual partner of a man (e.g., a gay man or a heterosexual woman) may be blamed more for their victimisation because they could be thought of as having behaved in a manner which could elicit rape (Ford, Liwag-McLamb, & Foley, 1998; Mitchell, Hirschmann, & Hall, 1999; Wakelin & Long, 2003). Doherty and Anderson (2004) found that participants considered rape to be worse for heterosexual men than for women or gay men. It is suggested that because the act involved in male rape deviates from that practiced by heterosexual men, the rape would therefore be worse for them. Rape was also judged by some participants to be worse for men than women. Doherty and Anderson (2004) suggest this is a “hierarchy of suffering” which establishes rape to be worse for heterosexual men than for gay men or women. Davies and McCartney (2003) compared victim blame and male rape myth acceptance towards male victims of rape via a sample of heterosexual men, gay men and women. This study found that heterosexual men made the most negative assessment of the male victim overall and were more likely to endorse male rape myths than the other two participant groups. Gay men were both less likely to engage in victim blaming and rape myth acceptance and assessed the assault as being more severe than heterosexual men or women did.

Within the female rape victim blaming literature, victims of acquaintance rape (where the victims knows their attacker to some degree) often seem to be held more responsible for being raped than victims of stranger rape (where the victim does not know their attacker) (e.g., Golge, Yavuz, Mudderisoglu, & Yavuz, 2003; Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderup, 2000). It is less easy to establish this finding within the current male rape victim blaming literature. The current literature focuses on scenarios which depict stranger rapes (Whatley & Riggio, 1993; Schneider et al., 2004), with manipulations of sexual orientation of the victim (Burt & DeMello, 2002; Davies et al., 2001; Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2006; Mitchell et al., 1999; Wakelin & Long, 2003) or acquaintance/date rapes (Anderson, 2004; Davies & McCartney, 2003; Gerber et al., 2004). There seems to be a scarcity of literature which compares the perceptions of male victims of stranger or acquaintance rape.

Within female rape research, it has been established that rape victim blaming can focus on the character of the rape victim and/or on the behaviour of the rape victim. Anderson (1999) carried out research which assessed how male and female victims of

rape are blamed behaviourally and characterologically. Characterological blame means that the blaming is focussed upon aspects of the victim's character, personality or disposition whilst behavioural blame attributions focus on suggestions that the victim should have taken more precautions or that they should have been more aware of their current situation. Anderson's findings suggest that people make more behavioural blame attributions towards both male and female rape victims than characterological blame attributions and that the male rape victim is attributed less blame than the female rape victim. Previously, Howard (1984) found that participants engaged in more character blame towards the female rape victim than the male rape victim. An opposite relationship was found for behavioural blame where the male rape victim was attributed more behavioural blame than the female rape victim. Davies et al. (2001) examined behavioural blame towards male and female victims of rape and found two significant main effects. First, that male participants blamed the rape victim more than female participants and secondly that the male victim was blamed more than the female victim. Male participants also blamed the male rape victim more than the female rape victim and had attributed more blame than the female participants attributed to either the male or female rape victim.

Within the developing body of research assessing the perception of male rape victims, the majority of victim blame measures assess a general measure of victim blame which combine both behavioural and characterological blame. For example, in Davies and McCartney (2003), scale items include "How responsible do you think Chris was for the attack" and "How much do you think Chris's behaviour was to blame for what happened". Similarly, Wakelin and Long (2003)'s blame scale items included "Mark should accept blame for the situation" and "Mark's behaviour contributed to the incident". This method of assessing a general measure of blame is adopted within this piece of research however in the future the development of this research area should establish the contribution of both behavioural and characterological blame in male rape victim blaming.

As well as victim blaming, the present study will also examine perpetrator blaming. This is of clear importance since in court, juries are required to make assessments of how culpable a defendant is in deciding guilt or innocence. The prior female rape literature suggests that blame varies between the victim and perpetrator. Where a rape

victim is seen as behaving in a way that is blameworthy, this then reduces the level of blame attributed towards the perpetrator (Krahe, 1991). Wakelin and Long (2003) found that male participants attributed less blame to the perpetrator than female participants did. In this study, the perpetrator of a rape of a gay man was considered less responsible for their actions than perpetrators of a rape of a lesbian or a male heterosexual victim.

