Summer 8-2019

Exploring College Students' Perceptions of Rape Through the Use of Visual Vignettes

Samantha Gavin

EXPLORING COLLEGE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF RAPE THROUGH THE USE OF VISUAL VIGNETTES

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Samantha M. Gavin

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

August 2019

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Samantha M. Gavin

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

_____	_____
	Erika Frenzel, Ph.D. Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Advisor
_____	_____
	Jonathon Cooper, Ph.D. Associate Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice
_____	_____
	John Lewis, Ph.D. Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice
_____	_____
	Jennifer Gossett, Ph.D. Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice

ACCEPTED

_____ _____

Randy L. Martin, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Exploring College Students' Perceptions of Rape Through the Use of Visual Vignettes

Author: Samantha M. Gavin

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Erika Frenzel

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Jonathon Cooper
Dr. John Lewis
Dr. Jennifer Gossett

While research has examined the level of blame placed on victims and perpetrators for rape and sexual assault simulations, no one has ever examined if college students can accurately identify what rape is. In addition, the simulations that are presented to students tend to overwhelming have female victims and male perpetrators. This study examines if college students can accurately identify rape, using four visual vignettes demonstrating a clear violation of law, an ambiguous violation of law, a clear non-violation of law, and an ambiguous non-violation of law, with a male victim and two female perpetrators. It was found that gender significantly influences an individual's likelihood of accurately identifying the simulation, and that students overall are able to identify rape, except for the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Department of Justice has found that rape is the most common form of violent crime to occur on college campuses, and that "college women [have a higher risk of being raped or experiencing] other forms of sexual assault than women the same age but not in college" (Sampson, 2003, p. 2). In order to understand the issue of sexual assault and rape, it is important to differentiate between the two, since research tends to interchange the terms. Sexual assault is defined as "sexual contact or behavior that occurs without explicit consent of the victim" (Rape Abuse and Incest National Network (RAINN), 2017, para. 2). Examples of sexual assault include: 1) "attempted rape;" 2) "fondling or unwanted sexual touching;" 3) "forcing a victim to perform sexual acts, such as oral sex or penetrating the perpetrator's body;" and 4) "penetration of the victim's body, also known as rape" (RAINN, 2017, para. 3). The Federal Bureau of Investigation, via the Uniform Crime Reports, defines rape as "penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without the consent of the victim" (RAINN, 2017, para. 4). Therefore, while sexual assault encompasses rape, attempted rape, and any form of unwanted sexual touching, rape focuses solely on penetration of a victim or offender without the victim's consent. Due to this, when research focuses on sexual assault, it examines rape as well, but does not examine sexual assault when it focuses specifically on rape. Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, and Martin (2007) found that one out of every five college women and one out of every 16 college men are sexually assaulted. This statistic demonstrates that both men and women who attend college are at a high risk of becoming victims of sexual assault, but that the rate is significantly higher for college women.

Data about sexual assault on college campuses or with college students suffers from a lack of reporting (Langton & Sinozich, 2014). In fact, over 40 % of college rape victims do not report their victimization (Sampson, 2003), while over 90 % of sexual assaults on college campuses go unreported (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). There are several reasons as to why individuals do not report rape or sexual assault victimizations. A few reasons include embarrassment and shame, mistrust of the campus judicial system, self-blaming, fear of reprisal from the assailant, and fear of social isolation (Sampson, 2003).

Current research about sexual assault victimizations of college students is limited. Research tends to focus on women more than men[1] (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Sampson, 2003; Oshiname, Ogunwale, & Ajuwon, 2013), and research pertaining to college students' perceptions of these crimes tends to focus only on rape, ignoring other aspects of sexual assault (Ben-David & Schneider, 2005; Burgess & Burpo, 2012; Lee, Pomeroy, Yoo, & Rheinboldt; Muehlenhard, Friedman, & Thomas; Oshiname, Ogunwale, & Ajuwon, 2013; Sahl & Keene, 2012; Schneider, Mori, Lambert, & Wong, 2009; Simonson & Subich, 1999; Vandiver & Dupalo, 2012; Varelas & Foley, 1998; White & Robinson Kurpius, 2002; Yamawaki & Tschanz, 2005). Lastly, while there is research pertaining to college students' perceptions of blameworthiness, the research as a whole is not comprehensive. Some studies focus on a specific category of college students (Giovannelli & Jackson, 2013; Oshiname, Ogunwale, & Ajuwon, 2013; Tamawaki & Tschanz, 2005; Romero-Sanchez, Megias, & Krahe, 2012), while others focus on specific factors which might influence college students' perceptions of blameworthiness (Burgess & Burpo, 2012; Maurer & Robinson, 2008; Romero-Sanchez, Megias, & Krahe, 2012; Vandiver & Dupalo, 2013). For example, in relation to specific groups of college students,

[1] This could be accounted for due to males reporting less rape and sexual assault victimizations than females.

Giovannelli and Jackson (2013) specifically studied Christian college students, Yamawaki and Tschanz (2005) compared Japanese college students' rape perceptions with rape perceptions of American college students, and Oshiname, Ogunwale, and Ajuwon (2013) focused on date rape perceptions among female college students studying at a university in Nigeria.

As demonstrated above, previous research about college students' perceptions of sexual offenses is limited (i.e., focusing on women more than men, focusing on specific respondents based on race, focusing on victim over perpetrator). Due to this, this research will address such limitations, by further enhancing research about college students and sexual offenses, specifically rape. For example, while previous research tends to focus on blameworthiness in rape scenarios, it fails to address how students perceive the incident as a whole in terms of whether or not they can accurately classify what constitutes rape or sexual assault. This research will enhance current research on students' perceptions of rape by steering away from the level of blame students place on the victim and perpetrator, and analyzing students' perceptions as to what constitutes rape, thereby adding to the literature on sexual assault as well. Furthermore, research tends to survey specific groups of students, instead of surveying students as a whole. Therefore, to further such research, this study will survey students within theatre and criminology/criminal justice courses, and not exclude them based on racial and ethnic demographics.

Although previous research about college students and sexual assaults does have limitations, it also provides useful information, which will be incorporated in this research. Studies have found that attire of the victim, and the gender and ethnicity of the respondent, impact how college students apply blameworthiness to victims and offenders. For example, the more provocatively the victim was dressed (Vandiver & Dupalo, 2013; Whatley, 2005;

Workman & Freeburg, 1999) the more survey respondents blamed the victim for their victimization. In relation to sex, male respondents were less likely to believe an action as being that of sexual assault than female respondents (Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001).

Although these variables impact how college students perceive blameworthiness of sexual offense incidents, not all of them relate specifically to addressing how students define sexual offenses. Therefore, this study will control for the respondent's gender and race. Doing so will allow for an understanding of how a respondent's gender and race influence his/her perceptions of what constitutes rape.

As will be demonstrated throughout Chapter 2, research within this topic does not look at whether or not college students accurately classify what constitutes rape. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to address the following research question: *Are college students able to correctly identify rape?* This is an important research question, because if the way college students perceive what constitutes rape differs from how rape is legally defined, a gap between knowledge and policy can possibly be demonstrated. This gap between what students perceive as rape and the legal definition of the law could potentially explain, in part, some of the reasons as to why high rates of rape and sexual assaults occur on college campuses yearly. This research will survey students attending Indiana University of Pennsylvania main campus after they have viewed four simulations depicting: 1) a clear violation of rape law; 2) an ambiguous violation of rape law; 3) a clear non-violation of rape law; and 4) an ambiguous non-violation of rape law, as defined by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The purpose is to determine if students can accurately label which simulations are violations of law and which are not.

Chapter 2 consists of a literature review discussing blameworthiness of sexual assault. A discussion of the use of simulations in previous literature will be provided. Furthermore, a

discussion of Friedman's theory of effective communication and law will also be provided in order to demonstrate how societal definitions of law can differ from the legal definitions of law. Chapter 3 provides the methodology for this study, a description of the sample, and an explanation of the legal definition of rape, along with the aspects of this definition that will be demonstrated in the simulations. Chapter 4 provides the results of the statistical analyses of the data, and Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the results along with the strengths and limitations of the research, and a recommended pathway for further research about this topic.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will provide a comprehensive overview of sexual assault as well as focus on how individuals perceive victim and offender blameworthiness of sexual offenses. First, a detailed discussion of the extent of sexual assault, in terms of statistics both on and off college campuses, will be provided. Following this, although there is no previous research on how college students define rape, in order to understand why individuals, perceive rape as they do, an explanation of how individuals' perceptions of blameworthiness of sexual offenses are influenced by various factors (respondent gender, respondent race, which are included in this study), must be addressed. Therefore, a discussion of sexual offense perceptions and how such perceptions are influenced by various factors will be provided. Next, an overview of how college students perceive the law overall will be provided, followed by a detailed explanation of Friedman's theory of effective communication and law will be given, thus demonstrating why college students' perceptions of rape may potentially differ from the legal definition of rape. Following this, a discussion of simulation research and its effectiveness in studying sexual assault perceptions will be provided. Lastly, a brief overview of the current study, along with the research questions and hypotheses will be provided.

Sexual Assault Statistics

Although rates of sexual violence against women in the United States decreased from 1995 to 2005, before leveling out and remaining consistent (Berzofsky, Krebs, Langton, & Planty, 2013), such statistics do not take into account sexual violence against men in the United States (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2013), giving us an incomplete picture of sexual violence. Overall, the Division of Violence Prevention (2012) found that one in five women and

one in 71 men "reported experiencing rape at some time in their lives" (p. 1), and that one in 20 males and females experienced some other form of sexual violence within a year prior to taking the survey. Black and colleagues (2011) found similar results, reporting that one in five women and one in 71 men will be raped at some point in their lives (National Sexual Violence Resource Center, 2015).

In relation to whom is more likely to perpetrate sexual assaults, Tjaden and Thoennes (2000) found that males were more likely to perpetrate sexual assault than females. In fact, they found that 99 % of female and 70.1 % of male rape victims were raped by a male perpetrator, with only 35.8 % of male victims being raped by a female perpetrator[2].

The National Sexual Violence Resource Center (2015) found that 46.4 % of lesbians, 74.9 % of bisexual women, 43.3 % of heterosexual women, 40.2 % of gay men, 47.4 % of bisexual men, and 20.8 % of heterosexual men will experience sexual violence other than rape during their lifetimes (Walters, Chen, & Breiding, 2013). Those with a sexual orientation other than heterosexual are at a higher risk of being sexually victimized throughout their lifetimes.

