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ABSTRACT

This study examined lay attributions regarding situations meeting the legal definition of rape and in addition examined a methodological question regarding the effect of use of a projective measure upon participant involvement and lay attributions. Eight scenarios completely crossed three two-level factors: stage of relationship, and victim and perpetrator alcohol consumption. The stage of relationship variable partially operationalized Shotland's (1989, 1992) courtship rape theory, which posits that acquaintance rape is not a unitary phenomenon. Half of the participants were asked to complete a projective section requesting that they complete sentence blanks regarding the inner cognitions and feelings of the rapist. All participants then responded to the Acquaintance Rape Attributions Questionnaire (ARAQ), which elicited information regarding the rapist's motivations and intentions. Results suggested that participants perceive beginning courtship rape and relational courtship rape differently, ascribing a stronger intent to rape and power motivation to the rapist who has known his victim for a relatively short amount of time (beginning courtship rape). In cases of relational courtship rape, participants were more likely to apply sexual interaction scripts (i.e., a man is entitled to sex if a woman leads him on and a woman may play hard to get but will eventually relax and enjoy herself). Male participants and participants holding rape supportive attitudes were more likely to invoke such sexual scripts. Participants who completed the projective measure were more likely to view the incident as resulting from sexual miscommunication that
the victim should have prevented, and they expressed a lower level of involvement in the task.
INTRODUCTION

In our culture, few if any crimes have been as highly politicized and widely misunderstood as rape. Indeed, feminists have charged that we Americans live in a "rape culture," permeated by attitudes and beliefs that not only allow but support the existence of rape. In partial support of their claims, they point to statistics indicating that rape is the most frequently committed and most underreported crime in the United States (Quackenbush, 1989). Furthermore, when rape victims do report the incident, they are routinely blamed for their own victimization, and of all crimes, rape has the lowest conviction rate (White & Sorenson, 1992).

The April 1991 incident in which William Kennedy Smith was charged with rape serves as a vivid example of one of the ways that rape culture functions to silence victims. During this case, media went to great lengths to discover the victim's identity, delved into her past sexual history and questioned both her morals and her motives for filing such a charge (Greensboro News and Record, 1991). As a result the number of women in Palm Beach County, Florida seeking rape exams was reduced from 10 in the first half of April to one in the remainder of the month (Greensboro News and Record, 1991).

Sociocultural factors have not only influenced the phenomenon of rape but also its definition and assessment (White & Sorenson, 1992). For instance, although rape has existed for centuries, the phenomenon was not consistently researched until the past 15 to 20 years. Also, much of early research was based on the stereotypical
definition of rape as a situation in which an unknown male attacks a female and forces her, through use of threats or violence, to participate in sexual intercourse or other sexual acts (Williams & Holmes, 1981) and with such a definition, focused almost exclusively on victims and perpetrators of stranger rape. This was the case in spite of early indications that the incidence of acquaintance rape was and is much higher, with at least half of all rapes committed by someone that the victim knows (Amir, 1971; McDermott, 1979).

Early research also was highly concerned about the phenomenon of victim blaming and resulted in a largely unorganized body of data identifying situational cues that lead to victims being held responsible for their crime. However, recent research has taken a more holistic approach, and has begun the search for mediating and moderating variables that affect judgments of relative responsibility.

The proposed analog research acknowledges the integral roles that culture plays in the phenomenon of acquaintance rape through its investigation of lay attitudes and attributions. Recent findings and theories are integrated into the research design of the study, which examines the motivations and intentions of the rapist and tests a methodological innovation designed to increase subject involvement in the study. The study is intended to be exploratory and investigates, among other things, whether lay people believe that rape is differentially motivated when it occurs at different stages of a couple's relationship. Also examined are the perceived
effects of alcohol consumption by the victim and/or perpetrator on their motivations, perceptions and intentions.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Etiological Approaches to Rape

Although for a time two etiological approaches predominated in rape literature (Briere & Malamuth, 1983), the sociocultural model is the one most commonly accepted by researchers today, especially when attempting to explain the phenomenon of acquaintance rape. The first causal theory of rape, the psychopathological model, posits that rape is the result of mental illness that includes uncontrollable sexual or aggressive impulses (Brodsky, 1976). The sociocultural model, on the other hand, views rape as an extension of culturally sanctioned male dominance over women (Weis & Borges, 1973).

Psychopathological Models

Psychopathological models have been generated from clinical experiences with small samples of rapists, typically, incarcerated stranger rapists. The resulting rapist profile is that of a "sick" individual from the "lunatic fringe" of society (Scully & Marolla, 1985). However, empirical research has revealed that fewer than 5 percent of men were psychotic when they raped (Abel, Becker, & Skinner, 1980).

Although the incidence of psychotic diagnoses is low, a popular belief is that a high number of rapists are personality disordered (Koss & Leonard, 1984). Koss and Leonard (1984) dispute this contention by identifying major methodological difficulties with many of the supporting studies (e.g. Cohen, Garofalo, Boucher, & Seghern, 1971; Groth, Burgess, & Holmstrom, 1977; Henn, 1968; McCaldon, 1967).
They note an absence of comparison groups and the failure to maintain blind conditions in the individuals making the diagnoses. Other more methodologically sound studies (Fisher & Rivlin, 1971; Malamuth, 1986; Rada, 1978) have failed to find a consistent and strong pattern of personality type or character disorder that discriminates rapists from other criminal groups. In a review of the evidence, Knight and Prentky (1990) conclude that rapists constitute a markedly heterogeneous group.

While some studies have found varying evidence of psychopathology, their results are based on a sample of stranger rapists involved in or convicted in criminal proceedings. The only study employing nonincarcerated rapists found no relationship between psychopathology and level of sexual aggression (Koss & Leonard, 1984). Thus, while psychopathology may possibly play an etiological role in stranger rape, no evidence exists to support the conclusion that psychopathology significantly contributes to acquaintance rape (Koss & Leonard, 1984).

Sociocultural Models

Sociocultural models make two general assertions: (1) rape behavior is learned through interaction with others and is not the result of a mental disorder and (2) rape falls at the end of a continuum of male-aggressive, female-passive sexual behavior patterns. Under this model, rape behavior results from conformity or overconformity to traditional male sex roles.

Traditionally, males are socialized to associate power, dominance, strength, virility and superiority with masculinity and submissiveness, passivity, weakness and
inferiority with femininity (Scully & Marolla, 1985). Men are taught to take the initiative in sexual encounters and to persist even when a woman indicates that she is unwilling because women are not supposed to directly indicate sexual willingness or freely engage in sexuality (Check & Malamuth, 1983). Based on this version of what men and women's proper sex roles should be, "no" does not necessarily mean "no."

Sexual scripts indicate that men ask, women consent or refuse, men persist, and women set limits (Shapiro & Shapiro, 1985). Furthermore, men are taught to have expectations regarding the nature of their sexual needs (Scully & Marolla, 1985), for example, that men have a strong sexual drive that must find a frequent outlet. Sexual prowess is often used as a measure of a man's masculine status (Macklin, 1983). In this cultural attribution script, the association between masculinity, high sexual needs, and aggressive sexual scripts coupled with corresponding female passivity and inferior social and physical power function to justify forced sex. Box (1983) summarizes the sociocultural model in this manner:

Masculine sex-role socialization is a cultural precondition of rape because, first, it reduces women in men's minds to the status of sex objects, and second, it instructs men to be prepared for strong, even if deceitful, resistance. . . . Thus, in pursuing "normal" sexual relationships, men often find themselves in a situation where a reluctant female has to be overcome, not only because that's what "real men" do, but because that's what "real" women really want. In other words, "normal" and "coercive" sexual encounters become so fused in the
masculine mystique that it becomes possible to see rape as not only normal, but even desired by the victim. (p. 47)

**Support for sociocultural models.** Much support for the sociocultural model has been generated in recent years. Among the most convincing evidence is the variation of rape rates from culture to culture. If rape were simply human nature (Symons, 1979) or the result of a psychological disorder, one might expect to find relatively stable rape rates throughout the world. Yet research shows that in some cultures, rape is virtually nonexistent (Sanday, 1979) while the United States is considered especially rape prone. For example, the rate of reported attempted and completed rapes was 18 times higher in the United States than in England in 1980 (West, 1983).

Other compelling evidence that supports the sociocultural model while rejecting the mental illness hypothesis is offered by Malamuth, Haber, and Feshback (1980). They found that 51 percent of the 53 college males in their study indicated a likelihood that they would force sex on a woman if assured of not facing recrimination. Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski (1987) replicated this finding in a national sample, reporting that 50 percent of men indicated some willingness to rape.

**Incidence and Prevalence of Acquaintance Rape**

If we accept, as do the majority of researchers and scholars, that rape is predicated upon sociocultural beliefs, then it stands to reason that such beliefs, as they are ingrained within the fabric of our society, also affect how the problem is
defined and researched (White & Sorenson, 1992). Establishing the actual incidence
and prevalence of acquaintance rape is central to our understanding of rape, for
among other things, it affects the extent to which it is viewed as a serious social
problem (Berliner, 1992; White & Sorenson, 1992). Yet efforts to determine true ac­
quaintance rape rates have been hampered not only by cultural and societal factors
inhibiting disclosure by rape survivors, but also politicization of this issue. Neverthe­
less, strong recent evidence exists that acquaintance rape is more pervasive than was
previously believed.

Cultural Factors Affecting Reporting of Rape

Ultimately, all data pertaining to the scope of rape depend on information
volunteered by rape survivors (Hindelang & Davis, 1977). However, strong societal
and cultural forces and beliefs function to suppress disclosure by the rape survivor
(Koss, 1992a). Traditionally, rape survivors have been disbelieved and stigmatized.
Cultural myths such as only bad girls get raped, a woman cannot be raped against
her will and a woman's behavior provokes rape have been widely held by the criminal
justice system personnel (Kerstetter, 1990).

These traditional perceptions of women and sexuality may mean that survivors
are victimized twice, the first assault by the perpetrator and what has been labeled
the "second assault" occurring within the courts (Williams & Holmes, 1981). Rape
survivors are subjected to a higher burden of proof than that associated with other
offenses. Frequently, they must submit to demeaning examination by both defense
attorneys and prosecutors of their personal lives, attire and previous sexual history in order to establish that they did not consent to the act—although recently-enacted rape shield laws may preclude the public revelation of certain portions of this information obtained if the case actually goes to trial (Shelton, 1994). The National Organization for Women’s Legal Defense and Education Fund cites instances where judges dismissed rape cases because they found the defendant handsome or thought the victim "ended up enjoying [herself]" (Shelton, 1994). This higher burden manifests itself in arrest and conviction rates. Of the 10 percent of all rapes that are reported to police, fewer than 40 percent result in an arrest, with an even lower conviction rate of three percent. For comparison purposes, the conviction rate for robbery is 18 percent (FBI, 1982). Not surprisingly, rape victims often determine that potential losses outweigh possible benefits of reporting the crime committed against them to police.

Adding to the problem of underreporting of acquaintance rape are cultural stereotypes regarding what constitutes "real rape" (Klemack & Klemack, 1976). Schreiber (1994) claims that the term "date rape" seems to work against its victims. Instead of helping people to understand that rape primarily happens with people you know, the term has become another opportunity to blame the victim and make her feel partially responsible for the crime. The term, originally meant to be descriptive "has become a qualifier, as if date rape is somehow a lesser kind of rape" (Shreiber, 1994). Recent debate in the popular media reveals that many feel that date rape
should be considered a less serious crime (Gibbs, 1994). The New York Post wrote in an editorial about the William Kennedy Smith case, "If the sexual encounter, forced or not, has been preceded by a series of consensual activities--drinking, a trip to the man's home, a walk on a deserted beach at 3 in the morning--the charge that's leveled against the alleged offender should, it seems to us, be different than the one filed against, say, the youths who raped and beat the jogger." (Cited in Gibbs, 1994).

In support of Gibbs (1994) and Shreiber (1994), research demonstrates that people are more likely to define an incident as rape if the offender is a stranger who uses physical force against a victim who fights back and is injured (Bachman, 1993; Bourque, 1989; Estrich, 1987). Thus, acquaintance rape victims are less likely to label their experience as rape than are victims of stranger rape (Koss, Dinero, Seibel, & Cox, 1988). Of a national sample of college women who had an experience meeting the legal definition of rape, roughly a quarter of them defined their experience as rape. Still another quarter thought the incident was some type of crime, but not rape, and the remaining half did not consider the episode to qualify as a crime at all (Koss, 1988).

Although Bachman (1993) argues that in recent years, the victim-offender relationship has not been related to a rape victim's decision to report the crime to police, Ruback (1993) disagrees. While acknowledging an increase in the reporting of nonstranger rapes, Ruback notes that both victims and others use the existence of a prior relationship to determine whether sexual contact is defined as rape or
consensual activity. Furthermore, the level of physical resistance and the amount of injury are dependent on the prior relationship between victim and offender, with acquaintance rapes evidencing less resistance and less injury (Ruback & Ivie, 1988; Kanin, 1984). Thus, acquaintance rape remains less likely to be defined as a crime and the relationship between victim and offender does indirectly affect a decision to report a rape.

Federal Rape Rate Data

Rape rate data is commonly described in terms of incidence and prevalence. Incidence refers to the number of new cases appearing within a fixed time period, usually a year, and is often expressed in terms of a victimization rate, which is obtained by dividing the number of incidents by the number of persons in the population. This rate is then set to a standard population base. Prevalence figures represent an attempt to estimate the number of women who have been victimized by rape within their lifetime.

The two federal sources of data regarding the incidence of rape in the United States are the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) compiled by the FBI which includes rapes reported to local authorities and the National Crime Survey (NCS) from the Bureau of Justice Statistics based on data from a representative sample of Americans over age 11. Both sources define rape as penile-vaginal penetration perpetrated by force and against the will of the victim. Excluded from this definition are rapes where the offender was the legal or common-law spouse of the victim, rapes involving forms
of penetration other than penile-vaginal intercourse, and rapes in which no force was used with the rapist taking advantage of a victim incapacitated by drugs or alcohol, mental illness or mental retardation. Attempted and completed rapes are included in the statistics.

Rape researchers agree that neither of these federal sources presents an accurate picture of the incidence of rape (Koss, 1992a). Indeed, the FBI itself acknowledges the inaccuracy of UCR statistics, through its recognition that rape is one of the most underreported crimes (FBI, 1982), with less than half of all rapes believed to be reported to police. Although the NCS was intended to gather information on all crimes, not just those reported to police, it also seems to fall short of estimating true rape rates (Koss, 1992a). For example, NCS estimates that rape victimization rates in 1989 occurred at the rate of 1.2 per 1000 women and girls, with 51 percent of the identified rapes said to be reported to police (BJS, 1991). Yet when compared with UCR data for that year, the NCS projects far less than twice as many rapes (135,410) than were actually reported to police (102,555). Thus the reported rapes exceeded 51 percent of projected rapes, a fact that appears to indicate that the NCS estimate is too low.

A number of methodological problems may be responsible for the inaccurate picture obtained by NCS, but the primary difficulty is easily pinpointed to inadequate rape screening items that do not directly and specifically ask the respondent if he or she has ever been raped (Koss, 1992a). For example, until 1991 the NCS interviewer
asked about assaults using the following specific question: "Were you knifed, shot at, or attacked with some other weapon by anyone at all?" (BJS, 1991, p. 108) In contrast, the screening question for rape was more nebulous: "Did anyone try to attack you in some other way?" (BJS, 1991, p. 108). This ambiguous questioning contributed greatly to underreporting (Koss, 1992a).

**Research Findings on Rape Incidence and Prevalence**

Because of their sound, state-of-the-art methodological procedures, large scale research studies such as the Ms. Magazine Project on Campus Sexual Assault are considered by many to be more accurate sources of information regarding the incidence and prevalence of acquaintance rape. Koss and colleagues administered ten behaviorally specific sexual screening items to a nationwide sample of 3187 women college students at 32 representative colleges and universities. Using the UCR definition, 76 per 1000 college women experienced one or more completed or attempted rapes in a 12-month period (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). When rape was defined according to state statutes that have been recently reformed to define rape as nonconsensual sexual penetration of a woman obtained by physical force, by threat of bodily harm or when the victim is incapable of giving consent by virtue of mental illness, mental retardation or intoxication, the incidence figure doubled to 166 per 1000 women (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). This figure again included both attempted and completed rapes.
A comparison between rape rates obtained in the *Ms. Magazine* study and federal data would be instructive, yet should be undertaken cautiously, as Koss and Harvey (1994) warn. Because the *Ms* data was obtained from a college student population rather than a representative sample of all U.S. households, this sample contained women with a higher than average educational level. Although less educated persons are commonly thought to be subject to more victimizations, college educated respondents typically recall more crimes than others, a phenomenon known as differential productivity. Furthermore, NCS information is gathered under conditions of bounded recall, in which the first contact with researchers serves as a reference point from which to begin remembering. On the other hand, *Ms* subjects were contacted only once and were asked to remember victimizations occurring within the past year. Under such conditions, telescoping, the tendency to compress time and overreport the occurrence of events (Bradburn, 1983) may occur. Experiences may be remembered as having occurred closer to (forward telescoping) or further from (backward telescoping) the present than they actually did.