In terms of male rape myths, defined here as false and stereotypical beliefs about male rape (Kassing, Beesley, & Frey, 2005), a range of myths have been established within the literature. Kassing et al. list six broad categories into which they fall (a) men's physical size and strength means they are unlikely to be overpowered or forced into sex; (b) men are the instigators of sexual activity and so would not be targeted for rape; (c) men who are victims of rape lose their manhood; (d) the occurrence of male rape is rare; (e) men are strong enough to cope with the experience of being raped; (f) male rape only happens in prisons. Rape myths regarding male victims may stem from traditional views of masculinity, which dictate that men should be strong, assertive, sexually dominant and heterosexual (Davies, 2002). These categories should not be considered to cover the full breadth and diversity of male rape myths. One significant male rape myth not encompassed by these categories is the idea that all male victims of rape (those perpetrated by men) are gay (or appeared gay) and so must have behaved in a way which was unsafe or risky (Kassing et al.) The function of such myths as "men cannot be raped" or "sexual assault is not as severe for men as it is for a woman" can minimise the impact that rape may have on male victims and serve to blame the victim for their rape (Davies & McCartney, 2003; Groth & Burgess, 1980).

In terms of the empirical research examining male rape myths, this is currently quite limited. Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson (1992) found that participants were most likely to agree with rape myths such as strong men cannot be raped and that a man should be able to escape from their assailant. However, the authors noted that overall there was no strong evidence to support the idea that male rape myths were widely accepted. This is contrary to that found within the female rape myth acceptance literature. Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) argue that female rape myths are widely accepted within our society. This was demonstrated to a certain extent by

Johnson, Kuck, and Schander (1997) who found that the levels of acceptance for female rape myths ranged from very low levels to around 90% with the majority being myths which would excuse the actions of the offender. However, Johnson et al. noted that there was a small minority of participants who accepted myths which blamed the victim. It would seem likely, given the female literature, that acceptance for male rape myths should show similar levels.

The development of a male rape myth scale currently lags behind that of female rape myth acceptance research. Melanson (1999) developed the scale used within this study, out of the current research published within the area (e.g. Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1992). This scale was used successfully by Kassing et al. (2005). It is only with the continued development of research within this area that the full scope of male rape myths can be understood.

Given that male rape myths seem to be based within traditional notions about gender roles and masculinity, this may be a valid explanation for why male victims of rape are blamed for their victimisation. The masculine gender role is expected to be independent, assertive, dominant and competitive in social and sexual relations (Hetherington & Parke, 1993). Survivors' accounts suggest that these societal expectations about men and masculinity discourage men from reporting sexual victimisation because they fear being labelled as weak or inadequate (Doherty & Anderson, 2004). Doherty and Anderson found that participants raised the idea that in becoming a victim of rape, in particular heterosexual men may be perceived as "less than men". These authors suggest that this perception may come about because of cultural expectations of hegemonic masculinity where male rape victims would be blamed because they have failed in their duties as "real men".

Simonson and Subich (1999) examined the role of gender traditionality in the perceptions of female rape victims. They found that less traditionality (in terms of gender role stereotypes) was related to a greater perception of seriousness of the rape (in the scenarios) and a lesser likelihood of blaming the victim. They suggested that traditionality may be more predictive of rape supportive beliefs than is the gender of the participants. This will be examined in the present study using the Sex Role

Egalitarianism Scale (SRES) which measures attitudes about men and women assuming non-traditional roles.

Belief in a just world theory (Lerner, 1980) explains victim blaming by contending that there can be no such thing as an innocent victim. Put simply, bad things only happen to bad people and so for something bad to have happened to someone they must have deserved this. In explaining this blaming, Correia, Vala, and Aguiar (2001) suggest that there are two stages to how people attribute responsibility in a situation. Initially, people focus on the victim's behaviour as an explanation for what happened, following this if it is not possible to assign responsibility in this way, responsibility is then attributed to the victim's character. This ensures that people can preserve their belief in the world as a just and fair place.

Research examining the relationship between belief in a just world and rape victim blaming has been inconsistent in establishing whether this theory is a useful explanation for why rape victims are blamed. The current research suggests that there is considerable room for further research. Whatley and Riggio (1993) found that participants with a high belief in a just world were more likely to blame the rape victim than those participants with a lower belief in a just world. Further, Ford et al. (1998) found belief in a just world only affected the responsibility participants allocated to the perpetrator, when the male rape victim was described as heterosexual (as opposed to gay), and that this effect was influenced by the participant's gender (i.e., more responsibility by females but less by males). However, both of these studies used the Rubin and Peplau (1975) belief in a just world scale which as noted by Whatley and Riggio (1993) can be psychometrically problematic. The Ford et al. (1998) study itself reported a coefficient alpha of .48 which is lower than acceptable.