While such rates of rape and other sexual assaults for both males and females are rather high, they are not entirely accurate. In fact, due to a lack of reporting of such victimizations, the overall rates may be higher than research has demonstrated. For example, in 1995, it was found that only one in three female victims of rape or sexual assault reported her victimization to police (Greenfeld, 1997). Over the past two decades, the rate of reporting has decreased. From 1992 to 2000, only 36 % "of rapes, 34 [%] of attempted rapes, and 26 [%] of sexual assaults were reported to police" (Rennison, 2002, p. 1). While research varies in the %age of rape and sexual assault reported to the police, one thing is fairly consistent, the %ages of individuals reporting

[2] %ages exceed over 100 % due to some victims having multiple perpetrators (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000).

rape and sexual assault are low. The %age of those reporting to police varies from 16 % to 33.6 % (Johnson & Sigler, 2000; Truman & Langton, 2015). Furthermore, research has found that 63 % to 65 % of rape and sexual assault victims do not report their victimizations to the police (Rennison, 2002; Berzofsky, Krebs, Langton, & Smiley-McDonald, 2012). Thus, not only are rape and sexual assault the least reported violent crimes, and in addition, "the most under-reported crime" (NSVRC, 2015, p. 2), but the rate at which such crimes are being reported to police are decreasing as well (Truman & Langton, 2015).

Ever present in the myths of rape and sexual assault is that the offender will be a stranger to the victim. In actuality however, research has found that victims of rape and sexual assault are more likely to know their perpetrator than they are to be victimized by a stranger. The Division for Violence Prevention (2012) found that female rape victims were more likely to be raped by an intimate partner (51.1 %) or an acquaintance (40.8 %) than by a stranger (13.8 %). Male rape victims, were more likely to be raped by an acquaintance (52.4 %) than by a stranger (15.1 %), and when male rape victims were made to penetrate someone else, they were more likely to be raped by an intimate partner (44.8 %) or an acquaintance (44.7 %), than by a stranger (8.2 %). As a result, although the ever popular "stranger-danger" slogan is present throughout the United States, individuals are more likely to be sexually victimized by someone they knew than by a stranger.

Even though all individuals are at risk of becoming victims of sexual violence, no matter what their age, research has found that females aged 18-24 years are at a higher risk of becoming victims of rape or sexual assault than females in all other age categories (Langton & Sinozich, 2014). In fact, although non-students are more likely to be raped or sexually assaulted than students, the difference is minimal; non-students are 1.2 times more likely than students to be

raped or sexually assaulted (Langton & Sinozich, 2014). Although the victimization rate between non-students and students slightly differs, overall, research has found that one out of every five women are assaulted while they are in college (Krebs et al., 2007), with some research stating that during the course of their college career, 15 to 20 % of college students as a whole, will become victims of a sex crime (Carey, Durney, Shepardson, & Carey, 2015; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). Therefore, although the rate of women being raped or sexually assaulted while attending college is the same as the national average, due to them falling into the most at-risk age group, female college students are at an increased risk of experiencing such victimization. Additionally, males are exceedingly more likely to be raped or sexually assaulted while they are in college than males who are not in college, no matter what the age. Krebs and colleagues (2007) found that one out of every 16 males will be sexually victimized while in college, which is significantly greater than the national average of one out of every 71 men.

While nationally research has demonstrated that 63 % of sexual victimizations go unreported, such rates are even higher among college students. Langton and Sinozich (2014) found that of female college students who are sexually victimized, 80 % do not report their victimizations, while Fisher, Cullen, and Turner (2000) found that 90 % of male and female college students who are sexually victimized, do not report their victimizations. In regard to the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator, it was found that female college students knew their attacker 80 % of the reported victimizations (Langton & Sinozich, 2014). Therefore, as with the national average, college students are more likely to be sexually victimized by someone they know than by a stranger.

Due to the high rates at which rape and sexual assault occur, the U.S. Department of Justice found that rape in the United States alone, costs $127 billion annually, therefore costing

more than any other crime (Miller, Cohen, & Wiersema, 1996). Research has found that each rape costs roughly $151,000, with the cost including victim costs and criminal justice costs. Victim costs include tangible and intangible costs, and the risk of death, while criminal justice costs include "annualized costs of investigation, legal defense, incarceration, parole, and probation" (Delisi, Kosloski, Sween, Hachmeister, Moore, & Drury, 2010, p. 505). Not only do the high rates of rapes and sexual assaults cost financially, but they incur mental costs as well. Post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and other short- and long-term mental issues, have been reported by 81 % of female and 35 % of male rape and sexual assault victims (Black et al., 2011). Therefore, not only are high rates of rape and sexual assault alone an issue, but the costs which such actions incur is an issue as well.

As research has demonstrated, rape and sexual assault victimization does not only affect a substantial number of men and women throughout the United States in general each year, but even more so, college aged students are at an increased risk of such victimization, compared to the general population. Even though reported victimization rates are high, they are not completely accurate, as demonstrated by the lack of such victimization being reported to police. Of even more concern is the fact that college students report sexual victimization at a lower rate than the national average. Due to this, college aged students are no doubt at the highest risk of being sexually victimized, while attending college. Due to the high rates of sexual victimization of students on college campuses, college students are a prime population to study for this research study.

Perceptions of Victim and Offender Blameworthiness

Overall, research pertaining to college students' perceptions of sexual assault incidents is lacking. In fact, not only is it lacking, but all research pertaining to college students' perceptions

of sexual assault focuses solely on the level of blame students place on the victim, and at times, the offender, for the incident. With all current research pertaining to college students' perceptions of sexual assault focusing on the level of blame students place on the victim or perpetrator; consequently, there is no research which examines how students classify what they consider rape to be, which is the focus of this study. However, although the research is severely limited and does not focus on the topic of study at hand, what research does exist is useful to the current study. Current research is useful because it demonstrates various factors that influence students' level of blame, and thus demonstrate factors that influence students' perceptions of the crime overall. Such factors include victim and perpetrator sex, victim-perpetrator relationship, respondent's sex, and respondent's ethnicity. Furthermore, current research, due to its limitations, as will be discussed later on, demonstrates various variables that need to be examined in order to determine if such factors influence college students' perceptions of sexual assault. As a result, such factors will be included in the study as dependent variables or control variables. Additionally, there is an assumption while reading this research that when more blame is assigned to the victim for the incident, there could be a belief that a rape or sexual assault did not occur, and that when less blame is assigned to the victim, there could be a belief that a rape or sexual assault did occur. For the purpose of this research study, the study will move beyond this assumption by looking at respondents' perceptions of rape-based simulations and comparing such perceptions to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's legal definition of rape.

Although research within this area is lacking, what research does exist needs to be discussed in order to provide a foundation for the current study, as well as demonstrate which variables will be included for study along with how the study will move past the assumption discussion above. Thus, this section will focus on individuals' perceptions of the perpetrators and

victims of sexual offenses. Although there is more research pertaining to college students' perceptions than societal perceptions, a comprehensive review of the literature is needed. A discussion of blameworthiness, both of the general public and of college students will be provided, along with how such perceptions are influenced by various factors. It is important to note that research tends to focus solely on victim and perpetrator blame for these incidents, thereby excluding other means by which these offenses are perceived. Additionally, in order to gain an understanding of why research that moves beyond assumption is needed, a demonstration of the limited research about society and college students' perceptions of sexual offenses will be provided.

Societal Perceptions of Sexual Offense Blameworthiness

Although research about societal perceptions of sexual offenses is limited, there are several different factors that have been found to influence perceptions of the victims and offenders of sexual assault. Such factors include victim's gender, perpetrator's gender, and the relationship between the victim and his/her perpetrator. Although this research pertains mainly to how various factors influence respondents' perceptions of victim blame and responsibility for the sexual assault, it is important to discuss it due to the assumption that the more respondents' blame the victim for the victimization, the less likely respondents are to believe that the described incident was a sexual assault. Furthermore, providing an overview of societal perceptions of such incidents will allow for a more in-depth understanding about how college students perceive such incidents. In understanding how society perceives sexual assault incidents, incorporated with the assumption that more victim blame suggests a belief in the incident portrayed not being that of a sexual assault, the groundwork for an understanding about how individuals might define sexual assault overall, will be provided.

Victim and perpetrator gender. Sommer, Reynolds, and Kehn (2015), while conducting mock juror trials, found that individuals were more likely to blame[3] the victim than the perpetrator for the rape. Mock jurors consisted of individuals who were recruited through Amazon's Mechanical Turk to complete the online survey, which consisted of vignettes[4] that described "allegations of a forcible rape between a man and woman" (Sommer, Reynolds, & Kehn, 20015, p. 8). The authors found that mock jurors tended to blame victims more than perpetrators for the rape. More specifically, male victims who were forcibly raped by female perpetrators were blamed more than female victims who were raped by male perpetrators (Sommer, Reynolds, & Kehn, 2015). Along with this, although mock jurors blamed victims more than perpetrators, what minimal blame was placed on perpetrators, was placed more on male perpetrators than female perpetrators. Therefore, males overall are blamed more than their female counterparts, whether they are victims or perpetrators of forcible rape[5].

Victim-perpetrator relationship. Research has demonstrated that victims are more likely to be sexually assaulted by someone they know than by a stranger (Division for Violence Prevention, 2012). Upon looking at how this relationship influences the way society perceives

[3] In order to determine victim and perpetrator blame, Sommer, Reynolds, and Kehn (2015) used the *Perception of Victim Blame Scale* and the *Perception of Perpetrator Blame Scale* (Rayburn, Mendoza, & Davison, 2003). The *Perceptions of Victim Blame Scale* has survey participants rate the victims described in the vignettes on a seven-point Likert scale. This scale measures "the degree of culpability [blame] participants assign to the victims" (Rayburn, Mendoza, & Davison, 2003, p. 1061). This scale was found to have an internal consistency of 0.90, thus making it a reliable way to measure the level of blame participants placed on the victim. As with the *Perception of Victim Blame Scale*, the *Perception of Perpetrator Blame Scale* has participants rate the perpetrators described in the vignettes on a seven-point Likert scale that "measured the degree of culpability [blame] participants assigned to the perpetrators" (Rayburn, Mendoza, & Davison, 2003, p. 1061). Similarly, the *Perception of Perpetrator Blame Scale* was found to be reliable, with an internal consistency of 0.85.

[4] The vignettes controlled for three variables: heterosexual pairings, revictimization, and the victim-perpetrator relationship. Doing so, the only types of scenarios excluded from the study involved homosexual and incestual incidents. Consequently, the vignettes demonstrated the majority of the cases that are seen in a court of law (Sommer, Reynolds, & Kehn, 2015).