Because research shows that data collected using unbounded recall produces estimates one third higher than those using bounded recall, Koss and Harvey (1994) reduced the *Ms* estimate of rape incidence among college women from 76 to 50 per 1000 women. When they compared this statistic with the corresponding NCS data, the *Ms* rate was still between 10 and 15 times higher than 1985 NCS estimates for women age 16 to 19 (4.3 per 1000) and 20 to 24 (3.4 per 1000).
In terms of prevalence, researchers found that 15 percent of college women had had an experience meeting the legal definition of rape as defined in most state statutes. An additional 12 percent had experienced attempted rape. This study does not stand alone in the literature. Prevalence estimates of completed rapes ranging from 15 to 25 percent have been obtained in several large scale surveys, including surveys of women in San Francisco (24 percent) (Russell, 1982), Los Angeles (28 percent rate for college-educated women age 18-39 years) (Sorenson, Stein, Siegel, Golding, & Burnam, 1987), Cleveland (20 percent) (Koss, Woodruff, & Koss, 1991), and Charleston (23 percent) (Kilpatrick, Saunders, Veronen, Best, & Von, 1987).

Estimates are that half of all rapes are committed by someone the victim knows (Amir, 1971). But again, higher rates have been obtained in self-report surveys. In the Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski (1987) national sample, 84% of rape victims knew their attacker. Of rape victims identified in a probability sample of 930 San Francisco residents, 88% knew the perpetrator (Russell, 1984). Ninety-two percent of a smaller sample (N=125) of college women knew their assailants at least casually (Mynatt & Allgeier, 1990).

**Political Consideration of Rape Rate Research**

Pointing to the high rape rates obtained by some researchers, feminists have charged that acquaintance rape is the "hidden crime" and that we are in the midst of a "silent epidemic" (Gibbs, 1994), thus raising acquaintance rape as a political issue.
and reasserting Brownmiller's (1975) argument that rape is a political crime that effectively maintains one sexes' dominance over the other. Such claims have caused others to make counterclaims, buttressing their arguments with criticisms of rape rate data obtained by researchers. One of the most vociferous critics is Neil Gilbert, who especially targets the 1987 national survey by Koss, Gidycz and Wisniewski. He charged that "radical feminists have distorted the definition of rape and created a bogus epidemic" (Hendrix, 1991). However, Koss (1992b) ably defended her methods and findings, rebutting Gilbert's three major assertions.

According to Koss, Gilbert's first claim—that the obtained rape rates defined rape so broadly that the rates include such events as sex that a woman subsequently regrets and subjection to sexual innuendo—is clearly in error. She clarified that while the national survey asked questions about other types of sexual victimization which included unwanted touching and intercourse following verbal coercion, these data were not included in the rape frequency figures.

Another basis for the criticism of rape statistics has been that many rape victims in the national study and in other studies failed to label their experience as rape. Koss (1992) pointed out that the experiences of these women met legal definitions of rape and further stated that "the failure to embrace the correct legal label for one's victimization does not mean that the victimization did not occur" (p. 124).
Finally, critics asserted that because 40% of the women reported having sex again with the men who raped them, the women were not raped and statistics were artificially inflated. As Koss points out, many explanations for this finding exist. Eight of 10 rape victims in the national survey knew the man who raped them and 60% were romantically involved with him. Possible reasons for additional contacts between the victim and rapist include future sexual contacts with spouse or boyfriend that were not forced, additional rapes by the perpetrator, and misguided attempts by the victim to return to the rapist to try a different strategy to control his behavior. Almost half of the rape victims in the national study were virgins and lacked knowledge of what consensual intercourse should be like. Whether after the first rape or the second, 87% of the rape victims ended the relationship with the person who raped them.

Exploring both sides of this political debate, Berliner (1992) concluded that while examining the validity of data is essential to the scientific process, in this case the criticism of rape rates by Gilbert and others has been driven by advocacy rather than dispassionate scientific debate. While she did not address claims that acquaintance rape is a "hidden epidemic," she located no evidence to discredit the findings of the researchers that actual and attempted rape rates are extremely high, with the largest majority of rapes perpetrated by an acquaintance.
Motivation for Rape: Sexual or Aggressive?

Determining incidence of rape has been but one of the highly politicized issues surrounding this complex social problem. Debate also continues on the question of why rapists rape. As Hegeman and Meikle (1980) point out, rapists' motivations have usually been classified as sexual, aggressive, or some combination thereof. Early feminists argued strongly against the sexual motivation of rape. In her book *Against Our Will*, Brownmiller (1975) stated that rape is an act of dominance, humiliation and aggression, the only sexual aspect being that the penis is used as a weapon.

This explanation has gained some acceptance among experts, but has not gone unquestioned. Palmer (1988), while acknowledging that feminist efforts have virtually eliminated among researchers the claim that rape is a sexually arousing experience for the victim, challenged the denial of sexual motivation on the part of the rapist. In examining twelve arguments commonly used to support the assertion that rape is not sexually motivated, he found all twelve to be either logically unsound, untestable, based on inaccurate definitions or inconsistent with the actual behavior of rapists. In conclusion, he agreed with Finkelhor (1984) that at least partial sexual motivation cannot be logically denied and that the goal of research with actual rapists should be to determine how sexuality interacts with other motivational factors.

Research with Acquaintance Rapists

Not surprisingly, the majority of the debate surrounding motivation for rape has focused on stranger rape. When considering the motivations of acquaintance rapists,
the issue becomes even more clouded. In one of the few studies with actual acquaintance rapists, Kanin (1984) found support for cultural influence, but his results on motivation were ambiguous. The 71 self-disclosed acquaintance rapists in Kanin's study, compared to a control group of 227 male, never-married university students, were shown to be products of a "highly erotic-oriented peer group socialization that started during the junior high and high school years" (p. 98). This socialization process, according to Kanin, continues into the college years and associates sexual conquest with feelings of self-worth. In partial support of his assertions, Kanin notes the response to a question regarding the number of heterosexual orgasms experienced during the average month of the past year. Rapists were much more active than controls, experiencing on average 1.5 per week compared to .8 per month for controls. But the rapists were significantly more likely to evaluate their sexual achievements as unsatisfactory.

Regarding the rape incident, all of the men had reported being in a similar situation on a prior date, but 91 percent had not raped. When questioned about the reason they raped on the occasion in question, they focused on two factors. The first of these was their perception of their dates' extreme sexual arousal, which intensified their own arousal to the point that they mostly ignored their dates' signals to stop. All of the rapes took place after some consensual sexual activity, with approximately 84 percent occurring after some genital play, usually orogenital. Typically, the men
reported that it was difficult to take their date's signals seriously considering the level of intimacy previously achieved.

Kanin found that 18 percent of the men responded to their dates' rejection of further sexual activity with high level anger responses. The majority reported feeling confused and wondering what they were doing wrong, with 31 percent reporting subsequent low level anger responses and the remaining 51 percent resisting characterization of their feelings as anger. These men continued to describe themselves as anxious and confused, emphasizing that they could never have performed sexually if they were experiencing anger.

The second factor used by these men to explain their behavior was alcohol. Two thirds of the men indicated that they had been drinking excessively and one fifth emphasized that the incident would never have occurred if they had not been drinking. Another 41 percent identified alcohol as playing a disinhibiting role in their behavior.

Regarding violence and force used by these rapists, Kanin reported no threats with weapons and low use of fists. The rapists physically overpowered the victims in what Kanin characterized as "mismatched wrestling contests" (p. 101). In 68 percent of the incidents, the woman had clearly stipulated as to her maximum level of sexual activity prior to any consensual activity. And most of the victims resisted verbally and physically to the rape.
Comparisons Between Acquaintance and Stranger Rapists

Contrasting Kanin's results with those of Scully and Marolla (1985) reveals interesting similarities and differences. Scully and Marolla interviewed 114 convicted rapists (almost exclusively stranger rapists) in an attempt to determine the function of sexual violence in their lives. Their analysis reveals that some raped to punish or gain revenge, some used it as a means to gain access to unwilling or unavailable women and some described rape as a form of impersonal sex that gained the offender power over his victims.

Many of the rapists emphasize the aggressive, power motivation for rape, as is evident in the following statement: "Rape was a feeling of total dominance. Before the rapes, I would always get a feeling of power and anger. I would degrade women so I could feel there was a person of less worth than me" (p. 256). But Scully and Marolla also emphasized that their data indicate that rape is in part sexually motivated, using this statement to buttress their argument: "All the guys wanted to fuck her . . . a real fox, beautiful shape. She was a beautiful woman and I wanted to see what she had" (p. 257).

While the level of violence reported by the 71 acquaintance rapists in Kanin's study is lower, their descriptions parallel those of the convicted stranger rapists interviewed by Scully and Marolla. The acquaintance rapists did not acknowledge a sense of dominance as readily, but some did report responding to the sexual limit setting of their dates with anger. It could be argued, as Scully and Marolla do about
the convicted stranger rapists, that the acquaintance rapists also held the belief that sex is a male entitlement and that when a woman says "no," rape is a suitable means of conquering the offending object.

Kanin, in looking at the roles of the sexual and power-aggression dimensions, concluded that while it may be more appropriate to stress the power-aggression dimension in such incarcerated, stranger rapist samples, in his acquaintance rapist sample, the sexual dimension should be more stressed. He noted: "It does not seem implausible that if a sexual act can be utilized for the gratification of power and other allied nonsexual needs, then power can be employed for the acquisition of sexual gratification" (p. 105).

Characteristics of Acquaintance Rape

Recent research has provided much information regarding the actual phenomenon of acquaintance rape and characteristics of the participants. Regarding the rape itself, Ward and associates (1991) found that among a sample of 518 women, 30 percent of whom had experienced unwanted attempted and/or completed sexual intercourse, unwanted sexual contact typically occurred in dormitories, off-campus apartments and fraternities. The women were mostly raped by a man that they knew casually: 59 percent were friends, acquaintances or strangers whom they had just met. But one third of the women were raped by their boyfriends. Most incidents occurred during or after parties, with male alcohol use involved in 75 percent and female alcohol use in 55 percent of all rapes. In about half of the
completed sexual assaults, the male "just did it," but verbal tactics, including arguments, pressure and verbal threats, were used by one third of the males. The men used or threatened to use force in 21 percent of the rapes. In response, the majority of women (70 percent) said no and made other verbal protests. A proportion of the women (20 percent) indicated that they were too frightened or intimidated to protest, but 28 percent physically struggled against their attacker.

Levine-MacCombie and Koss (1986) attempted to discriminate between rape victims and women who avoided rape. From a sample of 500 women, they identified women who had experienced an attack meeting the legal definition of rape and those who had experienced force or threat of force to engage in sexual intercourse but for one reason or another had avoided victimization. Victims could be discriminated from avoiders by the situational characteristics of their assault. Avoiders differed from victims in that they reported experiencing less intense feelings of self-blame and fear during the assault; they did not necessarily feel more anger than women who were victimized. In addition, avoiders perceived the assault as less violent and were more likely to use the active resistance strategies of screaming for help and running away. As a resistance strategy, quarreling with the offender was highly ineffective, and physical resistance resulted in assault completion as frequently as it did assault avoidance.

Attempts to distinguish acquaintance rapists from non-rapists, have found that men who accept stereotypical myths about rape, hold adversarial views about
male/female relationships, ascribe to traditional attitudes regarding sex roles and condone violence against women are more tolerant of rape, more blaming of rape victims and are more likely to report that they would rape if they could be assured of no repercussions (Koss, Leonard, Beezley, & Oros, 1985; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987). Adherence to these rape supportive attitudes has also been linked to actual experience as a perpetrator (Fischer, 1992; Malamuth, 1986).

**Differential Effects on Rape Victims**

Although many see acquaintance rape as a less serious crime than stranger rape (Klemmack & Klemmack, 1976), research with victims has not supported this assumption. In a number of longitudinal studies, the victim-offender relationship has failed to predict levels of post-rape depression, fear and social maladjustment (Ellis, Atkeson, & Calhoun, 1981; Frank, Turner, & Stewart, 1980; Kilpatrick, Veronen, & Best, 1985; Ruch & Chandler, 1983). The one exception to this finding occurred in a study in which interviewers rated the severity of post-rape symptoms of a group of victims within the first year following victimization and found those raped by a casual acquaintance to be more severely maladjusted than those raped by a friend, family member or total stranger (McCahill, Meyer, & Fischman, 1979).

After correcting a possible methodological shortcoming of earlier studies by expanding their sample to include non-help seeking and non-reporting victims, Koss, Dinero, Seibel, and Cox (1988) also found virtually no difference in the levels of psychological symptoms between different types of rape victims. Rather than
dichotomizing the victims, as was done in much earlier research, comparisons were made between groups of victims whose offenders were nonromantic acquaintances, casual dates, steady dates, and spouses or other close family members. Results supported earlier research. Measures of post-rape depression, anxiety, relationship satisfaction and sexual satisfaction revealed that rape has a clinically significant impact on victims regardless of the type of victim-offender relationship.

Mynatt and Allgeier (1990), using a non-help-seeking sample and specific levels of acquaintance, also found level of acquaintance to be a negligible factor in predicting adjustment problems. But moving beyond earlier studies, they identified other variables that may affect the severity of response to rape. Women who had been coerced by means of psychological rather than physical force, women who had been more physically injured and women who accepted the use of interpersonal violence reported more adjustment problems than did women who were physically coerced, women who were less physically injured and women who rejected the use of interpersonal violence.

Cultural Influences upon Victim Recovery

Some evidence exists that acquaintance rape victims may experience a more difficult and lengthy recovery from their experience than those victimized by strangers (Benson, Charlton, & Goodhart, 1992). Often acquaintance rape victims delay seeking treatment (Gidycz & Koss, 1991). Furthermore, when raped by men they know, women attribute more blame to themselves, have a less positive self-image and
experience greater difficulty establishing trust (Katz, 1991). They also rate themselves as less recovered than stranger rape victims for up to three years after the rape (Burt & Katz, 1988).

Cultural factors may perhaps account for this finding. Social influences can play a role in the recovery of both stranger and acquaintance rape survivors by affecting both responses to victims by others and victims' reactions to themselves through their self-attributions of responsibility. Rape victims have commonly been thought to be responsible to some extent for their own victimization (Thornton et. al, 1988). They have been variously perceived as having made themselves vulnerable to attack (Brownmiller, 1975), unconsciously desiring the assault (Schultz, 1975), provoking the assault through their enticing behavior and dress (Brownmiller, 1975; Groth, 1979) and/or being of questionable moral character (Brownmiller, 1975). Broad psychological support exists for the hypothesis that support and help from others in the victim's environment are essential to overcoming the negative aftereffects of rape (Winkel & Koppelaar, 1991). When victims report experiences that deviate from the popular conception that rape is perpetrated by a stranger, outdoors, and with a great deal of violence, they are treated with more suspicion, as the environment doubts whether or not the victim was actually raped (Johnson & Jackson, 1988; Williams, 1984). Thus, acquaintance rape victims may be even less likely than victims of strangers to receive the essential social support needed for their complete recovery.
Another factor thought to influence post-rape distress is the attribution made by the victim regarding the cause of the rape (Frazier, 1990). Two hypotheses have been proposed regarding self-blame. Self-blame has been alternately seen as detrimental to a victim's recovery (Burgess & Holstrom, 1974) or adaptive to recovery as long as the blame is directed toward specific controllable behaviors (behavioral self-blame) (Janoff-Bulman, 1979). According to this latter hypothesis, behavioral self-blame can have a positive impact on recovery because victims may feel that by changing those behaviors they can avoid future instances of rape. The type of self-blame that is considered harmful under this formulation is characterological, which is directed at stable, uncontrollable aspects of the self.

In a test of these hypotheses, Frazier (1990) found that many rape victims did engage in some self-blame, but tended to place more responsibility on the rapist and other external factors. Among those who did engage in self-blame, both the behavioral and characterological types were associated with increased post-rape depression. However, results did indicate that those victims who believe that they will be able to avoid future rapes, demonstrate less post-rape depression. As noted previously, acquaintance rape survivors tend to engage in more self-blame than women raped by strangers (Katz, 1991).

Interestingly, victims’ self-attributions of responsibility also influenced how victims are treated by their environment. In a study that included both rape crisis counselors and male and female lay observers, a victim’s expression of character-
ological or behavioral self-blame resulted in more negative impressions of the victim's emotional well-being on the part of observers (Thornton et. al, 1988). In addition, those victims who made attributions of self-responsibility rather than relying on chance explanations were also held more responsible for their victimization by observers. This bias held for rape crisis counselors as well as lay persons.

Cultural conceptions of how a victim ought to react to an assault may also affect the degree to which they are believed and supported. Research has demonstrated two basic styles of reacting to crime (Horowitz, 1976). In the emotional style of self-presentation, the victim's distress is clearly visible to observers, whereas in the numbed self-presentation style, victims communicate about their victimization in a much more controlled manner, with feelings stringently held in check. Winkel and Koppelaar (1991) found that victims who exhibit the emotional communication style were perceived more positively than victims exhibiting the numbed self-presentation. The emotional victim was more credible to subjects, who felt that she exhibited caution and was not responsible for her victimization. Thus, victims who initially react to their victimization by keeping tight control over their feelings of fear and hysteria, may be less likely to be believed by friends, family and criminal justice personnel, thus decreasing the amount and/or quality of social support received.