Thus, the hypotheses for the present study are that (a) male rape myth acceptance, (b) belief in just world and (c) egalitarian beliefs about gender role will predict victim and perpetrator blaming. The levels of rape myths within a scenario (high vs. low) and the type of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance) will affect the amount of blame attributed towards the (i) victim and (ii) perpetrator.

Method

Design

This study employed a between-participants design in which the level of rape myths (low vs. high) and type of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance) were manipulated in scenarios presented to participants. The relationship between (i) male rape myth acceptance, (ii) belief in a just world and (iii) sex role egalitarianism was examined with (a) victim blaming and (b) perpetrator blaming.

Participants

The sample consisted of 116 participants (67 females, 49 males). Their mean age was 19.23 years ($SD=1.18$). These were undergraduate students recruited in either their first ($n=49$) or second year ($n=67$) of study of a Psychology related degree.

Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions by the rotation of the scenarios by the webpage. Twenty-eight participants completed the stranger rape with a low level of rape myths scenario, 30 participants completed the stranger rape with a high level of rape myths scenario, 27 participants completed the acquaintance rape with a low level of rape myths scenario and 31 participants completed the acquaintance rape with a high level of rape myths scenario. Eleven participants (not counted in final sample size), signed up to the study and subsequently withdrew. This study was approved by the School of Psychology's Ethics Committee following the guidelines as laid down by the British Psychological Society.

Materials

Scenarios

The study required the development of four scenarios, which manipulated the type of rape presented (stranger or acquaintance) and also the level of rape myths present (high or low). The latter factor was manipulated by including information such as the drinking of alcohol, information about the body type of the victim and the time and location of the event. The phrase "physically forced sex" was used instead of 'rape' to avoid a bias that may be caused by describing the event as rape (Davies & Rogers, 2006). See Appendix A for an example of a scenario.

Victim and perpetrator blame scale

This was initially a 14 item scale assessing responsibility attributed to both the victim and the perpetrator of the rape. For each item, a seven point response scale was used (with 1="not at all" to 7="completely/totally"). An example of one of the items which measured victim blaming is "How much do you consider the incident to be Michael's fault?" Following a principle component analysis, scale items 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9 were retained to measure victim blame. The Cronbach alpha of the victim blame scale was .87 demonstrating a good level of reliability. Scale items 4, 6, 8, 13 were retained to measure perpetrator blame. The Cronbach alpha of the perpetrator blame scale was .88 demonstrating a good level of reliability. See Results section for a list of scale items and the full analysis.

Male Rape Myth Scale (MRMS – Melanson, 1999)

This is a 22 item questionnaire which measures false or stereotypical beliefs about male rape. Developed by Melanson (1999), response scales are from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Total scores are summated with higher scores indicating a greater acceptance of male rape myths. A previous Cronbach alpha of .90 and a test-retest reliability of .89 has been reported for this scale (Melanson, 1999). A Cronbach alpha of .85 was found for this study. An example of one of the male rape myth item is "A man can enjoy sex even if it is being forced upon him".

Belief in a Just World (English translation - Dalbert, Montada, & Schmitt, 1987)

This is a 6-item scale measuring general belief in a just world (BJW) with responses on a six point response scale ranging from 1-"strongly disagree" to 6-"strongly agree" with no neutral midpoint. This has been shown to be psychometrically sound when used with an alpha of .82 (Furnham, 1995). A Cronbach alpha of .77 was found for this present study. An example of one of the questionnaire items is "I think basically the world is a just place".

Sex Role Egalitarianism Scale Short Form BB (Beere, King, Beere, & King, 1984)

Five items of each domain of the full forms were included in the short form BB resulting in 25 items measuring sex role egalitarianism. A person high in sex role egalitarianism is tradition-free in their attitudes towards other sexes and does not discriminate against either women or men who assume non-traditional gender role behaviours (King & King, 1993). An example of one of the questionnaire items is "The husband should be the head of the family". The response format is along a five-

point Likert Scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. A Cronbach alpha of .67 was found for this present study.