[5] Such findings support previous research on victim and perpetrator sex (Vandiver & Dupalo, 2013; Gerber, Cronin, & Steigman, 2004; White & Kurpius, 2002; Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001; Ford, Liwag-McLamb, & Foley, 1998; Schneider, Ee, & Aronson, 2994; Groth & Burgess, 1980), however these studies sampled college students; therefore, they will be discussed below in the *College Students Perceptions of Sexual Offenses* section.

the sexual assault incident, research has demonstrated that society tends to place more blame[6] on the victim when the victim personally knew or was acquainted with her rapist (Durán, Moya, Megías, & Viki, 2010)[7]. Durán and colleagues (2010) surveyed high school students from Granada, Spain. Participants were provided with four rape scenarios in which a male raped a female, with two demonstrating a husband-wife relationship, and two demonstrating a boyfriend-girlfriend relationship. It was found that high school students blamed the victims who were raped by their husbands more than the victims who were raped by their boyfriends, for their victimizations. Thus, it can be suggested that the more a victim knows their rapist, the more likely society is to blame them for their rape.

Although research about societal perceptions on sexual offense incidents is exceedingly rare and limited, it does provide a basic understanding of how individuals perceive not only victims of rape, but perpetrators of rape as well. Generally, society tends to blame victims more than perpetrators, and males more than females. For example, male victims tend to be blamed more than female victims, and male perpetrators tend to be blamed more than female perpetrators. The more a victim knows his/her assailant, the more he/she is blamed for the sexual assault. As with the blame-perception assumption mentioned above, it can be assumed that since victims are perceived as being responsible for their victimization, individuals are less likely to

[6] The victim's blameworthiness was measured via fourteen statements, each with a five-point Likert scale. For example, "*what happened in the above situation is the woman's fault…the woman deserves all that happened in the sexual relationship with the man, because she didn't behave like a true woman…although the woman told him not to have sex, she really wanted to have sex with him"* (Durán et al., 2010, p. 509). Participants were asked to state how much they agreed or disagreed with each of the statements. The responses ranged in score from 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The higher the score, the higher the level of blame placed on the victim (Durán et al., 2010).

[7] As with victim and perpetrator sex studies, most of the studies pertaining to the relationship between the victim and his/her perpetrator involved surveying college students (Simonson & Subich, 1999; Ben-David & Schneider, 2005; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Rebeiz & Harb, 2010; Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderip, 2000; Brides, 1991; Bridges & McGail, 1989; Bell, Kuriloff, & Lottes, 1994; Sheldon-Keller, Llyod-McGarvey, West, & Canterbury, 1994; White & Yamawaki, 2009; Sleath & Bull, 2010; Gölge, Yavuz, Müderrisoglu, & Yavuz, 2013). Therefore, these studies will be discussed below in the *College Students Perceptions of Sexual Offenses* section.

perceive such incidents as being that of sexual assault. With the minimal research conducted on societal perceptions of sexual offense incidents, a look into college students' perceptions of such incidents, which is more vast, will help to determine a more comprehensive view of the characteristics which influences an individual's perceptions of sexual offense incidents.

College Students' Perceptions of Sexual Offense Blameworthiness

Research about perceptions of sexual offense incidents tends to incorporate college students in the sample more than any other group of individuals. A potential reason for this can be attributed to the high rates of rape and sexual assault that occur on college campuses. Through such research, several characteristics influencing college students' perceptions of sexual offense incidents, specifically who is at blame, have been identified. These characteristics include victim's dress, victim's and perpetrator's gender, victim-perpetrator relationship, respondent's gender, and respondent's ethnicity. After discussing each of these characteristics separately, an overall description of how college students perceive blameworthiness of sexual offense incidents will be provided. It is important to note once again that while reading this research, there is the assumption that the more respondents blame victims for the portrayed sexual assaults, the less likely the respondents perceive the incident to be that of a sexual assault. Therefore, gaining an understanding of victim blame, allows for one to begin to understand how college students might perceive what constitutes sexual assault incidents. Once this basic understanding is acquired, one can begin to examine how college students perceive rape incidents, and whether or not they can identify what constitutes rape from visual simulations, which is the purpose of this research study.

Victim dress. Research pertaining to what a victim is wearing at the time of a sexual assault incident has found that college students tend to place more blame for the incident on

provocatively dressed victims, and less blame on conservatively dressed victims. Whatley (2005), surveyed college students about their perceptions of a rape scenario that demonstrated a husband raping his wife. After reading the scenario, participants were asked to rate whom they found to be more responsible[8] for the incident; the husband or the wife. Following this, they were asked to indicate how the wife depicted in the scenario was dressed[9]. Whatley (2005) found that respondents placed more blame on the wife when they thought she was dressed provocatively than when they thought she was dressed conservatively, and that college students tended to rate provocatively dressed women as more deserving of being raped by their husbands than conservatively dressed victims. It was also found that holding the perpetrator responsible for committing rape was not significant (Whatley, 2005). Overall, Whatley (2005) found that college students tend to place more blame not only on the victims more than the perpetrators, but they place even more blame on the victims when they are dressing in a more provocative than conservative manner.

Workman and Freeburg (1999), while looking at college students' perceptions of rape incidents within dating scenarios, based on how the female was dressed, found similar results to that of Whatley (2005). In their study, Workman and Freeburg (1999) provided participants with not only a scenario depicting a rape incident between a dating couple, but with photographs of how the female in the scenario was dressed. The participants were provided with three photographs in total; one of a female wearing a "skirt that fell [three] inches below the knee,"

[8] Levels of responsibility for both the husband and the wife were rated on nine-point Likert-type scales which ranged from 1 *(not at all responsible*) to 9 (*very deserving*). In order to determine the level of responsibility placed on the wife for rape incident, participants were asked "how responsible for the incident do you believe Suzie was?" (Whatley, 2005, p. 194). Similarly, in order to determine the level of responsibility placed on the husband for the rape incident, participants were asked "how responsible for the incident do you believe Jim was?" (Whatley, 2005, p. 194).

[9] In order to determine how the participants thought the wife was dressed based on the scenario, participants were asked "how was Suzie dress?" (Whatley, 2005, p. 194). The response categories for this question contained a nine-point scale that ranged from 1 (*plain*) to 9 *(sexy*).

one of the same female with the skirt shortened three inches, and a third photograph of the same female with the skirt shortened three inches above that in the second photograph (Workman & Freeburg, 1999, p. 268). After looking at the photographs and reading the scenario, participants were asked how responsible[10] both the victim and the perpetrator were for the incident described in the scenario. The authors found that college students held the victim more responsible than the perpetrator, and that more responsibility was placed on the victims who were in shorter skirts than the victims who were in longer skirts.

Vandiver and Dupalo (2013), while examining the relationship between rape myths, found that over 20 % of college students surveyed in their study agreed that "a woman who dressed in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tries to force her to have sex" (p. 600). Abbey, Cozzarelli, McLaughlin, and Harnish (1987) while using photographs of women to depict rape myth perceptions, found that women who wear provocative clothing tended to be viewed as being more promiscuous than women who wear conservative clothing. This research finds that college student respondents tended to consider the state of dress of the victim when considering promiscuity and sexual expectations of women resulting in more blame placed on the skimpily dressed woman. Therefore, as per the blame-perception assumption, it can be suggested that college students are less likely to perceive incidents as that of rape when the victim is dressed in a provocative manner.

Victim and perpetrator gender. Currently, research tends to focus more on how the gender of the victim impacts how college students place blame and perceive rape situations, with less attention placed on the impact that the gender of the perpetrator has. Traditionally, women

[10] Responsibility of the victim and the perpetrator was rated based on a nine-point Likert scale with a range of 0 (*not responsible*) to 8 (*responsible*). Participants were asked the following two questions to determine responsibility levels: 1) "how responsible was Amy for what happened;" and 2) "how responsible was Mike for what happened?" (Workman & Freeburg, 1999, p. 269).

are viewed as gatekeepers of sex, therefore making them responsible for not only their own behaviors, but their partner's behaviors as well (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). Due to this, greater blame tends to be placed on females for their victimization than on males for perpetrating such victimization.

Vandiver and Dupalo (2013) confirmed Groth and Burgess' (1980) findings that college students have difficulty believing that males can be victims of rape. Through the use of vignettes, Vandiver and Dupalo (2013) surveyed college students to determine the likelihood that they would perceive scenarios as rape, depending on the sex of the victim. Thus, the authors created two surveys, with 13 scenarios each; the only difference being that in one survey the victim was male and the other survey, the victim was female. For each of the scenarios, participants were asked to rate the level at which they perceived the scenario to depict rape[11]. Vandiver and Dupalo (2013) found that college students perceived scenarios as rape more often when the victim was female than when the victim was male. Schneider, Ee, and Aronson (1994), Ford, Liwag-McLamb, and Foley (1998), and White and Kurpius (2002) found similar results.

Schneider, Ee, and Aronson (1994) and Ford, Liwag-McLamb, and Foley (1998) provided psychology undergraduates scenarios depicting several different forms of rape. Specifically, Schneider, Ee, and Aronson (1994) provided participants with six rape scenarios and asked them to rate the level of responsibility[12] the victim has in his/her rape victimization, while Ford, Liwag-McLamb, and Foley (1998) provided participants with one scenario and asked them to rate the level of responsibility[13] the victim and the perpetrator had in the rape

[11] Five-point Likert scales were used, ranging from 1 (*definitely rape*) to 5 (*definitely not rape*) (Vandiver & Dupalo, 2013).
[12] Level of responsibility was measured via a seven-point scale that ranged from 1 *(not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). The higher the total, the more responsibility participants placed on the victim (Schneider, Ee, & Aronson, 1994).
[13] Level of responsibility was measured via a four-point scale than ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*). The higher the total, the more responsibility participants placed on the victim/perpetrator (Ford, Liwag-McLamb, & Foley, 1998).

victimization. Schneider, Ee, and Aronson (1994) and Ford, Liwag-McLamb, and Foley (1998) both found that college students held female rape victims more responsible for their victimization than they held male rape victims. In relation to the level of responsibility placed on the perpetrator for the rape victimization, Ford, Liwag-McLamb, and Foley (1998) did not find any evidence suggesting that the sex of the perpetrator had any influence on college students' perceptions of perpetrator responsibility.

Similarly, while studying undergraduate students whom were taking summer courses, White and Kurpius (2002) found that participants placed more responsibility on female victims than they did male victims, for their victimization. White and Kurpius' (2002) provided participants with four rape scenarios. Although the perpetrator was a male in all four of the scenarios, the victim was female for two scenarios and male for the other two scenarios. After reading each scenario, participants were asked a series of questions pertaining to their own perceptions of that scenario. Of specific importance to this study, White and Kurpius (2002), through the use of the *Case Reaction Questionnaire*[14], asked participants to rate the level of responsibility they placed on the victim and the perpetrator for the rape incident. The authors found that the sex of the victim did not have a statistically significant effect on the level of blame placed on the victim. In terms of the level of responsibility placed on the victim based on the respondent's sex, White and Kurpius (2002) found what other more recent research (Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001; Gerber, Cronin, & Steigman, 2004) has found, that the level of responsibility and blame placed on the victim, depends on the sex of the participant being

[14] The *Case Reaction Questionnaire* was created by Schult and Schneider (1991). This questionnaire measures how participants perceive victim and perpetrator accountability for rape incidents. Participants, based on a seven-point Likert-type scale, are asked to rate how responsible they perceive the victim and the perpetrator to be. The scale ranges from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). The higher the total, the more responsible the participant perceives the victim/perpetrator for the rape incident (White & Kurpius, 2002).

surveyed. Male respondents tend to blame male victims for their rape victimization than female victims, while female respondents tend to blame male and female victims equally[15] (White & Kurpius, 2002; Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001; Gerber, Cronin, & Steigman, 2004).