Findings of Rape Attributions Research

In spite of the fact that most women are raped by someone they know, the large majority of early research reflected societal concern with stranger rape and
examined primarily the phenomenon of victim blaming. The studies examined lay attributions, typically using a college student sample. The research can be roughly grouped into four categories: examinations of victim characteristics, perpetrator attributes, characteristics of the observer, and aspects of the situation.

Victim Characteristics

A number of victim characteristics and behaviors have resulted in greater attributions of responsibility to rape victims. Among the variables manipulated are victim respectability, attractiveness, provocativeness, carelessness, and previous sexual behavior. For example, several studies have presented scenarios to subjects in which a woman is raped, varying only the degree of respectability of the victim.

Findings have been consistent regarding this particular victim characteristic, with respectable victims, such nuns or schoolteachers, held less responsible than less respectable ones like women working as callgirls or topless dancers (Kanekar & Seksaria, 1993; Luginbuhl & Mullin, 1981; McCaul, Veltum, Boyechko, & Crawford, 1990).

Manipulations of physical attractiveness have produced inconsistent effects on victim judgments but more stable effects of judgments regarding the attacker's responsibility. Seligman, Brickman and Koulack (1977) and Tieger (1981) found that unattractive victims were held more responsible for their assaults while the attacker was held less responsible. However, studies by Gerdes, Dammann and Heilig (1988) and Jacobson and Popovich (1983) have found no results for victim blame, but have
replicated findings that rapists of attractive victims are viewed more harshly than when the victim is unattractive. One possible explanation is that unattractive victims are seen as unlikely targets and thus are judged more likely to have provoked the assault (Pollard, 1992).

Of victim behavior, two commonly manipulated dimensions are victim carelessness and attire. Four studies (Acock & Ireland, 1983; Pallak & Davies, 1982; Kanekar, Pinto, & Mazumdar, 1985; Damrosch, 1985) found that women who failed to take precautions against being raped, such as by not varying a route when walking home late at night, leaving a car unlocked or giving a ride to a stranger, were held more responsible for their victimization. Similarly, rape victims were found to be more at fault when they wore sexy or revealing clothing (McCaul, Veltum, Boyechko, & Crawford, 1990; Cahoon & Edmonds, 1989; Edmonds and Cahoon, 1986; Kanekar & Kolsawalla, 1980; Yarmey, 1985).

Previous sexual activity has also been examined and found to influence victim blame. Scenarios in which victims had participated in at least one previous sexual relationship resulted in fewer guilty verdicts by mock jurors than those in which the victim was a virgin (Schult & Schneider, 1991; Borgida & White, 1978; L'Armand & Pepitone, 1982; Pugh, 1983).

Resistance to rape has also been associated with victim blame. Warner and Hewitt (1993) found that women offering no resistance to rape by a stranger were held more responsible by mock jurors than those offering verbal or physical
resistance. But interestingly, Branscombe and Weir (1992) found that while some resistance was necessary to convince observers that a rape did occur, increasing amounts of resistance can ultimately result in the opposite judgment. In their opinion, too much resistance on the part of a victim increases sympathy for the rapist, decreases observer confidence that an assault actually was rape, decreases the prescribed sentence, and raises questions about the victim's possible causal role in producing the outcome. Apparently, observers judge that if a perpetrator attends to a victim's resistance for a relatively long period of time without proceeding with the rape, the victim probably could have escaped rape if she had really wanted to avoid the contact. Finally, the point at which resistance occurs has also been found to influence attributions of blame, with victims whose protest begins late in foreplay held more responsible than those who protest earlier (Langley, et al. 1990; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983).

Perpetrator Characteristics

The relationship between characteristics of an alleged rapist and the attribution of responsibility have also been studied. One such factor is perpetrator attractiveness. Not surprisingly, physical attractiveness has been found to be an advantage to rapists, decreasing perceptions of guilt and length of assigned sentences (Gerdes, Dammann, & Heilig, 1988; Yarmey, 1985; Kanekar & Kolsawalla, 1981). Level of force used by the assailant has also been examined with consistent findings that greater violence leads to increased likelihood that the incident will be labeled rape and the
defendant held more responsible (Lovell, 1993; McCaul, Veltum, Boyechko, & Crawford, 1990; Shetland & Goodstein, 1983). Finally, Kleinke, Wallis, and Stalder (1991) found that rapists who confessed rather than denied their intention to rape were held more responsible, while those who expressed rather than denied remorse were evaluated more favorably.

Observer Characteristics

Evidence regarding two commonly examined subject differences (i.e., gender and sex-role attitudes) is somewhat inconsistent (Pollard, 1992). Several studies would seem to indicate general sex differences in judgments, with female subjects attributing less responsibility to a rape victim than males (Brekke & Borgida, 1988; Deitz, Littman, & Bentley, 1984; Edmonds & Cahoon, 1986; Johnson & Jackson, 1988; Luginbuhl & Mullin, 1981). Yet others have found no sex differences (Acock & Ireland, 1983; Krahe, 1988; L’Armand, & Pepitone, 1982; Yarmey, 1985).

Females have also been found to be more likely to believe in the defendant's guilt and recommend conviction (Borgida & White, 1978; Brekke & Borgida, 1988; Deitz, Littman, & Bentley, 1984; Pugh, 1983). But sentencing findings demonstrate more disparity with some studies showing females as recommending longer sentences (Gerdes, Damman, & Heilig, 1988; Wiener & Rinehart, 1986) and some demonstrating no sex differences (Brekke & Borgida, 1988; Check & Malamuth, 1984; Kleinke & Meyer, 1990).
Sex role attitudes and acceptance of common myths about rape have been found to be related to victim blame, with those holding traditional attitudes and believing in rape myths attributing greater responsibility to rape victims (Acock & Ireland, 1983; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983; Check & Malamuth, 1985; Krahe, 1988). Women have been found to be less accepting of rape myths (Burt, 1980; Check & Malamuth, 1985) than males. Some evidence exists (Shotland & Goodstein, 1983) that attitudinal factors rather than gender per se may be more important mediators of rape attributions (Pollard, 1992).

Still other studies (Deitz, Blackwell, Daley, & Bentley, 1982; Deitz, Littman, & Bentley, 1984, Weir & Wrightsman, 1990) have examined the effects of rape empathy on judgments of responsibility for rape. This research has found that observers often make attributions of responsibility that are consistent with their feelings of sympathy for the victim. Those who identify and empathize with the victim, hold the rapist responsible and those who identify with the rapist absolve him of blame.

Situational Variables

Approximately 75 percent of all acquaintance rapes involve consumption of alcohol on the part of the victim, rapist or both (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). Yet surprisingly little research exists regarding the effect that such drinking has on third party attributions. Richardson and Campbell (1982) created scenarios of an acquaintance rape in which the perpetrator, victim, both or neither were intoxicated. They found that subjects attributed less responsibility to the male offender and more
to the situation when he was drunk rather than sober. But conversely, the drunk victim was assigned more responsibility and judged to be less moral and more aggressive than her sober counterpart. The authors suggest that intoxication may be acceptable sex role behavior for men but not for women.

Another study varying drinking behavior (Norris & Cubbins, 1992) asked subjects to make judgments regarding both victim and attacker behaviors and traits. Findings were partially consistent with those of Richardson and Campbell (1982), except that across conditions the attacker was attributed a high degree of responsibility with the victim garnering a moderate amount. In addition, the researchers found that when both parties have been drinking, subjects were less certain that an acquaintance rape has occurred, the victim was not viewed as reacting negatively to the incident and the attacker was judged more likeable. One possible implication is that a woman and man drinking together appears to signify an expectation that sexual activity will occur. On the other hand, when only the female drinks, the perpetrator is judged more harshly, perhaps because he is seen as taking advantage of a woman who is in a vulnerable position. The male only drinking condition resulted in judgments that the female was relatively responsive sexually, perhaps because sex roles prescribe high sexual drive for men and alcohol plays a disinhibiting role; thus women who remain with a man who has been drinking indicate by their presence a willingness to engage in sexual intercourse.
New Approaches to Rape Research

Typically, the methodology for the studies summarized previously involves asking the subjects to read an account of a rape (usually a stranger rape) and make a variety of judgments that, although they differ from study to study, consistently include the assignment of relative responsibility of the parties involved. These studies have yielded a large, rather disorganized volume of informational cues regarding perpetrators, victims and subjects, but only hint at underlying cognitive processes affecting attributions. Recently, a number of studies have taken a more holistic approach, using creative research designs in an attempt to identify models and potential cognitive mediators of rape judgments.

Model of Rape Attribution Decision Process

Many early studies were concerned with identifying situational cues that lead subjects to blame victims for their own victimization. Shotland and Goodstein (1983) have taken a more holistic position, as they investigated variables involved in deciding whether or not a rape has taken place and tested a model of the decision process of rape attribution using a dating situation. They asked subjects to read a detailed description of a date scenario that varied the onset of victim protest (early, middle or late), type of victim protest (verbal, verbal and physical) and the amount of force used by the perpetrator (low and moderate). After reading the scenario, subjects responded to five-point Likert items measuring the extent to which subjects held the victim responsible for her rape (victim blame/responsibility scale) and subjects'
perceptions of the woman's desire to engage in sexual intercourse (desire for sex scale). In addition, subjects' judgments of the perpetrator's level of violence toward the victim and their perception of whether a rape occurred were each measured with a single item.

Shotland and Goodstein found that the amount of force used by the male and type and onset of protest by female were predictive of subjects' willingness to label an incident rape. When the woman began to protest, either by pleading alone or pleading coupled with physical resistance, after a significant amount of foreplay and when the male used a low degree of force, subjects were more likely to blame the woman and see her as desiring sex. Conversely, when there was more force with early and strong protest, the man was seen as more violent and the incident was more likely to be labeled rape. No overall sex differences were found, but attitudes toward women were significant predictors.

Based on the results of their study, Shotland and Goodstein concluded that the determination of whether or not a rape has occurred depends on the attributions that lay persons make regarding the violence of the male and the female's desire for sex.

Addition of gender differences to model of rape attribution decision process. Langley and colleagues (1991) advanced Shotland and Goodstein's (1983) causal model, proposing that men and women are influenced by different cognitive mediators and utilize different heuristics in the rape attribution process. Adapting the
scenarios used by Shotland and Goodstein by excluding the type of victim protest variable (verbal, verbal and physical) and adding more subjects to increase statistical power, they found that the rape victim was blamed the most if protest began later in foreplay, if the perpetrator used less force and by male subjects. For male subjects, but not female, the degree of force used and the perceived violence of the incident affected judgments of whether or not the incident was rape and whether the victim desired sexual intercourse.

Judgments of Sexual Pleasure as Predictor of Victim Blaming

A study by McCaul, Veltum, Boyechko, and Crawford (1990) adds further support to Shotland and Goodstein's contention that observers conceptualize acts of rape along the dimensions of sex and violence. They theorized that judgments about sex and violence represent implicit judgments of victim intentions. A rape incident that is conceptualized sexually was hypothesized to result in more victim blame/responsibility because sexual relationships are by their very nature participatory--one intends to engage in sex with another. Conversely, when an incident is judged to be violent, less victim blaming was expected, as the observer is more likely to think of the victim as intending to avoid the assault.

To test their model, subjects read one of two versions of nine scenarios with each scenario varying one parameter found to influence victim blaming: victim respectability, victim resistance, victim attractiveness, physical harm inflicted, victim familiarity with the assailant, degree of pleasure experienced by the victim, victim
gender, marital status of the victim and the victim's prior experience with sexual assault. After reading each description, subjects were asked to partition 100 points of blame among three possible sources: the perpetrator, the victim and the situation. In addition, participants rated the possibility that the victim derived sexual pleasure from the incident using a 0 (absolutely impossible) to 100 (extremely possible) scale.

Although across descriptions, subjects blamed the perpetrator most, followed by the situation, and the victim least (M=10.1), considerable variability in victim blaming was attained. Furthermore, judgments of whether the victim experienced sexual pleasure strongly predicted blame attributions with higher ratings of pleasure resulting in stronger victim blaming.

A second study was done to strengthen their model. Utilizing the same rape descriptions, McCaul and colleagues (1990) asked subjects to judge on 7-point Likert scales the extent to which the victim should have been able to foresee being raped and the extent to which the incident involved sexual pleasure versus violence. In addition, subjects attributed responsibility and blame to the victim. Results demonstrated that both perception of pleasure and foreseeability predicted victim blaming within and across incidents. McCaul and associates (1990) found these results to support the theory that intentions and foreseeability explain attributions of victim blame. However, they caution that they did not directly test victim intentions. Perceptions of derived pleasure could simply lead observers to decide that the victim is bad and derogate her by blaming her for the victimization.
Role of Ambiguity in Desire for Sexual Intercourse

Pursuing a similar vein of research, Johnson and Jackson (1988) investigated the effect of sexual attraction and ambiguity in desire for sexual intercourse on rape judgments. Participants read scenarios in which the characters were assigned to work on a class project together and were described as disliking each other (minimal attraction), liking each other as friends (moderate attraction), or were dating (maximal attraction). In one condition, the female responded to sexual advances by the male by letting him kiss her extensively before refusing intercourse (ambiguous condition). In the other condition, the female did not respond positively to sexual advances by the male and immediately told him that she did not want to participate in sexual intercourse (unambiguous condition). The male character in both conditions then forced the female to have sexual intercourse in spite of her lack of consent.

After reading one of these scenarios, subjects judged on nine point scales relative responsibility of the male and female, the male's intent to harm the female, and likelihood that he would be found guilty of rape in a court of law. Ambiguity was found to have a significant effect, with victims held more responsible and perpetrators less when ambiguity in the victim's desire for intercourse existed. However, attraction level had no effect on attributions, perhaps indicating that attraction level is simply not as salient as lack of consent in the attribution process.
Legal Model of Rape Judgment

A different but complementary model of rape judgment was proposed and tested in two other studies (Wiener & Vodanovich, 1986; Wiener & Rinehart, 1986). According to the legal model of rape judgment, people intuitively act as lawyers, combining judgments regarding physical causality (extent to which the situation is perceived as a rape and the accused is actually the perpetrator) and psychological causality (attacker’s intention to rape) into overall determinations of rapist responsibility. Tests of this model produced interesting results.

In one study (Wiener & Vodanovich, 1986), eight crime scenarios were used to manipulate the independent variables of positive versus negative witness identification of the perpetrator leaving the scene, criminal versus non-criminal background of the accused and the previous relationship between the parties either strangers or ex-lovers. As expected, witness identification information affected judgments of physical causality, with subjects more likely to perceive the situation as rape with a positive identification of the perpetrator by an onlooker. Subjects were most confident of their ratings of attacker responsibility for the criminal attacker who was positively identified as leaving the scene. Wiener and Vodanovich also noted subjects relied on their intentionality judgments only when physical causality was in question.

More interesting were findings regarding the effects of the attacker-victim relationship. While the relationship failed to affect the overall perception of attacker
responsibility, it did influence victim responsibility, with the victim held more responsible if her rapist was an ex-lover. Regarding judgments of attacker intentionality, rapists who did not know their victims were assigned stronger intention to rape ratings. This suggests that in acquaintance rape situations, lay persons may judge that the male is acting from an expectation of sexual intimacy, rather than an intention to rape.

The second test of the model (Wiener & Rinehart, 1986) specifically evaluated dimensions of psychological causality, and findings further illuminated results in the previously described study. Subjects read a crime scenario that established physical causality and that included the accused's self-reported thoughts. The attacker's initial intention (rape vs. seduction), motivation for the attack (externally imposed attraction to an ex-lover vs. self-induced thought about a convenient stranger) and affective reaction to the attack (remorse vs. emotional satisfaction) served as independent variables.

Results on dependent measures revealed attacker responsibility to be positively correlated with intent to do violence and negatively correlated with the degree to which the attacker's thoughts are attributable to the victim rather than being self-imposed. In other words, lay persons assigned more responsibility to the attacker whose initial intentions were to rape rather than seduce and whose motivation was based on a self-induced thought about a stranger rather than an externally-imposed attraction to an ex-lover.
Effects of Perpetrator Intent and Remorse

Results of a study by Kleinke, Wallis and Salder (1991) partially support findings of the legal model, while introducing a methodological innovation. These researchers varied the expressed intent and remorse of the rapist to determine what effect, if any, there would be on observer judgments of the rapist's character and assignment of a prison sentence. Two intent conditions were created by the male character either declaring that he had planned to rape the female (intent) or that he had not meant to rape her but couldn't stop himself (no intent). Likewise, two remorse conditions were engendered when the male either said that he was sorry and wished it had never happened (expressed remorse) or said that he didn't feel one way or another about the incident but had simply done what he had to do (denied remorse). In two conditions, the intent and/or the remorse statements were omitted.

Following their review of the described rapes, subjects were asked to describe the convicted rapist by expressing to what degree particular adjectives applied to the rapist. They were also asked to recommend an appropriate prison sentence. The rapist was evaluated more negatively and assigned a longer prison sentence when expressing rather than denying intent. Additionally, rapists who expressed remorse were evaluated less negatively, although remorse did not significantly affect the length of the assigned prison sentence.
Impact of Force and Resistance on Rapist Intentions

Pursuing a similar avenue of research, Lovell (1993) integrated theories regarding the importance of the sex-violence distinction to judgments about rape with a focus on the rapist. Rather than inferring the effect upon intentions or using intentions as an independent variable, Lovell directly examined the impact of force and resistance on lay attributions regarding rapist intentions, motivations and reactions to his behavior. Participants read one of four scenarios in which a rapist either ignored the protests of a victim (low perpetrator force) or verbally abused and physically restrained and slapped a victim (higher perpetrator force). The victim either protested verbally after a high degree of sexual intimacy had been achieved (low victim resistance) or resisted physically and verbally prior to much sexual contact (high victim resistance). Lovell found that levels of perpetrator force and victim resistance along with participant gender and sex role attitudes significantly affected lay attributions regarding acquaintance rapists. When rapists used a low level of force and victims a low level of resistance, the situation was more likely to be seen as the victim's responsibility because she failed to communicate. According to lay persons, the male character didn't preplan his actions or intend to commit rape, and he felt that his behavior was justified. Subjects saw him as mentally normal and felt that his actions were not motivated by a desire to achieve power over the woman.