Procedure

Participants were recruited as part of their Experimental Participation Requirement (EPR) for which they received 'EPR credit' for taking part. Participants are recruited via the EPR software. Once participants sign into the site, this directs them to a list of available studies. Participants can read further information about the content of the study by clicking on any of the study titles. Participants are not forced into choosing any one particular study. Following signing up to the study (where they were fully briefed as to the content of the study), participants were directed to a web page where the content of the study was further underlined. Participants indicated consent prior to beginning the study. This then directed the participant to the beginning of the study, participants were firstly presented with a scenario in which the level of rape myths (high vs. low) and the type of rape (stranger vs. acquaintance) were manipulated. Following this, participants filled in the four scales.

Results

Gender differences

To begin, gender differences were explored within the data. There was no significant difference between males and females in their belief in a just world [$t(114) = .56, p = .58$]. Males were more accepting of male rape myths [$t(114) = 3.01, p < .01$] and were more egalitarian in their sex role beliefs [$t(114) = 2.33, p = .02$] than females (see Table 1 for descriptive statistics).

INSERT TABLE 1

Acceptance of male rape myths

These data were analysed to determine the percentage of male and female participants that showed some level of agreement with male rape myths. Levels of acceptance ranged from 2.99 to 92.54% across the various myths (see Table 2). For example,

nearly 47% of male participants felt that the extent of a man's resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped. Over a third (35.82%) of female participants agreed that all male rape is committed by homosexuals.

INSERT TABLE 2

Factor analysis of victim and perpetrator blame scale

A principle component analysis examined the 14 item scale with a varimax rotation. This analysis found a three factor solution with eigenvalues greater than one. Loadings greater than 0.4 were retained within the analysis. Where the factor item loaded on more than one factor, the highest loading was retained for analysis (see Davies & McCartney, 2003). The first factor was a measure of victim blame which includes five items assessing the level of blame and responsibility attributed towards the victim. The second factor assessed attitudes towards the credibility of the rape and consent (this was not further analysed within this study, which focuses on blame). The third factor measured perpetrator blame which includes four items assessing the level of responsibility and blame attributed towards the perpetrator of the rape (see Table 3 for factor loadings).

INSERT TABLE 3

Victim and perpetrator blaming

A hierarchical multiple regression examining the relationship between *victim* blaming and three predictor variables was carried out. In step one (male rape myth acceptance) the model was significant [$F(3, 115) = 87.47, p < .01$]. In Step 2 (male rape myth acceptance and sex role egalitarian beliefs) the model was significant [$F(3, 115) = 43.82, p < .01$]. In Step 3 (male rape myth acceptance, sex role egalitarian beliefs and belief in a just world) the model was significant [$F(3, 115) = 29.03, p < .01$]. Thus, only male rape myth acceptance was a significant predictor (please see Table 4 for further details).

INSERT TABLE 4

A hierarchical multiple regression examining the relationship between *perpetrator* blaming and three predictor variables was carried out. In step one (male rape myth acceptance) the model was significant [$F(3, 115) = 10.78, p < .01$]. In Step 2 (male rape myth acceptance and sex role egalitarian beliefs) the model was significant [$F(3, 115) = 9.07, p < .01$]. In Step 3 (male rape myth acceptance, sex role egalitarian beliefs and belief in a just world) the model was significant [$F(3, 115) = 6.50, p < .01$]. Male rape myth acceptance and sex role egalitarian beliefs were significant predictors of perpetrator blaming (please see table 5 for further details).

INSERT TABLE 5

A two (male vs female) by two (stranger rape vs. acquaintance rape) by two (low level of rape myths vs high level of rape myths) between-subjects MANOVA was carried out. There was a statistically significant difference between stranger rape and acquaintance rape regarding the combined dependent variable [$F(2, 107) = 16.36, p < .01$; Wilks' Lambda = .77; partial eta squared = .23]. There was a statistically significant difference between low level of rape myths and high level of rape myths [$F(2, 107) = 4.63, p = .01$; Wilks' Lambda = .92; partial eta squared = .08]. There was a difference approaching significance between males and females on the combined dependent variable [$F(2, 107) = 2.58, p = .08$; Wilks' Lambda = .77; partial eta squared = .05].