Overall, research pertaining to how the sex of the victim and the sex of the perpetrator depicted in the rape scenarios, influences college students' perceptions of the rape incidents, tend to demonstrate more blame being placed on female victims than male victims, until respondent's gender is taken into consideration. As per the blame-perception assumption, it could be suggested that college students are less likely to perceive an incident as that of rape when the victim is female, when excluding the influence of the respondent's gender. In relation to the influence the sex of the perpetrator has on such perceptions, research has not found a relationship between the sex of the perpetrator and college students' perceptions of rape scenarios. Part of this could be due to the fact that there are only two such studies (Ford, Liwag-McLamb, & Foley, 1998; White & Kurpius, 2002) which examines such a relationship. In total, there are six studies that examine how the sex of the victim influences college students' perceptions of rape incidents (Vandiver & Dupalo, 2013; Schneider, Ee, & Aronson, 1994; Ford, Liwag-McLamb, & Foley, 1998; White & Kurpius, 2002; Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001; Gerber, Cronin, & Steigman, 2004), and only two of these studies examine how the sex of the perpetrator influences college students' perceptions of rape incidents (Davies, Pollard, & Aronson, 2001; Gerber, Cronin, & Steigman, 2004).

Victim-perpetrator relationship. Research pertaining to how college students' perceptions of sexual assault is influenced by the victim's relationship with her offender, has tended to demonstrate that the more the victim knows her offender, the more students blame her

[15] A more in-depth discussion on how participant sex influences participants' perceptions of victim blame and responsibility in rape scenarios will be provided in the *Respondent's Gender* section of this literature review.

for her victimization. Also, research has found that college students find stranger rapes to be more severe than acquaintance rape, date rape, and marital rape, with marital rape being the least severe form of rape. Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohlin, and Binderip (2000) found that college students viewed marital rape as less serious than non-partner rape, while Bridges (1991) found that college students viewed acquaintance rape as less serious than stranger rape. Furthermore, research has demonstrated that rape victims tend to blame themselves the more intimately they knew their rapists, and that they even place more blame on themselves for their victimization than their perpetrators (Koss, Dinero, Siebel, & Cox, 1998). For that reason, in order to gain a complete understanding of how differing levels of a relationship between a victim and his/her perpetrator influences college students' perceptions of a sexual assault incident, the following categories, which current research has been categorized into, will be discussed: 1) date rape versus stranger rape; 2) acquaintance rape versus stranger rape; 3) date rape versus acquaintance rape; and 4) all rape relationships.

Date rape versus stranger rape. Bridges (1991), Bell, Kuriloff, and Lottes (1994), Grubb and Harrower (2009), and Gölge and colleagues (2013), each examined how college students' perceptions of rape scenarios differed based on whether the rape occurred between two individuals who were dating, or if the rape occurred between two strangers. Bridges (1991) who examined the seriousness attributed to the rapes, found that date rapes were rated as less serious than stranger rapes, while Bell, Kuriloff, and Lottes (1994), Grubb and Harrower (2009), and Gölge and colleagues (2013), who examined the level of blame placed on the victim, found that victims of date rapes were blamed more for their victimization than victims of stranger rapes. It can be suggested that college students perceive date rapes as being less severe and more the victim's fault, than that of stranger rapes.

In examining the seriousness attributed to each type of rape, Bridges (1991) examined college students' perceptions of three victim-perpetrator relationships; steady dating partners, individuals on a first date, and strangers. Each of these scenarios depicted a female victim and a male perpetrator. After reading a scenario, participants were asked a series of questions pertaining rape-supportive beliefs[16] and sex role expectations[17]. The author found that participants ranked rape between steady dating partners as less severe than rape between individuals who were on a first date, and that rape between individuals who were on a first date was ranked as less severe than stranger rape. Therefore, it was found that the more intimately a victim knew her perpetrator, the less severe the rape was deemed to be.

Bell, Kuriloff, and Lottes (1994), while examining how the relationship between the victim and her perpetrator influences college students' perceptions of victim blame, provided their participants with one of four vignettes. Two of the vignettes demonstrated stranger rape scenarios, while the other two vignettes demonstrated date rape scenarios. Upon reading the scenarios, participants were asked multiple questions pertaining to the level of responsibility[18] they placed on the victim for her victimization. The authors found that date rape victims were

[16] Six measures were used to assess rape-supportive beliefs. Three of the measures were: "1) Barbara enjoyed the intercourse; 2) this incident was a violation of Barbara's rights; and 3) Barbara will be psychologically damaged as a result of the incident" (Bridges, 1991, p. 297). These measures consisted of response categories that ranged from '*not at all*' to '*to a great extent*'. Another measure asked participants the extent to which they thought Tim had psychological problems, while a fifth measure asked participants to characterize Barbara's reputation. The last measure asked participants as to whether or not they would characterize the incident described in the scenario as rape.

[17] Five measures were used to assess participants' sex role expectations. Three of the measures assessed sex role aspects, while two measures pertained to the victim and perpetrators level of femininity and masculinity. The measures pertaining to sex role aspects were: "1) the extent to which the incident was influenced by Barbara's failure to control the situation; 2) the extent to which the incident was influenced by Tim's misunderstanding of Barbara's behavior or desires; and 3) Barbara's true desire for intercourse" (Bridges, 1991, p. 297). The response categories for these measures ranged from '*not at all'* to '*to a great extent'*.

[18] Questions pertaining to the responsibility placed on the victim for her victimization included five items, each with five-point Likert-type scales that ranged from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*completely*). These items included "how responsible the rape victim was for being in the situation, the degree to which the rape victim was careless and seductive, and the degree to which the woman's character and behavior were to blame for the rape" (Bell, Kuriloff, & Lottes, 1994, p. 1723). Upon collapsing the items together, it was found that the measure of *victim blame* was rather reliable, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.76.

more at blame for their victimization than stranger rape victims. Similarly, Grubbs and Harrower (2009) examined the level of responsibility and blame[19] college students placed on rape victims for their victimization. Before reading a scenario, participants completed the *Attitudes towards Rape Victims Scale*, which assesses an individual's rape attitudes (Ward, 1988). Then, participants were provided with one of three scenarios depicting either date rape, stranger rape, or seduction rape[20]. After reading the scenario, participants were asked ten questions addressing the similarity the participant had to the victim or perpetrator, and the level of blame and responsibility they assigned to the victim. Grubbs and Harrower (2009) found that participants blamed date rape victims for their victimization more than they blamed stranger rape victims.

Lastly, Gölge and colleagues (2013), whom surveyed Turkish college students, provided their study participants with three scenarios; one depicting a date rape, and two depicting stranger rapes. After reading each scenario, participants were asked to rate the level of responsibility[21] they placed on the perpetrator and the victim, along with other varying questions pertaining to sex roles. It was found that participants held date rape victims more responsible for their victimization than stranger rape victims and that perpetrators were held less responsible for date rapes than stranger rapes. Furthermore, victims were found to be more responsible for their victimization in all scenarios, than their perpetrators (Gölge et al., 2013). Since date rape victims are blamed more for their victimization than stranger rape victims, it can be suggested that the more a victim knows her perpetrator, the more college students blame her for her victimization.

[19] The measure of *victim blame* was found to be exceedingly reliable with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.90 (Grubbs & harrower, 2009). The questions pertaining to this measure were rated through the use of a five-point Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*completely agree*).

[20] Seduction rape involves the act of seducing one into sexual intercourse (Conly, 2004). Due to seduction rape referring to the way in which an individual was coerced into have sexual intercourse, instead of defining a relationship level between the victim and her perpetrator, seduction rape data was excluded from this literature review.

[21] While the specific questions used to assess victim and perpetrator responsibility were not provided, these questions were rated on a five-point Likert scale and ranged from 1 (*not responsible*) to 5 (*totally responsible*).

Additionally, as per the blame-perception assumption, the more the victim knows their perpetrator, the less likely college students are to perceive the incident as being that of rape.

Acquaintance rape versus stranger rape. Studies pertaining to acquaintance rape and stranger rape, not only incorporated scenarios depicting a female victim and a male perpetrator (Hammock & Richardson, 1997), but they incorporated scenarios depicting a male victim and a male perpetrator as well (White & Yamawaki, 2009; Sleath & Bull, 2010). Overall, the studies found that victims of acquaintance rape were blamed more for their victimization than victims of stranger rape, for both male and female rape victims. Hammock and Richardson (1997) surveyed introductory psychology college students to determine how they perceived victim blame in both acquaintance rape and stranger rape scenarios. After reading the scenario, participants were asked questions pertaining to the responsibility[22] of the victim and the perpetrator for the victimization. The authors found that more blame was attributed to the victim of acquaintance rape for her victimization than was attributed to the victim of stranger rape for her victimization. In relation to perpetrator blame, acquaintance rape perpetrators were attributed more blame than stranger rape perpetrators when the victim was intoxicated, and less blame than when the victim was sober (Hammock & Richardson, 1997).

White and Yamawaki (2009) and Sleath and Bull (2010) while using scenarios with male victims and male perpetrators, found similar results to that of Hammock and Richardson (1997). In their study, White and Yamawaki (2009) provided half of their participants with a scenario depicting acquaintance rape between two males, and provided the other half with a scenario depicting stranger rape between two males. After reading the scenario, participants were then

[22] While the questions pertaining to the level of responsibility attributed to the victim and perpetrator are not provided, the responses were rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale than ranged from 1 (*not responsible at all*) to 7 (*very responsible*).

asked to answer questions from the *Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale*, which measures an individual's views of sex roles, the *Rape Minimization Scale*[23], and the *Victim Blame Attributions Scale*[24]. White and Yamawaki (2009) found that acquaintance rape victims were held more responsible for their victimization than stranger rape victims, and that the acquaintance rape scenarios were viewed as less serious than the stranger rape scenarios. Similarly, Sleath and Bull (2010), found that acquaintance rape victims were blamed less for their victimization than stranger rape victims, and that perpetrators were blamed less in acquaintance rape scenarios than stranger rape scenarios. As with Hammock and Richardson (1997), Sleath and Bull surveyed psychology students. They randomly assigned one of four scenarios (two depicting acquaintance rape and two depicting stranger rape) to their participants. After reading the scenario, participants were asked to complete the *Victim and Perpetrator Blame Scale*[25], the *Male Rape Myth Scale*, which measures individuals' perceptions of male victims, the *Belief in a Just World* scale, and the *Sex-Role Egalitarian Scale*.