Participants who had high sex role attitude scores (who endorsed rape myths and adversarial sexual beliefs) revealed a tendency to blame the victim and absolve
the perpetrator of responsibility. Female participants, in general, saw the perpetrator's actions as more power motivated than did male participants.

Considering responses across experimental conditions, 84% of respondents felt that the rapist's actions were at least partially sexually motivated, while 35% asserted power motivation. Thus, while the independent variables of participant gender, perpetrator force and victim resistance affected judgments of power motivation, the majority of participants saw sexual needs as playing a greater role in an acquaintance rapist's motivation.

Yet 64% believed that the perpetrator intended to rape her and felt that his actions were planful. The rapist was satisfied with his actions according to 74% of participants, but only 8% of them indicated that they would have felt and acted in the same manner as the rapist. The majority of people (90%) held the perpetrator responsible for the situation, although 29% viewed the victim as wholly or partially responsible as well.

Looking at causal factors, 50% thought that the situation was a matter of miscommunication between the parties, 43% believed the perpetrator to be mentally unstable and 51% felt that sex role socialization played a role.

**New Rape Typologies**

Although rape has typically been dichotomized as stranger rape or acquaintance/date rape, arguments have been advanced that other typologies may be more accurate and useful (Ward, Chapman, Cohn, White, & Williams, 1991; Shotland, 1989,
Ward and associates noted that this dichotomy does not particularly fit an anonymous type of victimization occurring when women meet men at a social function and are later assaulted, usually after one or both parties have consumed large quantities of alcohol or drugs. They argued that such individuals are more like strangers than acquaintances, the standard definition of this term being persons who know each other but who are not friends. Instead, they suggest classifying rape into four categories: standard stranger rape, party rape (in which the victim and perpetrator are strangers but are part of the same social scene), acquaintance rape (in which the victim and perpetrator are friends, dormmates, or classmates) and date rape (in which the two are seeing each other in a dating relationship ranging from a first date to a boyfriend-girlfriend situation).

Shotland (1989, 1992) expanded this typology further by examining the category of date rape, which he terms courtship rape. According to his theory, acquaintance rape is not a unitary phenomenon but is composed instead of up to five types of rape arising at different stages of a romantic relationship both in terms of length of relationship and previous sexual history. Each type of rape is associated with a different cause.

In support of his theory, Shotland noted that date rape occurs at different stages of relationships. Researchers have found that 21 percent of college women who had been raped were raped by casual dates and 31 percent by steady dates, with the remainder raped by strangers, nonromantic acquaintances and husbands.
(Koss, Dinero, Seibel, & Cox, 1988). Furthermore, Shotland argued that based on research that shows that sexually aggressive males have more sexual experience and are consistently seeking new sexual involvements (Kanin, 1967; Koss and Dinero, 1989), these males are unlikely to be involved in steady relationships. Because 31 percent of rape victims were raped by a steady date, several groups of rapists and victims possessing different characteristics and motivations may exist.

Shotland termed the five types of courtship rape: (1) beginning date rape, which occurs during the first few dates; (2) early date rape, which takes place after several dates but during the early part of the relationship when the couple are still getting to know each other and establishing the groundrules of their relationship; and (3) relational date rape occurring before the couple has had sexual intercourse but after a significant amount of dating has taken place and the couple believe that they know what to expect from each other. The final two types (4 and 5) are both named rape within sexually active couples, and are distinguished by the presence or absence of battery. (See Shotland, 1989, 1992 for further information regarding types 4 and 5.)

In beginning date rape, according to Shotland, misperceptions regarding desire for sexual intercourse do not play a large role, as most college students do not expect to engage in sexual intercourse during the first few dates. Men who engage in beginning date rape tend toward sociopathy with a history of antisocial acts and may date a woman to isolate her with an intention to rape, realizing that such an
action is less likely to be labeled as rape than if he were to attack a stranger. Another possibility is that he holds unrealistic sexual expectations and is willing to rape to obtain sex if the woman does not consent to meet his expectations.

Early date rape involves misperceptions of sexual intent coupled with the male's poor coping with sexual frustration and impulse control, says Shotland. Excitation transfer occurs in these situations when, after some consensual sexual activity, the female refuses additional intimacy, leading to surprise, embarrassment and ultimately sexual frustration and anger on the male's part. If the couple returns to milder forms of foreplay, the male's feelings of sexual arousal may increase because of his misinterpretation of his earlier anger as sexual arousal. Thus, anger and sexual arousal each act to raise the level of the other, creating a situation where date rape can take place.

Finally, in relational date rape, the rapist does not misperceive the intentions of his date, but instead views himself as emotionally and sexually disadvantaged due to social comparison with males in similar relationships. He may feel that the relationship is inequitable because he has been exclusively dating and paying for the date and may perceive that a woman's willingness to have sex is a sign of her love. This type of rapist may also hold romantic beliefs that his partner will resist his advances but ultimately be overcome with passion and become an enthusiastic participant. When the woman's resistance continues, excitation-transfer may serve to heighten arousal and aggression in such a way that rape follows.
Summary of Literature Review

A close examination of rape literature makes clear that sociocultural factors play an integral role, affecting every aspect of this phenomenon from perpetration to perception. Evidence suggests that rape behavior is predicated upon overconformity to traditional male sex roles which prescribe aggressive sexual behavior patterns and teach sexual entitlement. Culture then acts to silence victims who have failed in their role of sexual gatekeeper through belief in myths such as only bad girls are raped and women who are raped have provoked the rapist by their behavior. In addition, the criminal justice system has been unresponsive to rape victims, holding them to a higher standard of proof than is associated with other offenses. As a whole, society stigmatizes and blames victims for their own victimization.

This seems to be even more true for victims of acquaintance rape. Acquaintance rape victims have been found to suffer consequences at least as severe as those encountered by stranger rape victims. But because of stereotypical definitions of rape as an incident between strangers, the crime of acquaintance rape remained largely unacknowledged until recently. This arguably has had further deleterious effects the victims of acquaintance rape, who are even less likely to be seen or to see themselves as legitimate victims deserving of social support.

Apart from effects upon the parties involved in rape, sociocultural factors have also influenced the way that researchers study the phenomenon of rape. A large majority of early research focused on stranger rape, despite early evidence that
acquaintance rape was and is more common. In addition, early attribution research tended to center on characteristics of the victim, asking "what is it that makes people blame the victim?" rather than asking "what is it that makes people absolve the rapist?"—a subtle but essential distinction. Although the first question is not unimportant, by their nearly exclusive focus on the victim, researchers inadvertently furthered the cultural bias that obscures the responsibility of the rapist by diverting attention to the victim.

Rape is a highly politicized issue, a fact that becomes evident when research findings have run counter to accepted beliefs about rape. For example, controversy still reigns regarding the incidence and prevalence of rape. In spite of numerous, well-executed, large-scale studies that show that rape, especially acquaintance rape, is widespread, critics vociferously argue that the extent of the problem is greatly exaggerated.

Despite political resistance, recent research has greatly advanced our understanding of the phenomenon of rape. A number of attribution researchers have taken a more holistic approach, creatively designing studies to identify models and cognitive mediators of rape judgments. Preliminary findings indicate that perceptions that the victim derived sexual pleasure from intercourse, that she may have desired intercourse, or that she could have foreseen the rape predict victim blame. Additionally, when the victim protests after a significant amount of foreplay or when her rapist is an ex-lover, she is held more responsible.
(Koss, Dinero, Seibel, & Cox, 1988). Furthermore, Shotland argued that based on research that shows that sexually aggressive males have more sexual experience and are consistently seeking new sexual involvements (Kanin, 1967; Koss and Dinero, 1989), these males are unlikely to be involved in steady relationships. Because 31 percent of rape victims were raped by a steady date, several groups of rapists and victims possessing different characteristics and motivations may exist.

Shotland termed the five types of courtship rape: (1) beginning date rape, which occurs during the first few dates; (2) early date rape, which takes place after several dates but during the early part of the relationship when the couple are still getting to know each other and establishing the groundrules of their relationship; and (3) relational date rape occurring before the couple has had sexual intercourse but after a significant amount of dating has taken place and the couple believe that they know what to expect from each other. The final two types (4 and 5) are both named rape within sexually active couples, and are distinguished by the presence or absence of battery. (See Shotland, 1989, 1992 for further information regarding types 4 and 5.)

In beginning date rape, according to Shotland, misperceptions regarding desire for sexual intercourse do not play a large role, as most college students do not expect to engage in sexual intercourse during the first few dates. Men who engage in beginning date rape tend toward sociopathy with a history of antisocial acts and may date a woman to isolate her with an intention to rape, realizing that such an
action is less likely to be labeled as rape than if he were to attack a stranger. Another possibility is that he holds unrealistic sexual expectations and is willing to rape to obtain sex if the woman does not consent to meet his expectations.

Early date rape involves misperceptions of sexual intent coupled with the male's poor coping with sexual frustration and impulse control, says Shotland. Excitation transfer occurs in these situations when, after some consensual sexual activity, the female refuses additional intimacy, leading to surprise, embarrassment and ultimately sexual frustration and anger on the male's part. If the couple returns to milder forms of foreplay, the male's feelings of sexual arousal may increase because of his misinterpretation of his earlier anger as sexual arousal. Thus, anger and sexual arousal each act to raise the level of the other, creating a situation where date rape can take place.

Finally, in relational date rape, the rapist does not misperceive the intentions of his date, but instead views himself as emotionally and sexually disadvantaged due to social comparison with males in similar relationships. He may feel that the relationship is inequitable because he has been exclusively dating and paying for the date and may perceive that a woman's willingness to have sex is a sign of her love. This type of rapist may also hold romantic beliefs that his partner will resist his advances but ultimately be overcome with passion and become an enthusiastic participant. When the woman's resistance continues, excitation-transfer may serve to heighten arousal and aggression in such a way that rape follows.
A close examination of rape literature makes clear that sociocultural factors play an integral role, affecting every aspect of this phenomenon from perpetration to perception. Evidence suggests that rape behavior is predicated upon overconformity to traditional male sex roles which prescribe aggressive sexual behavior patterns and teach sexual entitlement. Culture then acts to silence victims who have failed in their role of sexual gatekeeper through belief in myths such as only bad girls are raped and women who are raped have provoked the rapist by their behavior. In addition, the criminal justice system has been unresponsive to rape victims, holding them to a higher standard of proof than is associated with other offenses. As a whole, society stigmatizes and blames victims for their own victimization.

This seems to be even more true for victims of acquaintance rape. Acquaintance rape victims have been found to suffer consequences at least as severe as those encountered by stranger rape victims. But because of stereotypical definitions of rape as an incident between strangers, the crime of acquaintance rape remained largely unacknowledged until recently. This arguably has had further deleterious effects the victims of acquaintance rape, who are even less likely to be seen or to see themselves as legitimate victims deserving of social support.

Apart from effects upon the parties involved in rape, sociocultural factors have also influenced the way that researchers study the phenomenon of rape. A large majority of early research focused on stranger rape, despite early evidence that
acquaintance rape was and is more common. In addition, early attribution research tended to center on characteristics of the victim, asking "what is it that makes people blame the victim?" rather than asking "what is it that makes people absolve the rapist?"—a subtle but essential distinction. Although the first question is not unimportant, by their nearly exclusive focus on the victim, researchers inadvertently furthered the cultural bias that obscures the responsibility of the rapist by diverting attention to the victim.

Rape is a highly politicized issue, a fact that becomes evident when research findings have run counter to accepted beliefs about rape. For example, controversy still reigns regarding the incidence and prevalence of rape. In spite of numerous, well-executed, large-scale studies that show that rape, especially acquaintance rape, is widespread, critics vociferously argue that the extent of the problem is greatly exaggerated.

Despite political resistance, recent research has greatly advanced our understanding of the phenomenon of rape. A number of attribution researchers have taken a more holistic approach, creatively designing studies to identify models and cognitive mediators of rape judgments. Preliminary findings indicate that perceptions that the victim derived sexual pleasure from intercourse, that she may have desired intercourse, or that she could have foreseen the rape predict victim blame. Additionally, when the victim protests after a significant amount of foreplay or when her rapist is an ex-lover, she is held more responsible.
Recent research also suggests that when rapists intend to rape, use more force and deny feeling remorse for their actions, they are evaluated more negatively. In general, findings indicate that most lay people see acquaintance rape as sexually-motivated rather than motivated by a desire to achieve power over a woman. When making causal attributions regarding rape, significant percentages of lay persons feel that rapists are mentally unstable while others believe acquaintance rape to be a matter of miscommunication between the involved parties.

Over time, many researchers have come to acknowledge and integrate the influence of sociocultural factors on rape within their research. The proposed research represents an attempt to continue within this vein and add to the findings summarized above.
MODEL AND HYPOTHESES

Overview of Current Study

The current analog research represents an attempt to utilize and build upon recent rape research and theory, and in addition, to address a methodological question regarding the effect of use of a projective measure upon participant involvement and upon lay attributions regarding acquaintance rapists. As with Lovell (1993), the current study constitutes a direct examination of intentions and motivations of the acquaintance rapist.

The study used eight scenarios that completely crossed three two-level factors (stage of relationship and victim and perpetrator alcohol consumption). The rapes depicted occurred at one of two stages in a couple's relationship: after two weeks of dating (beginning date rape) or after four months of exclusive dating (relational date rape). Thus, Shotland's typology of courtship rape was partially operationalized. In addition, alcohol consumption on the part of the victim and the perpetrator was varied, with the victim and/or perpetrator drinking a soft drink (victim/perpetrator abstinence) or drinking beer until the point of intoxication (victim/perpetrator intoxication). The scenarios incorporated research findings regarding the circumstances under which acquaintance rapes commonly occur. For instance, in all scenarios, the rapes occurred following a party in the female's dormitory room with a relatively low amount of force used by the rapist and some verbal and physical resistance from the victim.
The study was intended to arrive at attributions made by lay persons regarding situations that meet the legal definition of acquaintance rape. All participants were asked to respond to objective, Likert scale items designed to help identify the rapist's motivations, emotions, intentions and perceptions of the female character. Participants were also asked to make a judgment as to relative responsibility for causation of the incident and to indicate whether they felt that the incident was an example of rape. In addition, the study included two individual difference variables. Participant gender and rape supportive attitudes, as determined through use of a combined rape myth acceptance and adversarial sex role beliefs scale, were explored for possible effects on lay attributions.

The study was designed to test a methodological innovation first introduced in Lovell (1993). Approximately half of the experimental participants were exposed to a projective section that requested that they complete sentence blanks regarding the inner cognitions and feelings of the male prior to completing the respective objective items. The remainder of participants were asked to read their scenario a second time in an attempt to eliminate the possible confound of amount of exposure to the experimental condition. No extensive qualitative analysis was performed on the projective section, with examination focusing instead on differences in the two group's responses to objective attribution items and to differences in responses to items examining the participants' confidence in the accuracy of their answers to attribution
items, their perceptions of how realistic the scenario was and how interested they were in the experiment.

**General Hypotheses**

Based on previous research, some hypotheses were offered as to the results of the proposed study. All independent variables--stage of relationship, perpetrator alcohol consumption, victim alcohol consumption, and experimental methodology--were hypothesized to impact lay attributions regarding motivations and intentions of the perpetrator.

For instance, based on Shotland's (1989, 1992) courtship rape theory, subjects were hypothesized to be able to differentiate between motivations and intentions of beginning and relational date rapists. The beginning date rapist was believed more likely to be characterized as mentally unstable and ruthless and to be attributed a stronger intent to rape the victim and cause her harm. On the other hand, predictions regarding the relational date rapist indicated that participants would see him as a frustrated boyfriend who wanted more intimacy with his partner but who had little desire to rape her. Furthermore, as the length of relationship increased, participants would be less certain that an acquaintance rape took place.

The consumption of alcohol variables were expected to produce results consistent with previous research by Richardson and Campbell (1982) and Norris and Cubbins (1992). Predictions indicated that rapist would be attributed less intent to rape when he had been drinking whether or not the female abstained or imbibed.
Only when the female consumed and the male abstained would conditions result in a stronger perception of the male character's intent to rape.

No research existed to help predict the effects of interactions between the stage of relationship and drinking variables. However, expectations were that the female would be held relatively more responsible and the male relatively less in beginning date rape when either or both have been drinking. The reasoning underlying this supposition was that lay people might consider it especially foolish for a woman to drink with and/or remain with a man who has been drinking when she does not know him well. When the female character does know him better, as in the relational date rape condition, the victim might be held relatively less responsible when she consumes alcohol.