When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, significant differences were found in *victim* blaming for type of rape [$F(7, 108) = 7.75, p < .01$; partial eta squared = .07], for level of rape myths [$F(7, 108) = 6.69, p = .01$; partial eta squared = .06] and for gender [$F(7, 108) = 5.20, p = .03$; partial eta squared = .05]. No other significant differences or interactions were found. An inspection of the mean scores of these differences demonstrates that male participants ($M = 11.88, SD = 6.74$) blamed the rape victim more than female participants did ($M = 9.21, SD = 5.31$); that the acquaintance rape victim ($M = 11.91, SD = 6.60$) was blamed more than the stranger rape victim ($M = 8.76, SD = 5.00$); and that the rape victim was blamed more where there was a high level of rape myths within the vignette ($M = 11.69, SD = 6.60$) than when there was a low level of rape myths ($M = 8.84, SD =$

5.08). For *perpetrator* blaming, significant differences were only found for type of rape [$F(7, 108) = 32.81, p = <.01$; partial eta squared = .23] and inspection of the mean scores of this demonstrated that the perpetrator was blamed more in the stranger rape ($M = 26.72, SD = 2.75$) than in the acquaintance rape scenarios ($M = 21.78, SD = 5.69$.)

Discussion

It is clear when examining the findings of this study that male rape myth acceptance has a strong relationship with male rape victim blaming. Male rape myth acceptance was a strong predictor of victim blaming suggesting that acceptance of stereotypical ideas about male rape means that a person is more likely to engage in male rape victim blaming behaviours. This is of concern, particularly as it is likely that these myths are accepted widely (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995), as confirmed within this present study with some high levels of acceptance of certain myths. This finding of relatively high levels of acceptance is supported by Kassing et al. (2005) and Johnson et al. (1997) demonstrating that rape myth acceptance (regarding both male and female rape) is prevalent within our society. There appears to be parallels with female rape victim myth research in that the victim's level of resistance is an important factor in determining whether an event is defined or judged as rape or not. However there are also considerable contrasts with the female rape myth literature in the main due to the nature of male rape, particularly with regards to myths that suggest that men must be gay to be raped and that all male rapists are gay. There is also the myth regarding 'enjoyment of sex' which suggests that men are always ready and wanting sex and as rape is only a form of sex, that a man would therefore enjoy being raped because it is simply sex. This is supported by Anderson (2001) who found that the motivation for rape continued to be perceived as a need for sex rather than an act motivated by power.

Male rape myths seem to be inextricably linked with our society's traditional ideas about what defines a real man. Kassing et al. (2005) highlighted the harmful nature of acceptance of male rape myths particularly in reference to negative attitudes towards male rape victims, where male victims may be treated with suspicion. Scare (1997)

echoes this difficulty because of the problem of trying to resolve the incongruity between traditional notions of men as strong and independent and men as victims (of rape). Kassing et al. (2005) suggest that we will not be able to dispel such myths through educating the public about the existence of myths and that more is needed to change in the way that we are socialised in our understanding of what it is to be a man or woman. This is obviously unlikely to occur quickly or in the foreseeable future.

The MANOVA analysis for victim blaming demonstrated that the acquaintance rape victim was blamed more than the stranger rape victim. This shows clear parallels with the female rape literature where the victim knows their assailant for even a brief period of time can influence the levels of blame attributed towards the victim (e.g. Golge et al., 2003; Monson et al., 2000). This analysis also showed that the rape victim was blamed more when there was a high level of rape myths than where there was a low level of rape myths. The impact of such rape myths in the reporting practices of male victims may mean as Scarce (1997) suggests that many victims fear to report their victimisation because they believe that they will be labelled as a closet gay. Understanding that male rape is not solely linked to a gay lifestyle would be an important step for improving the response the victims may receive as well as the attitudes they may encounter.

With regards to perpetrator blaming, this was also predicted by male rape myth acceptance showing that where acceptance of male rape myths increases, the blaming of the perpetrator decreases. This agrees with the female rape research carried out by Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) who argue that the function of rape myths are to blame the victim and excuse the perpetrator. This also demonstrates that male rape myths do not solely relate to myths about the victims of rape but also include myths that relate to the perpetrators of rape. For perpetrator blaming, a significant difference was found for type of rape which shows that when the victim is known to the perpetrator, the level of blame attributed towards the perpetrator is significantly decreased. This agrees with Krahe (1991) that where the victim is seen as more blameworthy (as acquaintance rape victims often are), the perpetrator is considered less culpable. This should be of concern because of the impact it may have on juries. Any blameworthy behaviour of the victim, such as the drinking of alcohol, may lead

juries to excuse the behaviour of the perpetrator which could clearly influence judgments of guilt or innocence of the defendant.