[23] The *Rape Minimization Scale* determines how much an individual minimizes the sexual assault described in the scenario. Questions pertaining to whether the individual believes the incident was a sexual assault, as well as how much damage or injury the individual believes was done to the victim as a result of the incident. Items are rated via an 11-point scale that ranges from 0 (*not at all*) to 10 (*to a great extent*). When used by Langhinrichsen-Rohling and Monson (1998), the scale was reported to have a Cronbach's alpha of 0.82, thus making it a reliable scale. For the current study, the scale had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.80 (White & Yamawaki, 2009), thus making it a reliable scale for this study as well.

[24] The *Victim Blame Attribution Scale* was created by Langhinrichsen-Rohling and Monson (1998). It determines the level of responsibility participants place on the victim for their victimization. Questions include "how much desire did John have for intercourse" and "how much responsibility did John have in this situation?" (White & Yamawaki, 2009, p. 1123). Items on this scale are rated on an 11-point Likert-type scale that ranges from 0 (*not at all*) to 10 (*a great extent*). In Langhinrichsen-Rohling and Monson's (1998) study, the *Victim Blame Attribution Scale* had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.64, making it a slightly unreliable scale. However, in the present study, the scale was found to be quite reliable with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.84 (White & Yamawaki, 2009).

[25] The *Victim and Perpetrator Blame Scale* measures the level of responsibility participants place on the victim and the perpetrator for the victimization. Eight of the 14 items were used for the study; four of which pertaining to victim blame and four of which pertained to perpetrator blame. The items were rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*completely/totally*). The items used to measure victim blame were found to have a Cronbach's alpha of 0.87, while the items used to measure perpetrator blame were found to have a Cronbach's alpha of 0.88 (Sleath & Bull, 2010). Thus, both measures were found to be highly reliable.

Overall, research pertaining to how the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator influences college students' perception of rape scenarios, examines both victim blame and perpetrator blame. Research has found that victims of acquaintance rape are blamed more for their victimization than victims of stranger rape. As per the blame-perception assumption, it can be suggested that the more a victim know their perpetrator, the less likely college students are to perceive the incident as being that of rape. In relation to the level of blame college students place on perpetrators for the victimization, the research is mixed. One study states that the intoxication level of the victim impacts perpetrator blame (Hammock & Richardson, 1997), while the other two studies have demonstrated that perpetrators are blamed more in stranger rape scenarios than acquaintance rape scenarios (White & Yamawaki, 2009; Sleath & Bull, 2010). Further research is needed examining the level of blame placed on perpetrators in acquaintance rape scenarios and stranger rape scenarios.

Date rape versus acquaintance rape. Currently, there is only one study that focuses solely on how college students' perceptions differ between date rape and acquaintance rape. Sheldon-Keller and colleagues (1994) assessed the blame[26] college students placed on perpetrators of rape and victims of rape for the victimization, when the rape occurred between individuals whom were dating and between individuals whom were just friends, and when alcohol was used. For both scenarios, the victim was female, and the perpetrator was male. In total, there were four scenarios; two depicting a dating relationship and two depicting a friends-only relationship. Sheldon-Keller and colleagues (1994) found that the level of blame depended on the participant's sex. Males tended to blame victims more than perpetrators in both situations, they found the perpetrator's behavior as more excusable in the dating scenario than in the

[26] Blame was assessed by asking participants how excusable the victim's and perpetrator's actions were. Participants were asked to rate this on a seven-point Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 (*excusable*) to 7 (*inexcusable*).

friend's scenario, and they found the victim's behavior as less excusable in the dating scenario than in the friend's scenario. Thus, as per the blame-perception assumption, it can be suggested that the more a victim knows their perpetrator, the less likely college students are to perceive such incidents as being that of rape.

All rape relationships. A total of five studies examined and compared college students' perceptions of marital rape, date rape, acquaintance rape, and stranger rape. Three of the studies surveyed a random sample of American college students (Bridges & McGrail, 1989; Simonson & Subich, 1999; Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderip, 2000), one surveyed a random sample of Lebanese college students (Rebeiz & Harb, 2010), and one surveyed a random sample of Israeli college students (Ben-David & Schneider, 2005). All of the studies found that the more the victim knew her perpetrator, the less likely college students considered the incident to be rape, the more blame was placed on the victim for her victimization, and the less blame was placed on the perpetrator for the victimization.

Bridges and McGrail (1989) examined how the relationship between a victim and her rapist not only influenced college students' perceptions of victim blame, but whether the incident was deemed as severe, and overall as that of a rape. Participants randomly were assigned one of six scenarios; two depicting date rape, two depicting acquaintance rape, and two depicting stranger rape. After reading the scenario, participants were asked to answer questions pertaining to victim and perpetrator responsibility[27] for the victimization. Bridges and McGrail (1989) found that the victim was held more responsible for her victimization in the date rape scenarios, and held less responsible in the stranger rape scenarios. Thus, the more the victim knew her

[27] The level of responsibility attributed to the victim and the perpetrator for the victimization, were measured via eight items, each rated on an 11-point Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 to 10. The higher the rating, the higher the level of responsibility attributed.

rapist, the more she was blamed for her victimization. In relation to the level of responsibility placed on the perpetrator, it was found that the more the victim knew her rapist, the less blame was placed on him. These results, in terms of victim blame, were supported by Ben-David and Schneider (2005).

Ben-David and Schneider (2005), who surveyed Israeli college students, examined how their perceptions changed based on whether the perpetrator was the victim's neighbor, ex-boyfriend, or current romantic partner. Participants were asked to complete the *Sex-Role Egalitarian Scale*, and were then provided with one of the three rape scenarios. After reading the scenario, participants were asked to complete the *Rape Perceptions Questionnaire*[28]. The authors found that the more the victim knew her rapist, the less the incident was deemed as a rape, the more responsibility for the victimization was placed on the victim, and there were no significant differences in terms of the level of blame placed on the perpetrator for the victimization (Ben-David & Schneider, 2005). Similarly, Rebeiz and Harb (2010), whom surveyed Lebanese college students, found that the more intimately the victim knew her perpetrator, the less likely participants considered the incident to be rape. The authors examined how differing relationships between the victim and her perpetrator (i.e., married, dating, neighbors, strangers), influenced college students' perceptions of the seriousness of the rape. Each of these scenarios were

[28] The *Rape Perceptions Questionnaire* consisted questions pertaining to how the participant perceived the rape incident, the victim, and the perpetrator, as described in the scenarios, along with the appropriate punishment that should be given. In relation attribution of blame, five questions pertained to the victim, and five questions pertained to the perpetrator. The questions pertaining to the victim included "the extent to which the incident was influenced by 1) Barbara's control of the situation; 2) Barbara's lack of responsibility for the situation; 3) Barbara's desire for intercourse; 4) Barbara's enjoyment of the incident; and 5) Barbara's provocative nature," while the questions pertaining to the perpetrator included "the extent to which the incident was influenced by 6) Tim's misunderstanding of Barbara's behavior or desires; 7) Tim's inability to stop the incident; 8) Tim's excessive sex drive; 9) Tim's psychological problems; and 10) Tim's responsibility for the incident" (Ben-David & Schneider, 2005, p. 390). These questions were scored from one to ten, with a low total representing the minimization of the incident as rape. The measures pertaining to victim blame were more consistent than that of perpetrator blame, with Cronbach's alpha scores of 0.80 and 0.49, respectively (Ben-David & Schneider, 2005).

randomly assigned to participants. Of particular importance to this research study, Rebeiz and Harb (2010) provided three items that measured the level at which the incident was perceived as rape[29]. The authors found that the less the victim knew her rapist, the more the incident was perceived as being a rape.

Likewise, Simonson and Subich (1999), while surveying American college students, found that the more intimately the victim knew her perpetrator, the less likely participants deemed the incident to be that of rape. Participants randomly were assigned one of four scenarios depicting marital rape, date rape, acquaintance rape, and stranger rape. After reading the scenario, participants were asked to complete the *Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale*, the *Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale*, and questions pertaining to rape attitudes[30]. Simonson and Subich (1999) found that participants did not characterize the marital rape scenario as that of rape, and found it to be less severe than the incidents described in the other three scenarios. Thus, the more a victim knew her perpetrator, the less likely participants were to characterize the incident as that of rape. Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, and Binderip (2000), supported these results. The authors randomly assigned one of the four scenarios to study participants (stranger rape, acquaintance rape, date rape, marital rape); in each of these scenarios, the victim was female and the perpetrator was male. After reading the scenario, participants were asked to complete the *Rape-Supportive Attributions Scale*[31] and the *Sex Role Stereotypical Victim Blame*

[29] In order to determine if the incidents were perceived as rape, participants would respond via a seven-point Likert scale that ranged from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 7 (*strongly disagree*). The items were "Yasmine would be psychologically damaged by the incident, Yasmine's rights were violated, and do you consider this incident as rape?" (Rebeiz & Harb, 2010, p. 743). The items had Cronbach's alphas of 0.85 (married), 0.85 (dating), 0.86 (neighbors), and 0.80 (strangers), thus making them reliable measures for each of the scenarios.

[30] Questions measuring rape attitudes were taken from the *Rape Perceptions Questionnaire*, as described in footnote 42. However, when Simonson and Subich (1999) conducted their study, there was no reliability testing of the measures, at that time.

[31] The *Rape-Supportive Attributions Scale* consisted of four questions: "1) how violent do you feel this situation was; 2) how psychologically damaged do you feel "Jenny" will be from this experience; 3) to what degree were "Kevin's" actions a violation of "Jenny's" rights; and 4) how certain are you that this incident would be considered

Attributions Scale[32]. Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, and Binderip (2000) found that marital rape was deemed as the least severe, and not acknowledged as rape, while stranger rape was deemed as more severe.

Overall, in terms of how the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator influences college students' perceptions of rape incidents, research has demonstrated that greater blame tends to be placed on the victim for her victimization, the more intimate her relationship with her perpetrator was. For example, date rape victims are blamed more for their victimization than stranger rape victims (Bridges & McGrail, 1989; Bell, Kuriloff, & Lottes, 1994; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Gölge et al., 2013), victims were blamed more when they were raped by an individual whom they were dating than by a friend (Sheldon-Keller et al., 1994; Ben-David & Schneider, 2005), and acquaintance rape victims were blamed more for their victimization than victims of stranger rape (Bridges & McGrail, 1989; Hammock & Richardseon, 1997; White & Yamawaki, 2009; Sleath & Bull, 2010). This means that the more the victim knew her rapist, the more blame college students placed on the victim for her victimization, and the more a victim knows her rapist, the less likely college students are to perceive the incident as being that of a rape (Ben-David & Schneider, 2005; Rebeiz & Harb, 2010). As per the blame-perception assumption, it can be suggested that the more a victim knows their perpetrator, the less likely college students are to perceive such incident as being that of rape.