The effects of the methodological manipulation were difficult to predict, as no previous research was found to directly address the issue. In asking participants to complete the projective section, participants were given an additional incentive to consider the interaction between the parties fully, imagining exactly how the situation occurred and what contributed to its occurrence. This additional consideration was believed likely to affect attributions regarding perpetrator motivations and intentions; however, the direction of the effect was thought to depend upon participant sex role attitudes (Weir & Wrightsman, 1990). It was hypothesized that completion of the projective section would interact with participant attitudes in such a way as to strengthen and enhance the effect of those attitudes on lay attributions. For example,
someone with rape supportive attitudes who tended to absolve the perpetrator and hold the victim responsible would be more likely to do so after completion of the projective section offered a chance to consolidate their perspective of what happened. Responses to the participant involvement scale, which reflects the constructs of participant interest, confidence in their responses and perceptions of the realism of the scenario, were predicted to be higher when the projective methodology was used.
METHOD

Participants

Participants in this study were 321 students, 220 females and 101 males recruited from undergraduate psychology courses at Iowa State University. However, eight participants were excluded due to missing values in the data set and seven were excluded for obvious random responding. The final sample consisted of 306 students of which 218 were females and 88 males. Participation in this study was approved by the Iowa State University Human Subjects Committee and the Psychology Department Human Subjects Committee. Course credit was awarded for students' voluntary involvement.

Of the 306 students, 58% were freshman, 22% sophomores, 13% juniors, and 7% seniors. Participants' ages ranged from 17 to 52, with 98 percent of the participant pool 26 years old and younger. The modal age of the group was 19, and the racial composition was predominately white (83%) with Asians (11%), African Americans (4%), Hispanics (1%) and other nationalities (1%) making up the remainder of the sample.

The majority (58%) of the students were involved in a monogamous dating relationship at the time of their participation. Thirty-five percent of the sample reported that they were not dating and six percent were dating multiple partners. Examining the length of previous and/or current relationships, 63 percent of participants were or had been involved in a dating relationship lasting more than one
year, 30% had dated someone steadily for a period of time between one month and one year, and seven percent had never been involved in a dating relationship lasting for more than one month. Twenty-nine women and 3 men reported that they had been a victim of rape. No one admitted to perpetrating a rape. All participants were randomly assigned to read and complete the measures for one experimental condition.

Instruments and Procedures

Scenarios

One of eight narrative scenarios (see Appendix A) describing behavior and contextual information that would be observable by a third party witness and omitting information about the two characters' feelings and intentions was presented to each participant. Although the narratives described incidents meeting the legal definition of rape by acquaintances, none of the scenarios was labeled as such for the participant, for such experiences are not defined unequivocally as rape in real life.

The scenarios completely crossed three factors (stage of relationship, alcohol use by victim and alcohol use by perpetrator). The stage of relationship variable was based on Shotland's causes of courtship theory (1992). Two of the three types of rape occurring before the couple has established an active sexual relationship were represented, with one scenario depicting a rape occurring after two weeks of dating (beginning date rape) and the other representing a rape that occurs after the couple have been dating for a long time (four months) and believe that they know what to
expect from each other (relational date rape). Alcohol use on the part of the victim and the perpetrator were each two-level variables characterized by a no drinking condition and a condition in which the respective character was described as drinking to the point of intoxication.

**Projective Measure**

In addition to examining the effect of stage of relationship, victim alcohol use and perpetrator alcohol use, the study examined the effect of an experimental design variable (see Appendix B). Half of the participants were asked to read through one scenario twice before completing the Acquaintance Rape Attributions Questionnaire (ARAQ). Participants were provided two copies of the scenario to improve compliance with instructions to read the scenario twice and informal observation of participants during experimentation indicates a high degree of compliance. The remainder of the subjects were asked to read through one scenario and then to supply the missing details of the male character's emotions, thoughts and intentions. This was accomplished through interjecting, at logically determined points in the narrative, sentence completion blanks that prompted for information regarding the perpetrator's thoughts, feelings, inferences and reasons for behavior. The sentence completion blanks were worded and ordered in such a way as to maximize the richness of solicited information and to keep the story line smooth and consistent.
Acquaintance Rape Attributions Questionnaire

After reading the scenario and either completing the projective section or reading the scenario a second time, subjects responded to the Acquaintance Rape Attributions Questionnaire (see Appendix C). The ARAQ consists of 42 statements designed to assess the attributional distinctions used to account for the male characters' behavior. Attribution researchers do not agree on a single set of attributional categories across all types of occurrences (Wimer & Kelley, 1982). For that reason, the statements for each version of the ARAQ were based on distinctions proposed by attribution theorists as well as ones deriving from past research on factors contributing to the incidence of acquaintance rape. Subjects responded to the statements using a seven-point Likert scale, with the categories being agree strongly, agree somewhat, agree slightly, uncertain or neutral, disagree slightly, disagree somewhat and disagree strongly.

Embedded within the ARAQ items were five statements that were used to determine whether participants were able to differentiate between experimental conditions. The manipulation checks asked participants to identify how long the characters had been dating, whether or not they had previously engaged in sexual intercourse, and the abstinence or alcohol consumption of the characters.

Participant Involvement Scale

The Participant Involvement Scale (see Appendix D) consisted of seven items that examined three related content areas. The first of these was participant interest
in the experimental task and was measured with the items: "The incident between Tom and Sue captured my interest" and "The tasks that I have been asked to perform in this study interested me." A second content area, realism, was assessed with "I believe that a situation similar to what happened between Tom and Sue could actually happen in real life" and "The scenario I read was believable." Participant confidence was measured with "I am confident in the responses that I provided regarding Tom's behavior," "I put some thought into my responses in this study" and "I believe that I answered the questions about Tom as accurately as I could."

Rape Myth Acceptance and Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scales

Following completion of the ARAQ, all subjects completed Burt's (1980) Rape Myth Acceptance and Adversarial Sexual Beliefs scales (see Appendix E). The 14-item Rape Myth Acceptance Scale includes such statements as "Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wants to." and "A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex." The Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale consists of nine items, such as "A man's got to show the woman who's boss right from the start or he'll end up henpecked" and "Most women are sly and manipulating when they are out to attract a man." Both scales have high Cronbach alpha reliabilities of .875 and .802 respectively (Burt, 1980).
Demographical Questionnaire

A demographic questionnaire (see Appendix F) was also completed by participants and included information about whether or not participants had ever been raped and whether they were closely acquainted with rape victim. The questionnaire also requested information about participants' dating history, specifically length of longest dating relationship and how many persons they were currently dating.

Design and Analysis

This research was conceptualized as a stage of relationship (beginning, relational) x victim alcohol use (sober, intoxicated) x perpetrator alcohol use (sober, intoxicated) x method (projective form, no projective form) x participant gender (male, female) x sex role attitudes (rape supportive, rape critical) design.

Iterated principal axis factor analysis was employed to create factor scales from the individual items of the ARAQ. The factor analysis was performed across experimental conditions with the assumption that the factor structure was roughly consistent within the manipulations. The General Linear Model procedure of the Statistical Analysis System (SAS Institute, 1986) was then employed to perform a six-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine the effects of the independent variables (i.e., stage of relationship, victim/ perpetrator alcohol consumption, method, gender, and sex role attitudes) upon the dependent variables (i.e., the factored items of the ARAQ and the participant involvement scale). Due to the relatively small sample size, a full model was not run, but rather a partial model, including only main and simple
interactions. Exact factor scores were used in the analysis except with the Participant Involvement Scale. Cronbach alphas were computed to test reliabilities for Burt's Adversarial Sexual Beliefs and Rape Myth Acceptance Scales, as well as the Participant Involvement Scale.

**Sex Role Attitude Scores**

Due to strong intercorrelations among items of Burt's Rape Myth Acceptance and Adversarial Sexual Beliefs scales, the scales were combined into a single sex role attitudes scale for purposes of the proposed study. The combined measure was previously utilized in Lovell's (1993) study.

Sex role attitudes scores were obtained by first adding together subject scores on Burt's Rape Myth Acceptance and Adversarial Sexual Beliefs scales and then using a median split to determine low and high levels of rape supportive attitudes. The median fell on the score of 54 for the combined scale with a minimum score of 27 and a maximum of 131. Table 1 details the frequency distribution, separating male and female scores, as gender was moderately correlated with sex role attitude ($r = .38$).

Individual Cronbach alphas for Burt's Rape Myth Acceptance Scale and Adversarial Sexual Beliefs scales were .79 and .89 respectively. When combined into a rape supportive attitude scale, intercorrelations with other ARAQ factors were equivalent or higher than intercorrelations achieved with either scale considered individually. The Cronbach alpha for the combined scale was .74.
Table 1. Frequency distribution of sex role attitude scores by participant gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 - 35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 - 62</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 - 71</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 - 80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 - 89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 - 98</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 - 107</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 - 116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 - 125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 - 131</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Minimum scale score = 27. Maximum scale score = 189.
Participant Involvement Scale

Participant interest, participant confidence, and task realism items were reasonably intercorrelated and item analysis revealed no weak items. The Cronbach alpha for the Participant Involvement Scale was .83. Table 2 lists intercorrelations between items.

Acquaintance Rape Attributions Questionnaire

Manipulation check. The five manipulation check items demonstrated that experimental conditions were clearly established in all but seven instances and further examination revealed that these participants had either responded randomly or made some pervasive error in the majority of their responses. Data from these respondents were excluded from further analysis.

Factor analysis. To simplify the dependent variable component and aid interpretation of results, an iterated principal axis factor analyses was done on the 42 individual items of the ARAQ. Four factors were retained by the scree criterion and, using a varimax rotation, were examined for theoretical and conceptual interpretability. Use of a criterion of .30 resulted in coherent, interpretable factors scales. Five items were eliminated from the analysis after they either failed to meet the criterion or loaded on more than one factor scale. The individual item loadings, proportion of common variance explained by each factor, and final communality estimates are presented in Table 3.
Table 2. Item intercorrelations for the Participant Involvement Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Real 1</th>
<th>Real 2</th>
<th>Confid 1</th>
<th>Confid 2</th>
<th>Confid 3</th>
<th>Int 1</th>
<th>Int 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confid 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confid 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confid 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Real 1 = I believe that a situation similar to what happened between Tom and Sue could actually happen in real life. Real 2 = The scenario I read was believable. Confid 1 = I am confident in the responses that I provided regarding Tom's behavior. Confid 2 = I put some thought into my responses in this study. Confid 3 = I believe that I answered the questions about Tom as accurately as I could. Int 1 = The incident between Tom and Sue captured my interest. Int 2 = The tasks that I have been asked to perform in this study interest me.
Table 3. Acquaintance Rape Attributions Questionnaire (ARAQ) item loadings and variance explained with the four factor solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARAQ Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>h²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom's actions were primarily motivated by his sexual feelings for Sue.</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom heard Sue say &quot;no&quot; but felt that she would ultimately relax and enjoy herself.</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom felt entitled to have intercourse with Sue because she led him on.</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom believed that he persuaded Sue to consent to intercourse.</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom wanted Sue to feel powerless.</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom wanted to hurt Sue physically and/or emotionally.</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom has probably been involved in similar situations with other women.</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom would say that he had sex with Sue because he was so excited that he couldn't stop.</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom felt that his actions were wrong but he didn't care at the time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.427</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom is mentally ill.</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom was angry at Sue because he feels that she has all the power in their relationship.</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td></td>
<td>.218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom felt that he should have tried harder to control his behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.452</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. (Continued)

Rotated Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARAQ Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>h²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom did not plan to have sexual intercourse with Sue.</td>
<td>-.369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom was willing to proceed with sexual intercourse regardless of Sue's wishes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom felt that most other couples had sexual intercourse with each other at this particular stage of their relationship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.454</td>
<td></td>
<td>.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom felt that Sue wanted to have sexual intercourse but was playing hard to get.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom's actions were primarily the result of the situation that he found himself in.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom is most responsible for what happened between Sue and himself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.448</td>
<td></td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom is sexually deviant or abnormal.</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom had sexual intercourse with Sue to show his love for her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.506</td>
<td></td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom acted as he did because his judgment was impaired.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.418</td>
<td></td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom behaved as he did because he believes that men are supposed to be the dominant sex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.431</td>
<td></td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom felt better about himself after he had sexual intercourse with Sue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAQ Items</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>h²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom believed that Sue should have sexual intercourse with him to show him that she really cares for him.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom is a ruthless and self-centered person.</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main reason that Tom had sexual intercourse with Sue was because he wanted to put her in her place and show her who was boss.</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happened between Tom and Sue was the result of miscommunication.</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom was in full control of himself and his actions.</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue is most responsible for what happened between Tom and herself.</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom feels that he and Sue will be closer now that they have had sexual intercourse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This situation happened because Tom and Sue misread each other's sexual signals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom acted primarily out of anger at Sue.</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom feels good about what happened between Sue and himself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. (Continued)

Rotated Factor Loadings (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARAQ Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>h²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I were a man in a similar situation,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would act the way that Tom did.</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I were a man in a similar situation,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel and think the same things that Tom did.</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that Tom's behavior was wrong.</td>
<td>-.515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalues</td>
<td>3.938</td>
<td>2.890</td>
<td>2.519</td>
<td>2.197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Variance</td>
<td>9.375</td>
<td>6.880</td>
<td>5.998</td>
<td>5.231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Only loadings above .30 are shown.
Factor loadings on the four factors were used to define clusters of ARAQ items that could be analyzed together as a scale. The first factor, labeled sociopathic rapist, consisted of items indicating that subjects believed the perpetrator to be a mentally ill rapist who was probably not raping for the first time. They believed his actions to be controlled and planful, motivated by power needs and intended to hurt his victim physically and/or emotionally.

The second factor (sexual miscommunication) painted a different motivational and characterological picture of the rapist and his actions. In this instance the rapist was motivated by his love for the victim and cared about her wishes. The victim was seen as responsible for creating a situation in which sexual miscommunication occurred and the participants indicated that they would perceive the situation in the same way that the perpetrator did.

The third factor (rationalizations using sexual behavior myths) consisted of items pertaining to stereotypical beliefs about interaction between the sexes. The rapist believed that his victim was playing hard to get and would eventually relax and enjoy herself. He felt that he was too excited and couldn't stop and believed that he was entitled to sexual intercourse because the victim had led him on.

The fourth factor (perpetrator reaction) pertained to the perpetrator's reactions and expectations. He felt good about himself and had an expectation that his relationship with the victim will be closer now that they have had sexual intercourse.
Table 4 lists item means and standard deviations for each of the items included in the factors.
### Table 4. ARAQ item means and standard deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARAQ Items by Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1: Sociopathic Rapist</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom wanted Sue to feel powerless.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom wanted to hurt Sue physically and/or emotionally.</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom has probably been involved in similar situations with other women.</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom is mentally ill.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom was angry at Sue because he feels that she has all the power in their relationship.</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom did not plan to have sexual intercourse with Sue. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom's actions were primarily the result of the situation that he found himself in. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom is sexually deviant or abnormal.</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom acted as he did because his judgment was impaired. (Reversed)</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom behaved as he did because he believes that men are supposed to be the dominant sex.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom is a ruthless and self-centered person.</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main reason that Tom had sexual intercourse with Sue was because he wanted to put her in her place and show her who was boss.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARAQ Items by Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1: Sociopathic Rapist (Cont.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom was in full control of himself and his actions.</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom acted primarily out of anger at Sue.</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 2: Sexual Miscommunication**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom was willing to proceed with sexual intercourse regardless of Sue's wishes. (Reversed)</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom is most responsible for what happened between Sue and himself. (Reversed)</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom had sexual intercourse with Sue to show his love for her.</td>
<td>1.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happened between Tom and Sue was the result of miscommunication.</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue is most responsible for what happened between Tom and herself.</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This situation happened because Tom and Sue misread each other's sexual signals.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARAQ Items by Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Factor 2: Sexual Miscommunication (Cont.)**

- If I were a man in a similar situation, I would act the way that Tom did. 1.46 1.06
- If I were a man in a similar situation, I would feel and think the same things that Tom did. 2.30 1.72
- I believe that Tom's behavior was wrong. (Reversed) 1.38 1.12

**Factor 3: Rationalizations Using Sexual Behavior Myths**

- Tom's actions were primarily motivated by his sexual feelings for Sue. 4.83 1.89
- Tom heard Sue say "no" but felt that she would ultimately relax and enjoy herself. 5.27 1.55
- Tom felt entitled to have intercourse with Sue because she led him on. 3.91 1.93
- Tom believed that he persuaded Sue to consent to intercourse. 4.28 1.74
- Tom would say that he had sex with Sue because he was so excited that he couldn't stop. 5.19 1.57
- Tom felt that most other couples had sexual intercourse with each other at this particular stage of their relationship. 4.99 1.26
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARAQ Items by Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3: Rationalizations Using Sexual Behavior Myths (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom felt that Sue wanted to have sexual intercourse but was playing hard to get.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom believed that Sue should have sexual intercourse with him to show him that she really cares for him.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 4: Perpetrator Reaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom felt that his actions were wrong but he didn't care at the time. (Reversed)</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom felt that he should have tried harder to control his behavior. (Rev.)</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom felt better about himself after he had sexual intercourse with Sue.</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom feels that he and Sue will be closer now that they have had sexual intercourse.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom feels good about what happened between Sue and himself.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

Summary tables of the analysis of variance (Anova) for four factors of the ARAQ and the PIS are presented in Tables 5 through 9. Due to unequal sample sizes for the independent variables, determination of the significance of effects of independent variables was based on type III or partial sums of squares. As this was intended to be an exploratory study with limited statistical power, only main effects and two way interactions were examined. Mean effects are reported as standardized scores.