Belief in just world was not found to be a significant predictor of perpetrator or victim blaming. It seems that although belief in a just world may explain why blaming occurs for certain victims (such as victims of injustice, Furnham, 1995), it does not seem to consistently explain why we blame victims of rape. Similar to the findings by Ford et al. (1998), it appears that high belief in a just world only results in victim/perpetrator blaming in certain circumstances.

Sex role egalitarian beliefs predicted perpetrator blaming but not victim blaming. This was a negative relationship such that perpetrator blaming decreased with increasing egalitarian sex role beliefs. Previously Simonson and Subich (1999) also suggested that traditionality was predictive of rape supportive beliefs in the perceptions of female victims. It does seem that the traditional ideas society holds about men and masculinity may therefore be related to participants excusing the actions of the offender. Since, as noted by Doherty and Anderson (2004) that men who become rape victims have failed in their duties as 'real men', the perpetrator may then be attributed less blame.

The present study has established the importance of rape myths in terms of influencing the levels of blame attributed to both the victims and perpetrators of rape. It is clear that some myths are quite widely accepted (at least within this sample). This remains a concern particularly given the influence that they may have in jury decision making and also on police officers who are themselves members of our society.

Limitations

Further research in this area needs to develop a greater understanding of the influence of different types of blaming attributed towards male victims of rape as this research measures a general measure of victim blaming. Developing this area will contribute towards an understanding of how blame is apportioned to victims of rape and add to our understanding of whether the character of the victim is focussed upon or whether the behaviour of the victim is more important. It is also important to note that the

victim's sexual orientation was not included in the vignettes and as such participants' may have made their own assumptions about the rape victim's sexual orientation. As previous literature has demonstrated that the typical sexual partner for a man may be blamed more for their victimisation (Ford, Liwag-McLamb, & Foley, 1998; Mitchell, Hirschmann, & Hall, 1999; Wakelin & Long, 2003), these potential assumptions made by the participants could have affected the level of blame attributed to the male rape victim.

References

- Anderson, I. (2004). Explaining negative rape victim perception: Homophobia and the male rape victim. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 10, 1-14.
- Anderson, I. (2001). Perceived motivation for rape: Gender differences in beliefs about female and male rape. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 6, 107-122.
- Anderson, I. (1999). Characteriological and behavioural blame in conversations about female and male rape. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 18, 377-394.
- Beere, C. A., King, D. W., Beere, D. B., & King, L. A. (1984). The Sex Role Egalitarianism Scale: A measure of attitudes towards equality between the sexes. *Sex Roles*, 10, 563-576.
- Burt, D. L., & DeMello, L.R. (2002). Attribution of rape as a function of victim gender and sexuality, and perceived similarity to the victim. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43, 39-58.
- Correia, I., Vala, J., & Aguiar, P. (2001). The effects of belief in a just world and victim's innocence on secondary victimisation, judgements of justice and deservingness. *Social Justice Research*, 14, 327-342.
- Dalbert, C., Montada, L., & Schmitt, M. (1987). Glaube an eine gerechte Welt als Motiv: Validierungskorrelate zweier Skalen (Belief in a just world as motive: Validity correlates of two scales). *Psychologische Beiträge*, 29, 596-615.
- Davies, M. (2002). Male sexual assault victims: A selective review of the literature and implications for support services. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 7, 203-214.
- 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 and Applied Social Psychology*, 13, 391-398.
- Davies, M., Pollard, P., & Archer, J. (2006). Effects of perpetrator gender and victim sexuality on blame towards male victims of sexual assault. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 146, 275-291.
- Davies, M., Pollard, P., & Archer, J. (2001). The influence of victim gender and sexual orientation on judgements of the victim in a depicted stranger rape. *Violence and Victims*, 16, 607-619.