---

rape?" (Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderip, 2000, p. 1162). Although the scale for these questions was not provided, the higher the score, the more participants perceived the incident to be that of rape. In terms of reliability, the *Rape-Supportive Attributions Scale* was found to have a Cronbach's alpha of 0.82, making it a reliable measure.

[32] The *Sex Role Stereotypical Victim Blame Attributions Scale* measured the level of blame participants placed on the victim for her victimization. Four questions were used: "1) how much control did "Jenny" have in this situation; 2) how much did "Jenny" enjoy this situation; 3) how obligated was "Jenny" to engage in sexual relations in this case; and 4) how interested was "Jenny" in having sexual relations?" (Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Binderip, 2000, p. 1162). The response categories were not provided for these questions, and the scale was found to be slightly unreliable due to having a Cronbach's alpha of 0.64.

Respondent's gender. Although the impact a respondent's sex has on their perceptions of rape is the most researched relationship in regards to college students' perceptions of rape, the research is mixed. Some research has found that males blame victims more than females (Bell, Kuriloff, & Lottes, 1994; Brekke & Borgida, 1988; Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001; Deitz, Litman, & Bentley, 1984; Edmonts & Cahoon, 1986; Gerdes, Dammann, & Heilig, 1988; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Johnson & Jackson, 1988; Johnson, Jackson, & Smith, 1989; Kanekar & Nazareth, 1988; Kleinke & Meyer, 1990; Schneider et al., 2009; Sheldon-Keller et al., 1994), while other research has found no differences in college students' perceptions of rape based on their gender (Abrams, Viki, Masser, & Bohner, 2003; Acock & Ireland, 1983; Frese, Moya, & Megías, 2004; Newcombe, van den Eynde, Hafner, & Jolly, 2008; Viki, Abrams, & Masser, 2004; Yamawaki, 2007; Yarmey, 1985;). While research has demonstrated mixed results, the majority of the research tends to lead towards males blaming rape victims for their victimization more than females.

Overall, research has found that male college students tended to place more blame on rape victims for their victimization than they placed on perpetrators (Bell, Kuriloff, & Lottes, 1994; Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001; Deitz, Litman, & Bentley, 1984; Edmonts & Cahoon, 1986; Gerdes, Dammann, & Heilig, 1988; Gruber & Harrower, 2009; Johnson & Jackson, 1988; Johnson, Jackson, & Smith, 1989; Kanekar & Nazareth, 1988; Kleinke & Meyer, 1990). Along with this, Davies, Pollard, and Arch (2001) found that male college students tended to not only blame the victim more than the perpetrator, but that they blamed male victims more than they blamed female victims for their victimization. In fact, Schneider and colleagues (2009) found that males perceived rape victims to be more responsible than the perpetrators for their victimization. Aside from placing blame however, males tended to regard rapist's actions are

being more excusable, while regarding the victim's actions as less excusable (Sheldon-Keller et al., 1994). In fact, Sheldon-Keller and colleagues (1994) found that male college students believed that if the perpetrator and the victim were in a relationship with one another, the perpetrator had more of a right to have sex with their significant other, even if his significant other did not want to engage in such activity. Furthermore, male college students were significantly more likely than female college students to minimize the seriousness of a rape (Newcombe et al., 2008) and they recommended shorter prison sentences for rapists than female college students (Kanekar & Nazareth, 1988). Other studies however have found that there were no differences between male and female respondents in relation to the level of blame placed on the victim (Abrams et al., 2003; Acock & Ireland, 1983; Frese, Moya, & Megías, 2004; Viki, Abrams, & Masser, 2004; Yamawaki, 2007; Yarmey, 1985), or the level of blame placed on the perpetrator (Newcombe et al., 2008).

Respondent's ethnicity. There is very little research pertaining to how a respondent's ethnicity influences their perceptions of rape situations. What little research exists however, tends to demonstrate that college students of other ethnicities tend to blame victims more than Caucasian-Americans blame victims. While studying the differences between Japanese college students' perceptions of rape and American college students' perceptions of rape, Yamawaki and Tschanz (2005) found that compared to American college students, Japanese students were more likely to minimize the seriousness of the rape, they were more likely to blame the victim for her victimization, and they are more likely to excuse the perpetrator's actions. Similarly, Lee and colleagues (2005) found that Japanese college students were more likely to blame the victim than American college students were. Conversely, Spanish college students placed less blame on the victim when the perpetrator used force, and place more blame on the victim when the victim was

under the influence of alcohol (Romero-Sanchez, Megías, & Krahé, 2012). Lastly, although research has demonstrated that male American college students held the victim more responsible than female American college students, female Japanese college students held the victim more responsible than male Japanese college students (Yamawaki & Tschanz, 2005).

Research incorporating Asian and Spanish college students has demonstrated that these college students placed more blame on the victim than the perpetrator for the victimization, and Asian college students place a higher level of blame on rape victims for their victimization than American college students, while Spanish college students place more blame on the victim when alcohol is a factor. Thus, the level of blame placed on rape victims for their victimization differs depending on the ethnicity of the respondent, with American college students tending to place less blame on victims than college students of other ethnicities.

Research Limitations

While reading through previous research pertaining to college students' perceptions about sexual assault, one can begin to understand the assumption that the more students blame the victim for the victimization, the less they perceive the incident portrayed in the scenarios, as that of a sexual assault. It is as though since the victim did not prevent the incident, clearly, she wanted the sexual encounter to occur, ergo, the incident was not that of a sexual assault. Although this assumption can be demonstrated, there are still three limitations to this research, several of which will be addressed in this research study, while further diving into such assumption, by examining college students' actual perceptions of rape simulations. These limitations include: 1) a lack of research in the area; 2) looking at blame and responsibility only; and 3) scenarios depict a male perpetrator only.

A lack of research in the area. The literature identified as related to this topic was sparse and that which did exist was difficult to compare based on different variables assessed. The foundation for many of these studies were written scenarios that were read by the respondents, permitting each respondent to envision their perception of the event and add their own details where the scenarios lacked specific information; thus, partially accounting for the various difference in findings. Finally, much the research is dated having been completed 10 to 20 years ago, with only a few studies identified that have been completed in the past five years (since 2012).

This study will examine how simulations depicting a female perpetrator influence student perceptions of rape incidents, thereby expanding the research by incorporating research about female perpetrators, and allowing for a comparison of such finding to be compared to previous research which focused primarily on male perpetrators and female victims.

Perceptions of blame and responsibility. A main limitation of previous research about college students' perceptions of sexual assault is that research only examines how various factors influence the level of blame and responsibility students assign to victims and perpetrators. Thus, other means by which college students may perceive a sexual assault incident are either excluded from these studies, or left to each participant to fill in scenario gaps with their own perceptions and experiences. For example, research does not examine whether the incident depicted in the scenarios is that of a sexual assault, nor does it examine how various factors (i.e., alcohol consumption, victim dress, victim-perpetrator relationship, etc.) influence college students' perceptions of whether the incident itself was that of a sexual assault.

In order to account for this limitation, the current study will ask college students whether the simulation they viewed was criminal. This will be accomplished by having students view

four simulations, two of which demonstrate incidents based on the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's legal definition of rape, and two of which demonstrate no crime. For example, one simulation will demonstrate a clear violation of the law, one will demonstrate an ambiguous violation of the law, one will demonstrate a clear non-violation of the law, and one will demonstrate an ambiguous non-violation of the law. In addition, the respondent's gender and race, will be controlled for so that an examination of how such factors influence their perceptions of rape can be conducted. In doing so, whether students determine the incidents depicted in each of the simulations to be that of rape, and therefore illegal, will be examined.

Male perpetrator scenarios. Current research, while incorporating scenarios depicting female victims and male victims, depicted a male perpetrator only, thus excluding the influence that a female perpetrator would have on college students' perceptions of sexual assault. Such studies include five of the six victim and perpetrator gender studies (Vandiver & Dupalo, 2013; Schneider, Ee, & Aronson, 1994; Ford, Liwag-McLamb, & Foley, 1998; White & Kurpius, 2002; Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001), and two of the 14 victim-perpetrator relationship studies (White & Tamawaki, 2009; Sleath & Bull, 2010). Due to this, only one of the studies examined incorporated all four of the victim-perpetrator dyads (Gerber, Cronin, & Steigman, 2004).

Due to a lack of research about female offenders as the perpetrators of sexual assaults, this study will examine simulations depicting a female perpetrator, thereby expanding the research by incorporating research about female offenders, and allowing for a comparison of blameworthiness based on the gender of the perpetrator being female.

College Students' Perceptions of Law

As of current, while there are no studies examining how college students define laws, there are three studies that examine how college students perceive various laws and policies.

More specifically, two of these studies tend to focus on laws and policies relating to alcohol usage, while one focuses on mandatory reporting polices. Saltz (2007) examined college students' perceptions of campus alcohol policies, Lewis and Carlan (2009) examined which sanctions college students perceived as being effective at deterring public intoxication, and Mancini, Pickett, Call, and Roche (2016) examined how college students perceive campus mandatory reporting policies in regards to sexual assault victimization. Although there are no current studies that examined how college students appropriately or accurately define criminal activity, and while the studies that examine how college students perceive various laws and policies do not examine their perceptions of sexual assault laws, it is important to discuss the results of these studies in order to gain an understanding, in relation to this current study, as to how college students may perceive rape law and how these perceptions may differ from the legal definitions of rape.

Saltz (2007) surveyed college students to determine their perceptions about how to effectively reduce drinking problems. The respondents were to rate 20 alcohol problem prevention policies on perceived effectiveness[33] and perceived student support. The respondents who drank socially or not at all supported the policies and believed their peers also would support the policies. Respondents who reported to be binge drinkers failed to support the policies and believed their peers would not support the policies. Saltz (2007) noted that the more a policy negatively impacted a respondent's behavior, the less support the respondent had for the policy.

Where Saltz (2007) focused on policy support, Lewis and Carlan (2009) examined how perceived certainty of detection and certainty of arrest impacted student behavior. Through the use of vignettes and surveys, respondents determined whether they would walk home from a part

[33] Effectiveness was rated on a four-point scale that consisted of the responses *very effective*, *effective*, *not very effective*, and *totally ineffective* (Saltz, 2007).