Factor 1: Sociopathic Rapist

Factor one, sociopathic rapist yielded significant main effects for two of the six independent variables (see Table 5). The main effect for relationship was significant $F(1, 281) = 4.44, g = .04$, as well as perpetrator alcohol use $F(1, 281) = 19.32, g = .0001$. No two-way interactions were found for factor one.

Examining mean responses, participants produced higher factor one, sociopathic rapist scores in the beginning date rape condition ($M = .15$) than in the relational date rape condition ($M = -.15$). Thus, the rapist who dated his victim for two weeks was more likely to be seen as a sociopathic rapist than his counterpart in the four-month relationship. Figure 1 depicts the effect of stage of relationship on factor one.

In addition, when the perpetrator was drunk, he was less likely to be seen as a sociopathic rapist ($M = .29$) than when he was sober ($M = -.28$). See Figure 2 for a graphic representation of this main effect.
Table 5. Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Factor 1, Sociopathic Rapist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>PR&gt;F</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.158</td>
<td>2.246</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>202.182</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>249.340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>PR&gt;F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator Alcohol (PA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Alcohol (VA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Method (M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Gender (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Role Attitude (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x PA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x VA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x VA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA x M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M X A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Sociopathic rapist as a function of stage of relationship
Figure 2. Sociopathic rapist as a function of perpetrator alcohol use
Factor 2: Sexual Miscommunication

Experimental methodology \( [F(1, 281) = 9.15, p = .003] \) and sex role attitude \( [F(1, 281) = 32.55, p = .0001] \) produced significant main effects for factor two, sexual miscommunication. Furthermore, two simple interactions were found: relationship by participant gender, \( F(1, 281) = 4.01, p = .05 \), and perpetrator alcohol use by participant gender, \( F(1, 281) = 5.48, p = .02 \). Table 6 presents a summary of the analysis of variance results for factor 2.

An examination of mean responses reveals that compared to persons who only read the scenario \( (M = -15) \), persons who completed the projective form of the ARAQ \( (M = -17) \) were more likely to view the incident as resulting from sexual miscommunication (see Figure 3).

Participants holding rape supportive attitudes \( (M = 34) \) were more likely than those with rape critical attitudes \( (M = -34) \) to endorse factor two items. Figure 4 depicts this effect.

Turning to interactions, women were less likely to see the incident as resulting from sexual miscommunication as the length of relationship increased whereas men had the opposite reaction (see Figure 5).

Overall, female participants were less likely than male participants to endorse factor two regardless of the perpetrator's level of intoxication. However, women had lower factor two scores when the perpetrator was intoxicated in comparison to when he was sober. Factor two scores increased for male participants with an intoxicated perpetrator. The interaction between perpetrator alcohol use and stage of relationship is pictured in Figure 6.
Table 6. Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Factor 2, Sexual Miscommunication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>PR&gt;F</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.508</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>180.022</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>PR&gt;F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator Alcohol (PA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Alcohol (VA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Method (M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Gender (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Role Attitude (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.55</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x PA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x VA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x VA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA x M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. Sexual miscommunication as a function of experimental methodology
Figure 4. Sexual miscommunication as a function of sex role attitudes
Figure 5. Sexual miscommunication as a function of the two-way interaction between stage of relationship and participant gender.
Figure 6. Sexual miscommunication as a function of the two-way interaction between perpetrator alcohol use and participant gender.
Factor 3: Rationalizations Using Sexual Behavior Myths

Three main effects were found for factor three, rationalizations using sexual behavior myths (see Table 7): relationship, $[E(1, 281) = 3.94, p = .05$, experimental methodology, $[E(1, 281) = 60.31, p = .0001$] and participant gender, $[E(1, 281) = 6.40, p = .01]$. Relationship by perpetrator alcohol use $[E(1, 281) = 5.05, p = .03$] and victim alcohol use by experimental methodology $[E(1, 281) = 5.40, p = .02$] were also found to be significant.

When the characters had been dating for two weeks, participants were less likely to excuse the behavior of the rapist using myths regarding sexual interactions ($M = -.05$). With the four month-long relationship, factor three scores were increased ($M = .06$). The effect of stage of relationship on factor three is presented in Figure 7.

In addition, when participants completed the projective form of the ARAQ, they were more likely to employ rationalizations using sexual behavior myths ($M = .38$) than their counterparts who did not project feelings ($M = -.36$). Figure 8 depicts this effect.

Male participants, in general, had higher factor three scores ($M = .16$) than women ($M = -.06$). The effect of participant gender is noted in Figure 9.

Participants were most likely to apply rationalizations using sexual belief myths to a sober perpetrator within a four-month-long relationship and much less likely to apply such myths when the perpetrator was intoxicated after four months of dating. Within the two-week-long relationship, the intoxicated perpetrator's behavior was the more likely to produce higher factor three scores (Figure 10).

When the victim was sober, participants who completed the projective measure were the most likely to rationalize the perpetrator's behavior using sexual myths, a
Table 7. Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Factor 3, Rationalizations Using Sexual Behavior Myths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>PR&gt;F</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63.514</td>
<td>3.024</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>167.682</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>231.196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>PR&gt;F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator Alcohol (PA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Alcohol (VA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Method (M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.31</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Gender (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Role Attitude (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x PA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x VA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x VA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA x M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7. Rationalizations using sexual behavior myths as a function of stage of relationship.
Figure 8. Rationalizations using sexual behavior myths as a function of experimental methodology.
Figure 9. Rationalizations using sexual behavior myths as a function of participant gender
Figure 10. Rationalizations using sexual behavior myths as a function of the two-way interaction between stage of relationship and perpetrator alcohol use.
tendency that declined slightly for an intoxicated victim. Participants who read the scenario but did not complete the projective measure did not tend to rationalize his behavior regardless of the level of victim's intoxication, but they made a slightly weaker statement when the victim was intoxicated. Figure 11 details this interaction effect.

Figure 11. Rationalizations using sexual behavior myths as a function of the two-way interaction between victim alcohol use and experimental methodology.
Factor 4: Perpetrator Reaction

Table 8 details analysis of variance results for the fourth factor. No main effects were found for factor four, perpetrator reaction, but two simple interactions were significant: perpetrator alcohol use by victim alcohol use \([F(1, 281) = 4.76, p = .03]\) and participant gender by participant attitude \([F(1, 281) = 5.55, p = .02]\).

Participants predicted that when both the perpetrator and the victim were sober or when both were intoxicated, the perpetrator's reaction would be more strongly positive than when either of the parties was intoxicated (see Figure 12).

Rape critical women and rape supportive men were the most likely to endorse factor four items. Figure 13 presents the interaction effect of sex role attitude on perpetrator reaction.

Participant Involvement Scale

Experimental methodology significantly affected scores on the Participant Involvement Scale \((E(1, 281) = 5.17, p = .02)\), but not in the expected direction. In addition, relationship by victim alcohol use \((E(1, 281) = 4.34, p = .04)\) was also found to be significant. Table 9 summarizes analysis of variance results for the Participant Involvement Scale.

Participants who read the scenario and completed the projective section of the ARAQ, filling in blanks requesting information about the perpetrator's thoughts, feelings and intentions were less involved in the study \((M = .12)\) than those who merely read the scenario twice \((M = -.07)\). In other words, those who did not complete the projective section had higher PIS scores than those who did (see Figure 14).
Table 8. Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Factor 4, Perpetrator Reaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>PR&gt;F</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.466</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>212.444</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>230.909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>PR&gt;F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator Alcohol (PA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Alcohol (VA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Method (M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Gender (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Role Attitude (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x PA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x VA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x VA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA x M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Participant Involvement Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>PR&gt;F</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>707.922</td>
<td>33.711</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>9124.698</td>
<td>32.472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>9832.620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>PR&gt;F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator Alcohol (PA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Alcohol (VA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Method (M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Gender (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Role Attitude (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x PA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x VA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x VA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA x M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M x G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12. Perpetrator reaction as a function of the two-way interaction between perpetrator and victim alcohol use.
Figure 13. Perpetrator reaction as a function of sex role attitudes and participant involvement.
Figure 14. Participant involvement as a function of experimental methodology
A simple interaction effect between relationship and victim alcohol use on participant involvement was found as well. Participants were relatively more involved with the sober victim in the two week dating relationship and the intoxicated victim in the four month relationship than in the remaining two conditions. Scenarios with the intoxicated victim in the shorter relationship and the sober victim in the longer relationship produced lower PIS scores (see Figure 15).

Figure 15. Participant involvement as function of the two-way interaction between victim alcohol use and stage of relationship
DISCUSSION

Summary of Results

Level of relationship, perpetrator alcohol use and victim alcohol use produced significant effects on all of the factored attribution scales. Additionally, experimental methodology was found to affect both lay attributions and participant involvement.

Main Effects

Stage of Relationship. Stage of relationship produced significant effects on two of the factored attribution scales: sociopathic rapist (factor one) and rationalizations using sexual behavior myths (factor three). When the rapist and victim had been dating for two weeks (beginning date rape), participants were more likely to see him as a sociopathic rapist as opposed to the rapist involved in the four month long relationship (relational date rape). Factor one included items which characterized the rapist as a ruthless, sexually deviant man who is motivated by power needs to hurt his victim. Comparing beginning and relational date rape, lay observers more often rationalized the behavior of the rapist in the latter condition using sexual behavior myths such as beliefs regarding men's entitlement to sex if women lead them on and women playing hard to get, but eventually giving in and enjoying themself.

Perpetrator alcohol use. Alcohol use by the rapist had a significant effect on factor one (sociopathic rapist). When the rapist was intoxicated, he was less likely than his sober counterpart to be judged a sociopathic rapist.

Victim alcohol use. No main effects were found for victim alcohol use.

Sex role attitude. An individual difference variable, sex role attitude, was found to significantly affect factor two, sexual miscommunication, which includes items that depict the incident as resulting from a misunderstanding between a rapist who
misguidedly attempts to express his love and a victim who fails in her responsibility to prevent the miscommunication. When participants held rape supportive as opposed to rape critical sex role attitudes, they were more likely endorse such factor two items.

**Participant gender.** Participant gender also affected rationalizations using sexual behavior myths. Male participants, more often than female participants, invoked myths regarding sexual roles and interactions to excuse the behavior of the rapist.

**Experimental methodology.** Experimental methodology affected judgments of sexual miscommunication (factor two) and employment of rationalizations using sexual behavior myths (factor three). As compared with participants who only read the scenario, persons who read the scenario then completed the projective form had higher sexual miscommunication scores and higher rationalization using sexual behavior myth scores.

**Interaction Effects**

Relationship interacted significantly with three other independent variables: participant gender, perpetrator alcohol use and victim alcohol use. Women were less likely to see the situation as resulting from sexual miscommunication as the length of relationship increased, whereas men displayed the opposite trend. As the length of relationship increased, a sober perpetrator's behavior was more likely to be attributed to rationalizations using sexual behavior myths whereas the converse was true for an intoxicated perpetrator. Relationship and victim alcohol use affected participant involvement as well, with participants indicating relatively greater involvement with the sober, beginning date rape victim and the intoxicated, relational date rape victim.
Three simple interactions were found for perpetrator alcohol use: with relationship (described above), participant gender and victim alcohol use. Female observers were less likely than males to see the rape as resulting from sexual miscommunication regardless of the rapist's level of intoxication. However, women were more likely to see endorse factor two items when the perpetrator was sober as opposed to intoxicated. On the other hand, male participants increased their perceptions of sexual miscommunication with an intoxicated perpetrator. Perpetrator alcohol use interacted with victim alcohol use to produce a significant effect on factor four, perpetrator reaction. When both the victim and perpetrator were sober or when both were intoxicated, the rapist was most likely thought to react positively to his actions.

Victim alcohol use interacted with experimental methodology. With an intoxicated victim, persons in the projective experimental condition increased their tendency to endorse rationalizations using sexual behavior myths to explain the rape incident in comparison to the situation in which the victim was sober. But the opposite effect was found for persons who did not complete the projective section of the ARAQ.

Participant gender and sex role attitudes interacted significantly on factor four, perpetrator reaction. Men with rape supportive attitudes and women with rape critical attitudes were likely to believe that a perpetrator reacted positively to his behavior whereas rape critical men and rape supportive women were less likely to endorse factor four items.

**Evaluation of Results**

The current study examined three primary questions: (1) Do lay persons recognize different intentions and motivations on the part of a perpetrator involved in
beginning and relational acquaintance rape as defined by Shetland's (1989, 1992) theory? (2) Does stage of relationship interact with perpetrator and/or victim alcohol use to produce varying attributions regarding acquaintance rape? and (3) Does inclusion of a projective task affect lay attributions and participant involvement? Results of present research extended earlier findings, but only partially conformed to expectations.

**Differences Between Beginning and Relational Courtship Rapists**

Shetland's assertion that acquaintance rape was not a unitary phenomenon was echoed by lay observers in this study. Shetland believed that when a rape occurs within the first few dates (beginning date rape), miscommunication regarding sexual desire does not play a large role. Instead, the beginning date rapist was theorized to be a sociopath with a history of antisocial acts. Participants in this study concurred with Shetland's theory by, among other things, attributing to the rapist in the beginning date rape condition an intent to rape and cause harm to his victim that was motivated by anger. They also ascribed to him characteristics and behavior typical of a sociopath: being ruthless and self-centered, in control, and having previous experience with rape. They described him as mentally ill and sexually deviant as well.

The relational date rapist, according to Shetland, engages in social comparison with other males in similar relationships and as a result views himself as emotionally and sexually disadvantaged. This type of rapist, said Shotland, may also hold romantic beliefs that his partner's initial resistance will give way to enthusiastic participation. Lay attributions painted a similar picture of relational rape in this research with their endorsement of factor three, rationalizations using sexual behavior myths, which
included items whose content involved beliefs regarding the nature of high sexual arousal and men's entitlement to sex.

Thus, lay observers recognized different motivations and intentions on the part of a rapist as the length of relationship between the rapist and his victim increased. The finding supports the face validity of Shotland's theory of courtship rape, demonstrating that lay persons do not hold acquaintance rape to be a unitary phenomenon. Of course, such perceptions of the motivations and intentions of acquaintance rapists may not reflect their actual motivations and intentions. But, as was argued previously, culture plays an integral role in the phenomenon of acquaintance rape and explanations of behavior can actually shape such behavior.

Stage of Relationship and Alcohol Use

A second question examined by the current study involved the interaction between the level of relationship and alcohol use by the parties. The hypothesis predicted that the victim would be held relatively more responsible and the male relatively less in beginning date rape when either or both had been drinking. In fact, the interaction did affect attributions regarding the cause of the rapist's behavior. When the perpetrator was sober in the relational date rape condition, his actions were more likely to rationalized using sexual behavior myths than when he was intoxicated. Thus, this finding is roughly consistent with previous research.

Interestingly, stage of relationship and victim alcohol use affected ratings of participant involvement. Participant involvement was greater when the victim was sober in the beginning date rape condition and intoxicated in the relational date rape condition than in the opposing conditions. This finding may provide some indirect support for the original hypothesis that reasoned that lay persons might hold a victim
more responsible when she drank in the presence of a man that she did not know well (beginning date rape) than when she knew him better (relational date rape). Possibly, the expectations of what is acceptable drinking behavior for a woman can partially account for the finding that a sober beginning date rape victim and an intoxicated relational date rape victim appear to be the more realistic scenarios.

**Gender effects.** Perpetrator alcohol use interacted with participant gender, as well, in a way that does not correspond to previous research findings. A gender effect was found for factor two, sexual miscommunication. Women were more likely to see the situation as resulting from sexual miscommunication, when the perpetrator was sober as opposed to intoxicated. Male respondents, however, tended to increase the ratings of sexual miscommunication when the perpetrator was intoxicated rather than sober. Previous attribution research had not identified significant gender effects with regards to perpetrator alcohol use and judgments of relative responsibility. The underlying reason for differential results may be attributable to differences in experimental design. Previous research typically employed single items that directly requested that participants partition responsibility to the perpetrator and victim. The current dependent variable does not represent a pure responsibility rating, but is instead an amalgamation of relative responsibility, perpetrator motivation, and participant reaction.

**Effects of Experimental Methodology**

The final research question addressed the use of an experimental methodology that was intended to increase participant involvement in the study, thus increasing the validity of results obtained. The same innovation in design was employed by Lovell (1993), but no test of the design's efficacy was made at that time. Although the meth-
odology did affect judgments of sexual miscommunication and use of rationalizations using sexual behavior myths, as well as producing differential ratings of participant involvement, the effects were in an unanticipated direction.

Unexpectedly, participants who completed the projective section were found to achieve lower participant involvement scores than their counterparts who simply read the scenario through twice. They were also more likely to explain the situation as resulting from sexual miscommunication and rationalize the rapist's behavior in terms of sexual behavior myths. This finding held regardless of attitudinal factors.

**Cognitive dissonance.** In retrospect, a possible explanation for these results might be found in the application of cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957). Although a median split was obtained to differentiate between respondents' level of belief in rape myths and adversarial sex roles, the scores on the combined sex role attitude scale were relatively low, suggesting that most of the participants in the study did not hold a point of view similar to that of a rapist. But, in effect, the projective method put the participant in the rapist's role and asked the participant to explain the cognitions underlying his behavior, a perspective that was foreign. It is possible that assuming the perspective of a rapist was a counterattitudinal activity that produced cognitive dissonance. Such dissonance may have been resolved by making the rapist into a more of a good person (like them), attributing fewer negative intentions and less responsibility to the perpetrator.