- Davies, M., & Rogers, P. (2006). Perceptions of male victims in depicted sexual assaults: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 11*, 367-377.
- Doherty, K., & Anderson, I. (2004). Making sense of male rape: Constructions of gender, sexuality and experience of rape victims. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 14*, 85-103.
- Ford, T. M., Liwag-McLamb, M. G., & Foley, L. A. (1998). Perceptions of rape based on sex and sexual orientation of the victim. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 13*, 253-263.
- Furnham, A. (1995). The just world, charitable giving and attitudes towards disability. *Personality and Individual Differences, 19*, 577-583.
- Gerber, G.L., Cronin, J.M., & Steigman, H. (2004). Attributions of blame in sexual assault to perpetrators and victims of both genders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34*, 2149-2165.
- Golge, Z. B., Yavuz, M. F., Mudderrisoglu, S., & Yavuz, M. S. (2003). Turkish university students' attitudes toward rape. *Sex Roles, 49*, 653-661.
- Groth, A. N., & Burgess, A. W. (1980). Male rape: Offenders and victims. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 137*, 806-810.
- Hetherington, E. M., & Parke, R. D. (1993). *Child Psychology: A Contemporary Viewpoint*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Howard, J.A. (1984). The 'normal' victim: The effects of gender stereotypes on reactions to victims. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 47*, 270-281.
- Hodge, S., & Canter, D.(1998). Victims and perpetrators of male sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 13*, 222-240.
- HMPCSI/HMIC. (2007). *Without Consent: A report on the joint review of the investigation and prosecution of rape offences*. London: Home Office.
- Johnson, B. E., Kuck, D. L., & Schander, P. R. (1997). Rape myth acceptance and sociodemographic characteristics: A multidimensional analysis. *Sex Roles, 36*, 693-707.
- Kassing, L. R., Beesley, D., & Frey, L. L. (2005). Gender role conflict, homophobia, age, and education as predictors of male rape myth acceptance. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 27*, 311-328.
- King, L. A., & King, D. W. (1993) *Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale manual*. Sigma Assesment Systems, Inc: Port Huron.

- Krahe, B. (1991). Police officers' definitions of rape: A prototype study. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 1*, 223-244.
- Lerner, M. J. (1980). *The belief in a just world*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1995). Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: A theoretical and empirical re-examination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 704-711.
- Melanson, P. K. (1999). Belief in male rape myths: A test of two competing theories (Doctoral dissertation, Queen's University, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59*, 5620.
- Mitchell, D., Hirschman, R., & Hall, G. C. N. (1999). Attributions of victim responsibility, pleasure, and trauma in male rape. *Journal of Sex Research, 36*, 369-373.
- Monson, C. M., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Binderup, T. (2000). Does "no" really mean "no" after you say "yes"? Attributions about date and marital rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*, 1156-1174.
- Rogers, P. (1998). Call for research into male rape. *Mental Health Practice, 1*, 34.
- Scarce, M. (1997). *Male on male rape*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Schneider, L.J., Ee, J., & Aronson, H. (1994). Effects of victim gender and physical vs. psychological trauma/injury on observers' perceptions of sexual assault and its aftereffects. *Sex Roles, 30*, 793-808.
- Simonson, K., & Subich, L.M. (1999). Rape perceptions as a function of gender-role traditionality and victim-perpetrator association. *Sex Roles, 40*, 617-634.
- Wakelin, A., & Long, K. M. (2003). Effects of victim gender and sexuality on attributions of blame to rape victims. *Sex Roles, 49*, 477-487.
- Walker, J., Archer, J., & Davies, M. (2005). Effects of rape on men: A descriptive analysis. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 34*, 69-80.
- Whatley, M.A., & Riggio, R.E. (1993). Gender differences in attributions of blame for male rape victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 8*, 502-511.

Appendix A: Example of one scenario used (Stranger rape with a high level of rape myths)

Michael is a university student. Michael is of slight build. He had been drinking alcohol with his friends in a bar. Late that night he was walking home alone, half a mile from where he lived. His path home went through a small park. A man called out to Michael. Michael continued walking. Then the man grabbed hold of him. He began to undress Michael. Michael asked the man to let him go. The man began to push him down to the ground. Michael tried to push the man away. The man then physically forced him into sexual intercourse.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Victim Blame, Perpetrator Blame, Belief in a Just World, Male Rape Myths and Sex Role Egalitarianism.

	Gender	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Belief in a just world	Male	20.88	5.79
	Female	20.33	4.73
Male rape myth acceptance	Male	62.69	16.00
	Female	54.27	14.47
Sex role egalitarian beliefs	Male	70.94	9.33
	Female	67.24	7.11

Table 2

Percentage of participants (separated by gender) who indicated a level of acceptance to the male rape myth.