(commit the crime of public intoxication) or if they would stay the night at the party. Most respondents believed they would be stopped by the police for public intoxication even when displaying overt signs of intoxication. Additionally, "as the respondents' age increase[d] their perception[s] of getting stopped by the police decrease[d]" (Lewis & Carlan, 2009, p. 175). This research suggests that as the certainty of detection and the certainty of arrest decreases, offending increases. These findings can be associated with sexual assault research where the reporting of offenses is under 40 %, and the conviction rate even lower; thus, offending increases as the certainty of arrest and the certainty of punishment decreases. Additionally, as personal and vicarious experience with detection decreases and punishment avoidance increases, offending will increase.

Mancini and colleagues (2016), while examining the level of support college students have for mandatory reporting policies in relation to sexual assault victimizations, found that not only do college students support the policy, but they believe in the potential benefits of the policy. The authors surveyed college students to determine their level of approval for mandatory reporting policies[34], their likelihood of reporting under these policies[35], their expected outcomes of the mandatory reporting policies[36], and their perceptions of faculty compliance with such

[34] In order to measure approval of mandatory reporting policies, respondents were asked *how much do you support or oppose mandatory reporting laws,* and were provided with the following response categories: *strongly support*, *support*, *neither support nor oppose*, *oppose*, and *strongly oppose* (Mancini et al., 2016).

[35] To measure the likelihood that students were report a sexual victimization under the mandatory reporting policies, respondents were asked *if you experienced a sexual victimization, how much more or less likely would MR [mandatory reporting] laws make you personally report the victimization to the University or an employee of the University*? Respondents were provided with the following response categories: *much more likely*, *more likely*, *neither more nor less likely*, *less likely*, and *much less likely* (Mancini et al., 2016).

[36] Respondents were provided with 12 potential outcomes of the mandatory reporting policies, and were asked to rate on a four-point scale ranging from 1 (*very* unlikely) to 4 (*very* likely) how likely or unlikely it mandatory reporting policies would lead to each of the outcomes. The outcomes include: "1) make students less likely to report sexual victimizations to university staff; 2) provide better assistance to victims; 3) increase the likelihood that sex offenders who victimize students will be arrested; 4) increase the number of innocent students who are wrongly investigated by police for sex crimes; 5) prevent universities from sweeping sex crimes under the rug; 6) increase university accountability; 7) reduce victim autonomy; 8) reduce the number of sex crimes committed against students; 9) reduce victims' willingness to seek counseling or other social services from the university; 10) increase

policies[37]. It was found that 66 % of the respondents strongly supported or supported the mandatory reporting policies, and 56 % of the respondents reported that they would be more likely to report a sexual victimization because of mandatory reporting policies, while 15 % reported that mandatory reporting policies would deter them from reporting sexual victimization. Furthermore, 90 % of the respondents believe that mandatory reporting policies will increase university accountability, and 85 % of students reported that they believed that their professors would comply with the mandatory reporting policies (Mancini et al., 2016).

As demonstrated above, the research pertaining to college students' perceptions of laws and policies is limited. For example, Saltz (2007) and Mancini and colleagues (2016) found that college students supported policies aimed at decreased crime on campus, while Lewis and Carlan (2009) did not examine the level of student support. Due to the limited research, this study will examine how college students perceive rape incidents, and determine how such perceptions compare and contrast to that of the legal definitions of rape.

Communication of Legal Acts

According to Friedman (1977), "a legal act…is a message [that] must be transmitted to an audience, or it can have no effect on behavior" (Friedman, 1977, p. 111). In order to most effectively transmit the messages, the transmission needs to be direct (face to face) and personal (relating to each individual). Without appropriately relaying the message to the audience, the audience is unable to obtain a full and comprehensive understanding (Friedman, 1977). Essentially, if the legal definition of a law is not directly provided to each individual within

punishments for persons who commit sex crimes against students; 11) retraumatize victims; and 12) force university staff and police officers to spend too much time investigating weak sexual assault allegations" (Mancini et al., 2016, p. 227).

[37] Respondents were asked to rate on a four-point scale that ranged from *very unlikely* to *very likely*, how likely they thought their professors would be to comply with the mandatory reporting policies (Mancini et al., 2016).

society, society is unable to obtain a full and comprehensive understanding of what the law entails, the behaviors that violate the law, and the punishments for the law. In relation to this study, a lack of communication between the criminal justice system and society, specifically in terms of what laws are defined as, can result in a gap between societal definitions of laws and the legal definitions of laws. Therefore, this section will demonstrate a lack of effective communication of laws, as well as a complexity of such laws, can result in a disjoint between societal definitions of laws and their actual, legal definitions. In doing so, one can understand how college students' perceptions of rape may differ from that of the legal definition of rape.

Effective Communication

In order to effectively communicate what an unambiguous law entails, specifically in terms of what actions constitute a violation of such law, the audience which the law is aimed at needs to be identified, and deliverance of the law needs to have a clear language. This means that the law needs to be delivered to those who are to adhere to the law, and that if the law is presented to them in too general or vague of a manner, the law can be misunderstood, or not be taken seriously (Friedman, 1977). For example, in relation to this study, if society is simply told that rape is illegal, but not provided with the specific actions that constitute rape, nor the punishments associated with committing the crime of rape, it is likely that society will misunderstand the legal definition of rape, and adhere to what they believe rape is. Since they were not provided with guidelines, they are likely to generate their own guidelines, which may in turn differ from the legal definition of the law. Furthermore, with society generating their own guidelines, such guidelines are created based off of influences around them, thereby excluding the influence of the legal system. For example, individuals are likely to base their guidelines

pertaining to rape off of how rape is portrayed in the media or the programs offered to them while they are on college campuses.

The media tends to portray rape in a manner that is inaccurate to the way in which rape actually occurs. The news media tends to sensationalize sex crimes, and reports that the only reason individuals commit such crimes is to fulfill their sexual desires (Dowler, 2006); thus, the news media tends to portray an inaccurate picture of sexual abuse in terms of why individuals commit rape and sexual assault (Plumm, Nelson, & Terrance, 2012). Additionally, in various forms of media (i.e., books, magazines, television shows, movies), whenever sexual violence is portrayed, there is usually "the suggestion that despite the initial resistance the victim secretly desires and eventually derives pleasure from the assault" (Malamuth & Briere, 1986, p. 77). This is demonstrated in the ever-popular quote from Megara in Disney's *Hercules* "Well, you know how men are. They think "no" means "yes" and "get lost" means "take me, I'm yours" (Dewey, Musker, & Clements, 1997). Consequently, society learns, even at a young age, that when a woman says 'no' she is just flirting and really means 'yes,' simply due to media portrayals that even though women resist, they still want to engage in sex. Thus, the media portrays rape inaccurately, demonstrating that women cannot be raped because they want it, and that men have the right to fulfill their sexual desires and take what they want. Due to this, the likelihood that media will influence an individual's perceptions of rape in a negative manner is highly likely.

In relation to programs offered to college students while they are on campus, these programs tend to be presented to students during orientation week, or information about them are provided via the college website, as a resource for students to use. Due to this, students partake in such programs at the very beginning of their college experience, usually when they are overwhelmed and anxious for the next phase of their lives to begin, or they are unaware that such

information exists on the school website. Therefore, the means by which and the time at which students tend to obtain information about sexual assault programs, is inefficient. For example, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, which is where this study will be conducted, has a sexual harassment and sexual violence policy. However, this policy is offered online, via a direct search for the policy, and is not presented specifically to students (Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 2014). As a result, students tend to be unaware of this policy because they are not subjected to reading and understanding it; thus, the likelihood of this policy influencing students' perceptions of rape is limited. In order to determine students' knowledge of this policy, the survey will consist of a question asking survey respondents if they have read or had the IUP sexual harassment and sexual violence policy explained to them.

In relation to the sexual assault based programs that are provided at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, there are several such programs. These programs include the *Haven Project*[38], and the *Six O'clock Series*[39]. The *Haven Project* hosts its own events such as *Take Back the Night* (which had roughly 800 individuals, not all of whom were students, participate in the 2014-2015 march), the *Green Light Campaign*, *Rainn Day*, *Turn the Red Zone Green*, and *Bystanders Step Up!* training. Furthermore, Indiana University of Pennsylvania participates in *Sexual Assault Awareness Month*, which takes place in April. During this month, documentaries pertaining to sexual assault victims are shown, discussion sessions on various sexual assault topics are held, and chalk messages containing sexual assault facts are written on sidewalks throughout campus.

[38] The only event that provided the number of individuals in attendance was *Take Back the Night*. The number provided however included community members as well as student participants.
[39] A total of roughly 2,500 individuals attended the *Six O'clock Series* events during the 2015-2016 academic year (B. N. Drylie, personal communication, July 12, 2016). However, this number does not accurately represent the number of students whom attended the events. Instead, this number includes both student and community attendees. Furthermore, not all of the events pertained to sexual assault, thereby limiting the number of students who attended such events even more.

Although there are several programs demonstrating the issues of sexual assault, these programs are not mandatory for students. For example, for the 2014-2015 academic year, the Haven Project offered 35 events and education programs which were attended by a total of 1,626 participants. This means that on average, 46 individuals attended each event. With Indiana University of Pennsylvania having a student population of roughly 14,000, assuming all participants were students, less than roughly eight % of students attended a Haven Project event. In addition, not all of these events pertained to sexual assault, and it is likely that the same students attended more than one event due to interest in the topic, thereby decreasing the %age of students who attended a sexual assault event hosted by the Haven project. Furthermore, students who partake in such programs tend to be those who have a personal interest about the topic, therefore excluding students without such interest.

Similarly, these events, while being publicized via chalk messages, posters, and emails (which might be ignored by students), are not only minimally publicized, but they are difficult to find on the Indiana University of Pennsylvania website. For example, in relation to publicizing of events, in the 2014-2015 academic year "ten newsletter editions, four bulletin boards…five table tents…3,852 posters and flyers…[and] twenty-eight information tables visited by 964 people" (The Haven Project, personnel communication, July 15, 2016) were displayed, passed out, or set up in residence halls, dining areas, and the library. The issue with this is that majority of students live and eat off campus, and a large % do not use the campus library. Additionally, in relation to events being publicized via email, as mentioned above, such emails may be ignored and thus not read by the students. Furthermore, in relation to website location, a list of such events cannot simply be searched for and easily found; specific names and groups are needed. In order to determine whether students have attended such events or know about such events, in an attempt

to control for potential bias of the knowledge acquired about rape during these events, there will be a question on the survey asking students to select all events that they participated in, which related to sexual assault events.