Occasional comments to researchers indicated that some respondents found the projective section difficult to complete. Aronson (1968, 1992) suggests that cognitive dissonance also arises with a threat to the self-concept, for example, the belief in self-competence. It may be that the difficulty of the projective task threatened perceptions
of self-competence, raising cognitive dissonance that was dispelled through derogation of the task. In other words, participants who were challenged by the task may have released their frustrations by rating the study as less interesting and less realistic.

**Counterfactual thinking.** Another social psychological theory with possible explanatory power in this instance is that of counterfactual thinking (Kahneman & Miller, 1986). According to this theory, when people react to a negative event such as an acquaintance rape, they frequently imagine different courses of action that could have led to different outcomes. Recent research has found that empathic focus influences counterfactual effects on social judgments (Macrae & Milne, 1992). It is possible that by asking participants to assume the point of view of the rapist and imagine his thoughts, feelings and intentions, an empathic set toward the rapist was inadvertently established. With this point of view, participants engaged in counterfactual thinking that was more favorable toward the rapist. For example, they may have noted that the victim could have acted more strongly to avoid the rape, and as a result they attributed the responsibility for the incident to the victim, explaining the perpetrator's behavior as that of an individual who misunderstood his date's sexual signals.

**Comparison with Previous Research**

**Consistency with Cognitive Mediator Research.** Findings of the current study are not inconsistent with research on cognitive mediators. Decisions regarding relative responsibility for rape have been found to be affected by perceptions of the violence of the male (Langley et. al, 1991; Lovell, 1993; Shotland and Goodstein, 1983), the female's resistance (Langley et. al, 1991; Lovell, 1993; Shotland and Goodstein, 1983)
sexual pleasure received by the female (McCaul, Veltum, Boyechko, & Crawford, 1990; McCaul et. al, 1990), ambiguity in desire for intercourse (Johnson & Jackson, 1988) and foreseeability (McCaul et. al, 1990).

In the present study, when the perpetrator and victim had been dating for four months, observers judged the perpetrator to be motivated sexually with little intent to rape, while the victim was believed responsible for the misunderstanding between them. On the other hand, when the rapist had dated his victim for two weeks, observers were likely to attribute more responsibility and intent to rape to the perpetrator who acted out of anger and power needs. Such results could be easily explained in terms of the previously identified cognitive mediators. In the longer relationship, more ambiguity in the female's desire for intercourse exists, and participants are more likely to believe that she received sexual pleasure from a person to whom she had been sufficiently attracted to date for an extended period of time. Similarly observers are less likely to judge that the rapist intended to harm his victim and may judge that the victim should have been able to foresee that such an incident was imminent.

Interaction of gender and attitude. Replicating previous research (Shotland & Goodstein, 1983; Lovell, 1993), participant gender and sex role attitude interacted in a counterintuitive manner. Women with rape critical attitudes and men with rape supportive attitudes were both likely to believe that the perpetrator was satisfied with his behavior whereas rape supportive women and rape critical men felt that the perpetrator would be remorseful. Similarly, Lovell (1993) and Shotland and Goodstein (1983) found female subjects with rape supportive attitudes tended to judge the female character more harshly than even rape supportive males. Rape critical
females and rape supportive males were also found (Lovell, 1993) to respond to attribution statements in similar ways while rape supportive females and rape critical males presented the opposite response. For example, both rape critical women and rape supportive men were more likely than their counterparts to see the perpetrator's actions as power motivated.

One possible explanation for these findings involves differences in value systems and willingness to identify with the oppressor or oppressed group. For example, rape critical women, valuing egalitarian sex role ideals, may condemn the perpetrator's actions as power motivated because he takes away the victim's power to set limits on sexual activity. Rape supportive women, may fail to see the power motivation because of their beliefs that the male's role is to push for greater sexual activity while the woman acts as the sexual gatekeeper; in other words, they fail to see it as a power issue because the male was just playing his role while the woman failed at hers. Perhaps for rape supportive men, who believe that men should have power over women, the endorsement of power motivations statements does not mean attributing a negative quality to one's own sex; rape critical men, who may see power motivation as undesirable, deny the motivation because not to do so would imply that they are members of an oppressive group (much as rape supportive women wish to deny their membership in an oppressed group).

General Perceptions of Acquaintance Rape

Limiting discussion to main and interaction effects provides only half of the story of how lay persons picture the intentions of acquaintance rapists, a picture that can be fleshed out with an examination of mean responses across conditions. These data are especially suited to such evaluation, as 97 percent of participants, an
extremely high number, indicated at least mild agreement with an item labeling the scenario an incident of acquaintance rape. To be included in the following percentages, participants had to respond on average to each item included in the particular ARAQ factor in question with a more extreme number than the Likert scale midpoint of 4 (i.e., responding with a 5, 6 or 7 on average). In other words, for factor 4, perpetrator response, which consists of 5 items, only participant scores in excess of 25 are included in the proportion quoted below.

Considering responses across experimental conditions, only 7.33 percent of participants responded strongly to factor one items which depict the rapist as a sociopath who intended to rape his victim and who was motivated by power needs. Less than 1 percent endorsed factor two items (sexual miscommunication) strongly, indicating that the majority of persons did not feel that the incident arose out of sexual miscommunication that the victim should have prevented. On the other hand, 32.4 percent explained the interaction in terms of rationalizations using sexual behavior myths (factor three). Only 12.93 percent, predicted that the perpetrator felt positively about his actions (factor four).

These findings are partially consistent with the previous study that depicted a rape occurring during a study date (Lovell, 1993). The large majority of participants in the 1993 study also felt the rapist's actions to be at least partially sexually motivated, although a higher percentage (35%) asserted some power motivation as well. In addition, a higher percentage (64%) of respondents to the study date situation ascribed to the rapist an intent to rape and believed him to be satisfied with his actions. This difference may perhaps reflect a stage of relationship effect, as the study date would reflect a lesser level of acquaintance between the parties.
Evaluation of the ARAQ

The Acquaintance Rape Attributions Questionnaire (ARAQ) was first introduced in Lovell (1993). In its original form, 33 items covering possible intentions, motivations and explanations for an acquaintance rape were initially grouped into 11 logically determined subscales (i.e., power motivation, sexual motivation, intent to rape, planfulness, mental illness, rapist responsibility, victim responsibility, miscommunication, socialization, rapist acceptance, and participant acceptance). The subscales were then subjected to factor analysis to simplify interpretation of results. Three factors were extracted with one subscale (socialization) failing to load on any of the factors.

In comparison to the 1993 rendition of the ARAQ, the revised version retains the original items and adds 9 other items to address specific questions raised by this particular research design. Rather than factor analyze subscales, an item-level factor analysis was performed, with four factors retained. Much commonality exists between the results of the two factor analyses of the original and revised ARAQ, but some differences also. Items in the revised version cleaved together in the same subscales or content areas identified in the 1993 version, but the content of the factors while roughly similar, is not identical. Further analysis of the ARAQ with other samples is recommended to establish the robustness of the current factor structure.

Implications

Results of this study have interesting implications for the perception of acquaintance rape and may be of use to rape educators and attorneys. However, additional research is needed before any definitive pronouncements can be formulated.
In this study, an experimental methodology intended to increase the ecological validity of an analogue research design was examined. The method was hypothesized to increase the participant's involvement in the research and strengthen results. Instead, participants who were first asked to imagine the incident from the perpetrator's perspective were subsequently more likely to excuse the rapist's actions, depicting him as a frustrated boyfriend who romantically believed that his partner would succumb to his persuasion. Even observers who held rape critical attitudes were more likely to invoke sexual scripts rather than scripts pertaining to criminal behavior.

These results raise questions regarding the role that such an effect has on jurors who are asked by a defense attorney to put themselves in the defendant's place. Of course, in an actual rape trial, jurors may also put themselves in the victim's place, which might effectively cancel out this effect. Additional research, perhaps asking participants to take the perspective of both actors, would help to clarify the issue.

Lay persons were found to vary their attributions regarding motivations and intentions as the parameters of a rape changed, with rapists who knew their victim well less likely to be viewed as intending rape. However, across experimental conditions, a strong tendency to view acquaintance rape as sexually motivated was revealed. These attributions regarding motivation may be of key importance in answering the question of why society frequently exempts acquaintance rapists from their actions.

As a society, it may be that we expect a certain amount of control of aggressive impulses but have lesser requirements for male sexual impulse control. Thus, lay persons might consider male sexual urges to be so strong that they are uncontrolla-
blem (i.e., "boys will be boys," "all men are animals"). So the final judgment is that acquaintance rapists, while violating social mores, are at the mercy of biology and thus their actions do not merit imposition of criminal penalties.

Further research is needed to test these hypotheses and provide practical guidance to those who wrestle with the problem of acquaintance rape on a daily basis.
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Scenario 1

Please read the following description of a date between two people named Tom and Sue.

Sue and Tom are freshmen who have been dating casually for two weeks. They have never before engaged in sexual intercourse. Tonight they were invited to a party at a friend's house near campus.

At 9 p.m., Tom walked across to Sue's dorm to pick her up. After greeting her with a kiss and complementing her outfit, the two walked hand in hand to the party. Conversation ranged from talk of classes and homework to who they would know at the party this evening.

When they arrived, the party was in full swing, with music blasting and people dancing or talking. They walked to the refreshment table, and each picked up a beer. They saw someone they knew and joined in a conversation. For the next few hours, Tom and Sue danced or talked with each other and friends. Both drank beer steadily to the point of intoxication. At about 12:30, they left and walked back to Sue's room.

Explaining that her roommate was gone for the weekend, Sue invited Tom in for a while. They relaxed on the couch, talking about the party. Tom leaned over and kissed Sue's nose and then her mouth. Sue returned his kiss, and Tom touched her face with his free hand, slowly sliding it to her breast. Sue moved his hand away, and Tom then rested it on her thigh. After a few moments, Tom began to move his hand toward Sue's inner thigh and Sue began to squirm. She broke the kiss which was getting harder and more intense and said "No, slow down. I don't want this to go any further."

Tom continued touching Sue and resumed kissing her. Sue broke the kiss, repeated "no," and pushed his hands away. Tom said "okay" and put his hands on her shoulders. They kissed for a few more minutes before Tom again began touching Sue's breasts. Sue pushed against his chest, saying "I said no." Catching Sue's hands and kissing her all the while, Tom laid Sue down on the couch and slid his hand under her skirt. She continued to try to move and talk but her words were muffled. Intercourse took place. When he entered her, Sue lay still, and tears rolled down her cheeks.

After he ejaculated, Tom rose and pulled up his jeans. Sue went quickly to the bathroom next door. When she had been in there several minutes, Tom pushed the door ajar and asked if she were all right. She said that she felt ill. Saying he'd call her tomorrow, Tom left.
Scenario 2

Please read the following description of a date between two people named Tom and Sue.

Sue and Tom are freshmen who have been dating casually for two weeks. They have never before engaged in sexual intercourse. Tonight they were invited to a party at a friend's house near campus.

At 9 p.m., Tom walked across to Sue's dorm to pick her up. After greeting her with a kiss and complementing her outfit, the two walked hand in hand to the party. Conversation ranged from talk of classes and homework to who they would know at the party this evening.

When they arrived, the party was in full swing, with music blasting and people dancing or talking. They walked to the refreshment table, and Tom picked up a beer while Sue took a coke. They saw someone they knew and joined in a conversation. For the next few hours, Tom and Sue danced or talked with each other and friends. Tom drank beer steadily to the point of intoxication, while Sue drank coke. At about 12:30, they left and walked back to Sue's room.

Explaining that her roommate was gone for the weekend, Sue invited Tom in for a while. They relaxed on the couch, talking about the party. Tom leaned over and kissed Sue's nose and then her mouth. Sue returned his kiss, and Tom touched her face with his free hand, slowly sliding it to her breast. Sue moved his hand away, and Tom then rested it on her thigh. After a few moments, Tom began to move his hand toward Sue's inner thigh and Sue began to squirm. She broke the kiss which was getting harder and more intense and said "No, slow down. I don't want this to go any further."

Tom continued touching Sue and resumed kissing her. Sue broke the kiss, repeated "no," and pushed his hands away. Tom said "okay" and put his hands on her shoulders. They kissed for a few more minutes before Tom again began touching Sue's breasts. Sue pushed against his chest, saying "I said no." Catching Sue's hands and kissing her all the while, Tom laid Sue down on the couch and slid his hand under her skirt. She continued to try to move and talk but her words were muffled. Intercourse took place. When he entered her, Sue lay still, and tears rolled down her cheeks.

After he ejaculated, Tom rose and pulled up his jeans. Sue went quickly to the bathroom next door. When she had been in there several minutes, Tom pushed the door ajar and asked if she were all right. She said that she felt ill. Saying he'd call her tomorrow, Tom left.
Scenario 3

Please read the following description of a date between two people named Tom and Sue.

Sue and Tom are freshmen who have been dating casually for two weeks. They have never before engaged in sexual intercourse. Tonight they were invited to a party at a friend's house near campus.

At 9 p.m., Tom walked across to Sue's dorm to pick her up. After greeting her with a kiss and complementing her outfit, the two walked hand in hand to the party. Conversation ranged from talk of classes and homework to who they would know at the party this evening.

When they arrived, the party was in full swing, with music blasting and people dancing or talking. They walked to the refreshment table, and Tom picked up a coke while Sue took a beer. They saw someone they knew and joined in a conversation. For the next few hours, Tom and Sue danced or talked with each other and friends. Sue drank beer steadily to the point of intoxication, while Tom drank coke. At about 12:30, they left and walked back to Sue's room.

Explaining that her roommate was gone for the weekend, Sue invited Tom in for a while. They relaxed on the couch, talking about the party. Tom leaned over and kissed Sue's nose and then her mouth. Sue returned his kiss, and Tom touched her face with his free hand, slowly sliding it to her breast. Sue moved his hand away, and Tom then rested it on her thigh. After a few moments, Tom began to move his hand toward Sue's inner thigh and Sue began to squirm. She broke the kiss which was getting harder and more intense and said "No, slow down. I don't want this to go any further."

Tom continued touching Sue and resumed kissing her. Sue broke the kiss, repeated "no," and pushed his hands away. Tom said "okay" and put his hands on her shoulders. They kissed for a few more minutes before Tom again began touching Sue's breasts. Sue pushed against his chest, saying "I said no." Catching Sue's hands and kissing her all the while, Tom laid Sue down on the couch and slid his hand under her skirt. She continued to try to move and talk but her words were muffled. Intercourse took place. When he entered her, Sue lay still, and tears rolled down her cheeks.

After he ejaculated, Tom rose and pulled up his jeans. Sue went quickly to the bathroom next door. When she had been in there several minutes, Tom pushed the door ajar and asked if she were all right. She said that she felt ill. Saying he'd call her tomorrow, Tom left.
Please read the following description of a date between two people named Tom and Sue.

Sue and Tom are freshmen who have been dating casually for two weeks. They have never before engaged in sexual intercourse. Tonight they were invited to a party at a friend's house near campus.

At 9 p.m., Tom walked across to Sue's dorm to pick her up. After greeting her with a kiss and complementing her outfit, the two walked hand in hand to the party. Conversation ranged from talk of classes and homework to who they would know at the party this evening.

When they arrived, the party was in full swing, with music blasting and people dancing or talking. They walked to the refreshment table, and each picked up a coke. They saw someone they knew and joined in a conversation. For the next few hours, Tom and Sue danced or talked with each other and friends. Both drank coke. At about 12:30, they left and walked back to Sue's room.

Explaining that her roommate was gone for the weekend, Sue invited Tom in for a while. They relaxed on the couch, talking about the party. Tom leaned over and kissed Sue's nose and then her mouth. Sue returned his kiss, and Tom touched her face with his free hand, slowly sliding it to her breast. Sue moved his hand away, and Tom then rested it on her thigh. After a few moments, Tom began to move his hand toward Sue's inner thigh and Sue began to squirm. She broke the kiss which was getting harder and more intense and said "No, slow down. I don't want this to go any further."

Tom continued touching Sue and resumed kissing her. Sue broke the kiss, repeated "no," and pushed his hands away. Tom said "okay" and put his hands on her shoulders. They kissed for a few more minutes before Tom again began touching Sue's breasts. Sue pushed against his chest, saying "I said no." Catching Sue's hands and kissing her all the while, Tom laid Sue down on the couch and slid his hand under her skirt. She continued to try to move and talk but her words were muffled. Intercourse took place. When he entered her, Sue lay still, and tears rolled down her cheeks.

After he ejaculated, Tom rose and pulled up his jeans. Sue went quickly to the bathroom next door. When she had been in there several minutes, Tom pushed the door ajar and asked if she were all right. She said that she felt ill. Saying he'd call her tomorrow, Tom left.
Scenario 5

Please read the following description of a date between two people named Tom and Sue.

Sue and Tom are freshmen who have been dating each other exclusively for four months. They have never before engaged in sexual intercourse. Tonight they were invited to a party at a friend's house near campus.