	Females	Males
It is a terrible experience for a man to be raped by a woman	92.54	77.55
The extent of a man's resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped	55.22	46.94
Any healthy man can successfully resist a rapist if he really wants to	17.91	18.37
If a man obtained an erection while being raped it probably means that he started to enjoy it	13.43	16.32
A man can enjoy sex even if it is being forced upon him	17.91	26.53
Most men who are raped by a woman are very upset by the incident	86.57	79.59
Many men claim rape if they have consented to homosexual relations but have changed their minds afterwards	20.90	22.45
Most men who are raped by a woman are somewhat to blame for not escaping or fighting off the woman	13.43	30.61
If a man engages in kissing and petting and he lets things get out of hand, it is his fault if his partner forces sex on him	17.91	16.33
Male rape is usually committed by homosexuals	35.82	34.69
Most men who are raped by a man are somewhat to blame for not escaping or fighting off the man	4.48	18.37
A man who has been raped has lost his manhood	2.99	16.33
Most men who are raped by a woman are somewhat to blame for not being more careful	2.99	26.53
If a man told me that he had been raped by another man, I would suspect that he is homosexual	5.97	8.16
Most men who have been raped have a history of promiscuity	1.49	10.20
No self-respecting man would admit to being raped	4.48	10.20
Women who rape men are sexually frustrated individuals	35.82	38.77

A man who allows himself to be raped by another man is probably homosexual	5.97	12.24
Most men would <u>not</u> enjoy being raped by a woman	67.16	48.98
Men who parade around nude in a changing room are asking for trouble	2.99	12.24
Male rape is more serious when the victim is heterosexual than when the victim is homosexual	5.97	16.33
I would have a hard time believing a man who told me that he was raped by a woman	19.40	51.02

Table 3

Principle component analysis of victim and perpetrator blame scale

Scale No.		Factor 1 loading	Factor 2 loading	Factor 3 loading
Factor 1: Victim blame Eigenvalue = 6.21				
1	How much do you blame Michael for what happened?	.67*	-.58	
3	In your opinion, did Michael communicate that he did not agree to sexual intercourse?	.65*		
5	How much do you consider the incident to be Michael's fault?	.72*	-.53	
7	To what extent do you consider Michael's claim of rape to be credible?	.79*		
9	Overall to what extent was Michael responsible for what happened?	.79*	-.45	
Factor 2: Credibility of allegation Eigenvalue = 1.83				
2	If identified, to what extent would you consider the man described in the paragraph's claim of innocence of rape to be credible?		.47*	
10	In your opinion, was Michael sexually provocative?		-.72	
11	To what extent do you believe that the man described in the paragraph believed that Michael was willing for sexual intercourse to occur?		.79*	
12	Given Michael's behaviour, was it reasonable for the man described in the paragraph to assume that he was interested in sexual intercourse?		.80*	
Factor 3: Perpetrator Blame Eigenvalue = 1.23				
4	Overall to what extent was the man described in the paragraph responsible for what happened?			.86*
6	How much do you blame the man described in the paragraph for what happened?			.86*

8	How much do you consider the incident to be the man described in the paragraph's fault?		.84*
13	To what extent, do you consider the man described in the paragraph is guilty?	-.51	.56*

Table 4

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Rape Victim Blaming.

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Step 1			
Male rape myth acceptance	0.24	0.03	.66*
Step 2			
Male rape myth acceptance	0.23	0.03	.64*
Sex role egalitarian beliefs	0.04	0.06	.06
Step 3			
Male rape myth acceptance	0.23	22.45	.64*
Sex role egalitarian beliefs	0.05	0.06	.07
Belief in a just world	-0.03	0.09	-.03

Note. $R^2 = .43$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .003$ for Step 2; $\Delta R^2 = .001$ for Step 3 ($ps < .01$)

* $p < .01$

Table 5

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Rape Perpetrator Blaming.

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Step 1			
Male rape myth acceptance	-0.09	0.03	-.29*
Step 2			
Male rape myth acceptance	-0.12	0.03	-.40*
Sex role egalitarian beliefs	0.15	0.06	.25*
Step 3			
Male rape myth acceptance	-.12	0.03	-.41*
Sex role egalitarian beliefs	0.14	0.06	.22*
Belief in a just world	0.10	0.09	.11

Note. $R^2 = .09$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .05$ for Step 2; $\Delta R^2 = .01$ for Step 3 ($ps < .01$)

* $p < .01$