At 9 p.m., Tom walked across to Sue's dorm to pick her up. After greeting her with a kiss and complementing her outfit, the two walked hand in hand to the party. Conversation ranged from talk of classes and homework to who they would know at the party this evening.

When they arrived, the party was in full swing, with music blasting and people dancing or talking. They walked to the refreshment table, and each picked up a beer. They saw someone they knew and joined in a conversation. For the next few hours, Tom and Sue danced or talked with each other and friends. Both drank beer steadily to the point of intoxication. At about 12:30, they left and walked back to Sue's room.

Explaining that her roommate was gone for the weekend, Sue invited Tom in for a while. They relaxed on the couch, talking about the party. Tom leaned over and kissed Sue's nose and then her mouth. Sue returned his kiss, and Tom touched her face with his free hand, slowly sliding it to her breast. Sue moved his hand away, and Tom then rested it on her thigh. After a few moments, Tom began to move his hand toward Sue's inner thigh and Sue began to squirm. She broke the kiss which was getting harder and more intense and said "No, slow down. I don't want this to go any further."

Tom continued touching Sue and resumed kissing her. Sue broke the kiss, repeated "no," and pushed his hands away. Tom said "okay" and put his hands on her shoulders. They kissed for a few more minutes before Tom again began touching Sue's breasts. Sue pushed against his chest, saying "I said no." Catching Sue's hands and kissing her all the while, Tom laid Sue down on the couch and slid his hand under her skirt. She continued to try to move and talk but her words were muffled. Intercourse took place. When he entered her, Sue lay still, and tears rolled down her cheeks.

After he ejaculated, Tom rose and pulled up his jeans. Sue went quickly to the bathroom next door. When she had been in there several minutes, Tom pushed the door ajar and asked if she were all right. She said that she felt ill. Saying he'd call her tomorrow, Tom left.
Scenario 6

Please read the following description of a date between two people named Tom and Sue.

Sue and Tom are freshmen who have been dating each other exclusively for four months. They have never before engaged in sexual intercourse. Tonight they were invited to a party at a friend’s house near campus.

At 9 p.m., Tom walked across to Sue’s dorm to pick her up. After greeting her with a kiss and complementing her outfit, the two walked hand in hand to the party. Conversation ranged from talk of classes and homework to who they would know at the party this evening.

When they arrived, the party was in full swing, with music blasting and people dancing or talking. They walked to the refreshment table, and Tom picked up a beer while Sue took a coke. They saw someone they knew and joined in a conversation.

For the next few hours, Tom and Sue danced or talked with each other and friends. Tom drank beer steadily to the point of intoxication, while Sue drank coke. At about 12:30, they left and walked back to Sue’s room.

Explaining that her roommate was gone for the weekend, Sue invited Tom in for a while. They relaxed on the couch, talking about the party. Tom leaned over and kissed Sue’s nose and then her mouth. Sue returned his kiss, and Tom touched her face with his free hand, slowly sliding it to her breast. Sue moved his hand away, and Tom then rested it on her thigh. After a few moments, Tom began to move his hand toward Sue’s inner thigh and Sue began to squirm. She broke the kiss which was getting harder and more intense and said “No, slow down. I don’t want this to go any further.”

Tom continued touching Sue and resumed kissing her. Sue broke the kiss, repeated “no,” and pushed his hands away. Tom said “okay” and put his hands on her shoulders. They kissed for a few more minutes before Tom again began touching Sue’s breasts. Sue pushed against his chest, saying “I said no.” Catching Sue’s hands and kissing her all the while, Tom laid Sue down on the couch and slid his hand under her skirt. She continued to try to move and talk but her words were muffled. Intercourse took place. When he entered her, Sue lay still, and tears rolled down her cheeks.

After he ejaculated, Tom rose and pulled up his jeans. Sue went quickly to the bathroom next door. When she had been in there several minutes, Tom pushed the door ajar and asked if she were all right. She said that she felt ill. Saying he’d call her tomorrow, Tom left.
Scenario 7

Please read the following description of a date between two people named Tom and Sue.

Sue and Tom are freshmen who have been dating each other exclusively for four months. They have never before engaged in sexual intercourse. Tonight they were invited to a party at a friend's house near campus.

At 9 p.m., Tom walked across to Sue's dorm to pick her up. After greeting her with a kiss and complementing her outfit, the two walked hand in hand to the party. Conversation ranged from talk of classes and homework to who they would know at the party this evening.

When they arrived, the party was in full swing, with music blasting and people dancing or talking. They walked to the refreshment table, and Tom picked up a coke while Sue took a beer. They saw someone they knew and joined in a conversation. For the next few hours, Tom and Sue danced or talked with each other and friends. Sue drank beer steadily to the point of intoxication, while Tom drank coke. At about 12:30, they left and walked back to Sue's room.

Explaining that her roommate was gone for the weekend, Sue invited Tom in for a while. They relaxed on the couch, talking about the party. Tom leaned over and kissed Sue's nose and then her mouth. Sue returned his kiss, and Tom touched her face with his free hand, slowly sliding it to her breast. Sue moved his hand away, and Tom then rested it on her thigh. After a few moments, Tom began to move his hand toward Sue's inner thigh and Sue began to squirm. She broke the kiss which was getting harder and more intense and said "No, slow down. I don't want this to go any further."

Tom continued touching Sue and resumed kissing her. Sue broke the kiss, repeated "no," and pushed his hands away. Tom said "okay" and put his hands on her shoulders. They kissed for a few more minutes before Tom again began touching Sue's breasts. Sue pushed against his chest, saying "I said no." Catching Sue's hands and kissing her all the while, Tom laid Sue down on the couch and slid his hand under her skirt. She continued to try to move and talk but her words were muffled. Intercourse took place. When he entered her, Sue lay still, and tears rolled down her cheeks.

After he ejaculated, Tom rose and pulled up his jeans. Sue went quickly to the bathroom next door. When she had been in there several minutes, Tom pushed the door ajar and asked if she were all right. She said that she felt ill. Saying he'd call her tomorrow, Tom left.
Scenario 8

Please read the following description of a date between two people named Tom and Sue.

Sue and Tom are freshmen who have been dating each other exclusively for four months. They have never before engaged in sexual intercourse. Tonight they were invited to a party at a friend's house near campus.

At 9 p.m., Tom walked across to Sue's dorm to pick her up. After greeting her with a kiss and complementing her outfit, the two walked hand in hand to the party. Conversation ranged from talk of classes and homework to who they would know at the party this evening.

When they arrived, the party was in full swing, with music blasting and people dancing or talking. They walked to the refreshment table, and each picked up a coke. They saw someone they knew and joined in a conversation. For the next few hours, Tom and Sue danced or talked with each other and friends. Both drank coke. At about 12:30, they left and walked back to Sue's room.

Explaining that her roommate was gone for the weekend, Sue invited Tom in for a while. They relaxed on the couch, talking about the party. Tom leaned over and kissed Sue's nose and then her mouth. Sue returned his kiss, and Tom touched her face with his free hand, slowly sliding it to her breast. Sue moved his hand away, and Tom then rested it on her thigh. After a few moments, Tom began to move his hand toward Sue's inner thigh and Sue began to squirm. She broke the kiss which was getting harder and more intense and said "No, slow down. I don't want this to go any further."

Tom continued touching Sue and resumed kissing her. Sue broke the kiss, repeated "no," and pushed his hands away. Tom said "okay" and put his hands on her shoulders. They kissed for a few more minutes before Tom again began touching Sue's breasts. Sue pushed against his chest, saying "I said no." Catching Sue's hands and kissing her all the while, Tom laid Sue down on the couch and slid his hand under her skirt. She continued to try to move and talk but her words were muffled. Intercourse took place. When he entered her, Sue lay still, and tears rolled down her cheeks.

After he ejaculated, Tom rose and pulled up his jeans. Sue went quickly to the bathroom next door. When she had been in there several minutes, Tom pushed the door ajar and asked if she were all right. She said that she felt ill. Saying he'd call her tomorrow, Tom left.
Please take Tom's perspective and think about how he might have felt, what he might have been thinking and why he acted the way that he did. You may make assumptions about information not directly supplied in the story (such as what the conversations were like and the characters' body language). Then complete the sentence blanks with a word or phrase to supply the missing information about Tom's thoughts and feelings.

Sue and Tom are freshmen who have been dating casually for two weeks. They have never before engaged in sexual intercourse. Tonight they were invited to a party at a friend's house near campus.

At 9 p.m., Tom walked across to Sue's dorm to pick her up. After greeting her with a kiss and complementing her outfit, the two walked hand in hand to the party. Conversation ranged from talk of classes and homework to who they would know at the party this evening. If Tom had to describe how he feels about Sue, he would say

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

He thinks going to the party with her will be _______________________
because _____________________________________________________
________________________________________________________

When they arrived, the party was in full swing, with music blasting and people dancing or talking. They walked to the refreshment table, and each picked up a beer. They saw someone they knew and joined in a conversation. For the next few hours, Tom and Sue danced or talked with each other and friends. Both drank beer steadily
to the point of intoxication. At about 12:30, they left and walked back to Sue's room.

Tom feels ____________________________________________
because ________________________________________________.

Explaining that her roommate was gone for the weekend, Sue invited Tom in for a while. They relaxed on the couch, talking about the party. Tom wants ________________________________ and thinks that Sue ____________________________________________
because _________________________________________________. Tom leaned over and kissed Sue's nose and then her mouth. Sue returned his kiss, and Tom touched her face with his free hand, slowly sliding it to her breast. Sue moved his hand away, and Tom then rested it on her thigh. After a few moments, Tom began to move his hand toward Sue's inner thigh and Sue began to squirm. She broke the kiss which was getting harder and more intense and said "No, slow down. I don't want this to go any further." Tom feels ________________________________ because _____________________________________________.

Tom continued touching Sue and resumed kissing her. Sue broke the kiss, repeated "no," and pushed his hands away. Tom said "okay" and put his hands on her shoulders. They kissed for a few more minutes before Tom again began touching Sue's breasts. Sue pushed against his chest, saying "I said no." Tom feels ________________________________ because _____________________________________________.


Catching Sue's hands and kissing her all the while, Tom laid Sue down on the couch and slid his hand under her skirt. She continued to try to move and talk but her words were muffled. Intercourse took place. When he entered her, Sue lay still, and tears rolled down her cheeks. He thinks that Sue ____________________.

After he ejaculated, Tom rose and pulled up his jeans. Sue went quickly to the bathroom next door. When she had been in there several minutes, Tom pushed the door ajar and asked if she were all right. She said that she felt ill. He feels ______________ and thinks ____________________________ because ____________________________. Saying he'd call her tomorrow, Tom left.

Please summarize the reason for Tom's behavior by completing the following sentence:

Tom had intercourse with Sue because ______________________________

______________________________.
APPENDIX C: ARAQ

Based on your responses regarding Tom's feelings, thoughts and intentions, please respond to the following statements by blackening the circle which best indicates your opinion. If you strongly disagree, you would answer "1"; if you agree slightly, you would answer "5"; if you feel neutral, you would answer "4"; and so on.

SD N SA
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. Before this date, Sue and Tom had never had sexual intercourse.
2. Tom was sexually attracted to Sue.
3. Tom heard Sue say 'no' but felt that she would ultimately relax and enjoy herself.
4. Tom only cares about what he wants.
5. Tom was surprised and frustrated when Sue said "no."
6. Tom felt that he persuaded Sue to consent to intercourse.
7. Tom wanted to hurt Sue physically and emotionally.
8. Tom wanted Sue to feel powerless.
9. Tom felt entitled to have intercourse with Sue.
10. Sue's behavior caused Tom to believe that she wanted intercourse.
11. Tom has been involved in similar situations with other women.
12. Tom felt that he should have tried harder to control his behavior.
13. Tom had sex with Sue because he was so excited he couldn't stop.
14. Tom felt that his actions were wrong but he didn't care.
15. Tom was willing to proceed with intercourse regardless of Sue's wishes.
16. Tom believed that Sue should have sex with him to show him that she really loves him.
17. Tom felt that most other couples had intercourse with each other at this particular stage of their relationship.
18. Tom wanted Sue to have sex with him because she led him on.
19. Tom was angry at Sue because he feels that she has all the power in their relationship.
20. Tom wanted to have sex with Sue to show his love for her.
21. Tom didn't fully understand what was happening between himself and Sue.
22. Tom is mentally ill.
23. Tom did not plan to have sexual intercourse with Sue.
24. Tom is sexually deviant or abnormal.
25. Tom and Sue have dated for 4 months.
26. Tom felt that Sue was playing "hard to get".
27. Tom is more responsible than Sue for what happened.
28. Tom was in full control of himself and his actions.
29. Tom did not drink any alcohol at the party.
30. Tom acted as he did because his judgment was impaired.
31. Tom is a ruthless and self-centered person.
32. Tom's own self-induced feelings and beliefs were the main causes of his behavior.
33. Tom feels that he and Sue will be closer now that they have had sexual intercourse.
35. Sue drank alcohol at the party.
36. Tom believes that he was justified in acting as he did.
37. Tom feels like he should not have had intercourse with Sue.
38. Tom's anger at Sue was more important than his sexual feelings in determining his behavior.
39. Sue and Tom have dated for 2 weeks.
40. What happened between Sue and Tom was the result of miscommunication.
41. The main reason that Tom had intercourse with Sue was because he wanted to put her in her place.
42. Tom feels like he raped Sue.

Please respond to the following statements with your own opinions and thoughts.

43. The above is an example of acquaintance or date rape.
44. If I were a man, I would act and feel the same way that Tom did. (Please respond even if you are a woman.)
APPENDIX D: PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT SCALE

49. I believe that a situation similar to what happened between Tom and Sue could actually happen in real life.

50. The incident between Tom and Sue captured my interest.

51. I am confident in the responses that I provided regarding Tom's behavior.

52. The tasks that I have been asked to perform in this study interest me.

53. I put some thought into my responses in this study.

54. The scenario I read was believable.

55. I believe that I answered the questions about Tom as accurately as I could.
APPENDIX E: RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE
AND ADVERSARIAL SEXUAL BELIEFS SCALES

For the statements which follow, please blacken the number that best indicates your opinion—what you believe. If you strongly disagree, you would answer "1"; if you agree slightly, you would answer "5"; if you feel neutral, you would answer "4"; and so on.
Continue answering on the same answer sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex.
46. Any female can get raped.
47. Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wants to.
48. When women go around braless or wearing short skirts and tight tops, they are just asking for trouble.
49. In the majority of rapes, the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.
50. If a girl engages in necking or petting and she lets things get out of hand, it is her own fault if her partner forces sex on her.
51. Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve.
52. A woman who is stuck-up and thinks she is too good to talk to guys on the street deserves to be taught a lesson.
53. Many women have an unconscious wish to be raped, and may then unconsciously set up a situation in which they are likely to be attacked.
54. If a woman gets drunk at a party and has intercourse with a man she's just met there, she should be considered "fair game" to other males at the party who want to have sex with her too, whether she wants to or not.
55. A woman will only respect a man who will lay down the law to her.
56. Many women are so demanding sexually that a man just can't satisfy them.
57. A man's got to show the woman who's boss right from the start or he'll end up henpecked.
58. Women are usually sweet until they've caught a man, but then they let their true self show.
59. A lot of men talk big, but when it comes down to it, they can't perform well sexually.
60. In a dating relationship a woman is largely out to take advantage of a man.
61. Most men are out for only one thing.
62. Most women are sly and manipulating when they are out to attract a man.
63. A lot of women seem to get pleasure in putting men down.

Please use the following key to answer the next two questions. Blacken the circle that shows what fraction you believe to be true.

1--Almost None
2--A Few
3--Some
4--About Half
5--Many
6--A Lot
7--Almost All

64. What percentage of women who report a rape would you say are lying because they are angry and want to get back at the man they accuse?
65. What percentage of reported rapes would you guess were merely invented by women who discovered they were pregnant and wanted to protect their own reputation?

Please use the following key to answer the next question:

1--Never
2--Rarely
3--Sometimes
4--Half the Time
5--Often
6--Usually
7--Always

A person come to you and claims they were raped. How likely would you be to believe their statement if the person were:

66. your best friend?
67. an Indian woman?
68. a neighborhood woman?
69. a young boy?
70. a black woman?
71. a white woman?
APPENDIX F: DEMOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Please fill in the blank on your computer answer sheet corresponding to the response which best matches your situation. Reminder: your response to the following items, and all items in this study, is completely anonymous.

83. My sex is
   1. Male
   2. Female

84. My college classification is
   1. Freshman
   2. Sophomore
   3. Junior
   4. Senior
   5. Graduate
   6. Other

85. My race is
   1. Caucasian
   2. Black
   3. Hispanic
   4. Asian
   5. Other

86. Are you presently dating
   1. 1 person
   2. 2 or more persons
   3. I am not currently involved in a dating relationship

87. The longest amount of time that I have ever been involved with another person in a dating relationship is
   1. Less than a week
   2. Between 1 week and 1 month
   3. Between 1 to 5 months
   4. Between 5 months to 12 months
   5. Longer than 1 year

88. I have forced a woman/man to have sexual intercourse against his/her will.
   1. No
   2. Yes
89. Someone has attempted to force me to have sexual intercourse against my will.
   1. No
   2. Yes

90. Someone has forced me to have sexual intercourse against my will.
   1. No
   2. Yes

91. I have been raped.
   1. No
   2. Yes

92. I have raped someone.
   1. No
   2. Yes