Law Complexity and Law Knowledge

Even if the definition of a law is effectively communicated to society, the complexity in which the law was written could prove difficult for the average individual to understand, thus preventing such individuals from obtaining the true legal definition of the law. According to Friedman (1977), "knowledge of the law…is not spread evenly in society. There are class differences, age differences, group differences. Societies, too, are very viable in this regard" (p. 114). This means that not everyone is able to understand the law in the way that it was written. For example, individuals who are younger and belong to lower socioeconomic classes, are more likely to be less educated than someone who is older and belongs to a higher socioeconomic class. Without a proper education, individuals are at a disadvantage of understanding the law. And then, even individuals who have a college education, still may not understand the law. In fact, the true definitions of laws, with the way in which they were written, along with the audience which they were written for, tend to only be understood by individuals who have been educated on law, or work in a profession in which they need to know law (i.e., lawyers, accountants). However, even these individuals are only familiar with the type of law that they studied under. For example, accountants are only familiar with tax law, while criminal attorneys and civil attorneys have experience with differing laws as well. Therefore, according to Friedman (1977), a typical individual within society is unable to understand the definition of law due to the way it was written. As a result, individuals perceive the law in their own way, causing them to have their own definitions of law. In relation to this study, the fact that majority of

college students are unlikely to be trained in law in general, but even more so in rape law, they are less likely to fully comprehend the legal definitions of such laws, resulting in them having their own definitions, and thus their own perceptions of rape.

Simulation Research

Currently, there is *minimal* research pertaining to the use of rape simulations in determining how individuals perceive such simulations in terms of what they consider demonstrating a crime. In fact, not only is the research miniscule in number, but varying factors are altered to determine whether a crime was committed instead of looking at the crime as a whole, and the form of simulation used for such simulations differs from what is used in this study. However, for this study, since simulations will be used to determine how college students perceive rape-based simulations in terms of whether a crime is depicted, it is important to gain an understanding of how simulation research has been used in current literature, as well as the usefulness of using simulations instead of simple scenario-based surveys. Therefore, this section will provide information on current simulation research.

Simulation Research Usage

Simulation research tends to occur in many forms. There are participatory simulations (Bachen, Hernández-Ramos, & Raphael, 2012; Finch & Munro, 2008; Gates, Fitzwater, & Telintelo, 2001) in which study participants engage in various simulations, analogue simulations (Bernat, Wilson, & Calhoun, 1999) in which study participants listen to recordings of different simulations, and visual simulations (McNamara, Vattano, & Viney, 1993) in which study participants watch various simulations. Each of these simulations are useful in their own right, as will be explained below. For this study, visual simulations will be used.

Participatory simulations. Out of the three main types of simulation research methods, participatory simulations are the most used. This is due to the fact that such simulations tend to be used for educational and training purposes. Research has demonstrated the effective use of participatory simulations in terms of teaching and training (Gates, Fitzwater, & Telintelo, 2001), instead of looking at how such simulations influences an individual's perceptions of a specific event.

Gates, Fitzwater, and Telintelo (2001) created simulations for nursing home nurses to participate in, to train nurses on the *Violence Prevention Checklist*. The standardized simulations took place in a nursing home resident's bedroom, with a psychiatric nurse acting as a resident in each of the simulations. Of the five nurses who participated in the simulations, all five found the simulations to be very realistic, allowing them to experience anxiety they would normally feel in such experiences. Overall, based on the nurses' feedback, and two raters, rating the simulations, it was found that the use of simulations was in fact "an effective method for evaluating the performance of violence prevention skills" (Gates, Fitzwater, Telintelo, 2001, p. 396).

In relation to real-life experience simulations, Bachen, Hernández-Ramos, and Raphael (2012) used interactive computer simulations in an attempt to develop global civic learning and empathy, with individuals from around the world. Thus, 301 high school students from three schools across Northern California played a simulation game that allowed the students to take on lives of individuals from around the world, thereby experiencing how someone else lives and is treated based on their race, nationality, gender, etc. It was found that not only were the simulations realistic, but students who participated in the simulations showed an increase in empathy (Bachen, Hernández-Ramos, & Raphael, 2012). Therefore, it can be suggested that participating in realistic simulations enhances training and educational techniques.

More relevant to the current study, is a study using jury simulations to determine jurors' attitudes of the cases at hand (Finch & Munro, 2008). Finch and Munro (2008), through the use of a mock jury, "examined juror attitudes in rape cases involving an intoxicated complainant" (p. 30). Throughout the mock jury simulations, the intoxication type, how the intoxicant was administered, and the level of intoxication of the victim, all varied. After watching a simulation, each group was to discuss whether or not a rape actually had been committed within the simulation. While the results of the mock deliberations were not provided, the researchers stated that the use of simulations was important to obtain a clear understanding of how actual jurors interpret cases as well as how they can be influenced by specific factors (Finch & Munro, 2008). In doing so, the focus of this study was on the use of simulations for understanding juror perceptions, which is the purpose of this current study in terms of understanding how students perceive rape.

Analogue simulations. Differing from participatory simulations, instead of actually engaging in the simulations, study participants simply listen to the audio version of a simulation, when analogue simulations are used. Bernat, Wilson, and Calhoun (1999) examined the perceptions of both men who had a history of coercive sexual behavior, and men who had no such history, on "how far a man should go in using coercion in an audiotaped data rape simulation" (p. 147). It was found that men who tended to be more coercive themselves, took longer to stop the date rape interaction than men who were less coercive or noncoercive (Bernat, Wilson, & Calhoun, 1999). While perceptions of the audio simulation were not examined, such simulations were used to determine how much coercion survey respondents perceived to be acceptable. In addition, this study demonstrates how audio simulations are useful in determining an individual's perceptions of rape.

Visual simulations. McNamara, Vattano, and Viney (1993) used visual simulations to determine how college students posing as mock jurors determined a verdict, a sentence, and the certainty that a rape was committed, based on the level of evidence presented and the sex of the mock jurors. Introductory psychology students were split into two groups; one group was provided with a simulation that presented more evidence than the simulation that was provided to the other group. The simulations comprised of recorded videos that were presented to the groups. These visual simulations consisted of actions and legal professionals, acting out a scripted trial (McNamara, Vattano, & Viney, 1993). It was found that overall, women (76%) were more likely to find the offender guilty than men (49%), no matter which simulation they viewed. Furthermore, participants who observed the simulation that presented more evidence were more likely to render a guilty verdict (79%) than participants who observed the simulation with less evidence (49%). In addition, women were more likely to recommend longer sentences than men, and were more likely to be confident of their verdict (McNamara, Vattano, & Viney, 1993). This study demonstrates how simulations, specifically visual simulations (i.e., videos), are useful in determining an individual's perceptions of rape.

Effectiveness of Simulation Research

Research has demonstrated the effectiveness of using realistic simulations in terms of training, education, and perceptions (McNamara, Vattano, & Viney, 1993; Bernat, Wilson, & Calhoun, 1999; Bachen, Hernández-Ramos, & Raphael, 2012; Finch & Munro, 2008; Gates, Fitzwater, & Telintelo, 2001). However, the effectiveness of this research method as a whole, needs to be discussed. Therefore, this section will discuss the importance of the realism of the simulation, as well as the benefits and limitations of using simulations.

Simulation realism. In relation to the importance of using a realistic simulation to acquire accurate perceptions and results, Bermant, McGuire, McKinley, and Salo (1974) examined how the realism of a simulation impacted mock jurors' perceptions of a case. Four groups of college students were shown murder simulations that differed in terms of simulation realism. The more realistic the simulation presented, the more perceptions of the incident changed. It was found that the group provided with the most realistic simulation, due to being provided the most information about the case, was less likely to find the offender not guilty than the other groups (Bermant et al., 1974). Thus, the more realistic the simulation, the more perceptions changed. This suggests that in order for simulations to be effective at obtaining realistic data from study participants, the simulations themselves need to be as realistic as possible. For this study, in order to create realistic simulations, the simulations are based off of the definition of rape, as provided by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Furthermore, professionals within the criminal justice field were consulted to determine if the simulations were accurately displaying criminal and non-criminal behavior, from a legal standpoint.

Benefits. Using simulations, specifically for training and educational purposes has been found to have significant educational benefits. Akhtar-Danesh and colleagues (2009) examined whether the use of simulations within nursing schools were effective at enhancing one's education and training within the field. It was found that nursing faculty and students found that the use of participatory simulations allowed for the enhancement of nursing education and training, thereby making such simulations an important element of nursing education (Akhtar-Danesh et al., 2009). Furthermore, with budget cuts decreasing the number of clinical settings which nursing students can use, thereby limiting their time in a clinic during school (Curl, Smith,

Chisholm, Hamilton, & McGee, 2007), using simulations within their educational setting allows nursing students to participate in clinical practices they might otherwise not be able to engage in.

A second benefit of using simulation research is that it incorporates a laboratory methodological approach (DiFonzo, Hantula, & Bordia, 1998). Simulations can be altered based on various factors, thereby using an experimental methodological basis. Thus, the use of simulations in research allows an experimental approach to be used.

Limitations. The main limitation of using simulation in research is that the level of fidelity which the simulations demonstrate can vary. (Feinstein & Cannon, 2002; Akhtar-Danesh et al., 2009). Simulation fidelity refers to the lifelikeness which the simulation portrays (Havighurst, Fields, & Fields, 2003). This means that the less realistic the simulation is, the less fidelity it has, while the more realistic the simulation is, the greater fidelity it has. A key solution to the issue of low fidelity, is to use an expert in the creation of a simulation (Alison, van den Heuvel, Waring, Power, Long, O'Hara, & Crego, 2013; Glaser & Chi, 1988; Klein & Hoffman, 1993; Lipshitz & Shaul, 1997; Murphy & Wright, 1984; Reimann & Chi, 1989). Having expertise in the subject matter allows for the simulations to be created as realistically as possible. For this study, in order to obtain realistic simulations, thereby creating a greater level of fidelity, the simulations are based off of the definition of rape, as provided by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and professionals within the criminal justice field were consulted to determine if the simulations were accurately displaying criminal and non-criminal behavior, from a legal standpoint.

Current Study

Currently, the research pertaining to sexual offenses, more specifically rape, excludes various factors. Research tends to exclude female perpetrators and male victims from study.

Moreover, research tends to focus only on how various factors influence the level of blame and responsibility college students place on victims and perpetrators for the victimization, consequently excluding how such factors influence their perceptions of rape in general. Furthermore, there is no current research identifying how college students define sexual offenses, resulting in an inability to compare and contrast such definitions to the legal definitions of sexual assault. As expressed by Freidman (1977), a lack of proper communication and knowledge of legal definitions of law can lead to individuals creating their own such definitions, resulting in a gap between how one understands the law and how the law was meant to be interpreted. Without knowing how college students perceive rape, and whether or not such perceptions differ from that of the legal definitions of sexual assault, it is unknown if a differing of definitions is attributed to the high rates of rape that occur on college campuses.

Due to the potential of there being a gap between college students' knowledge and understanding of rape and sexual offense laws themselves, the purpose of this research is to provide an understanding of how and why college students perceive sexual assault, more specifically rape, as they do, through the use of visual simulations, thereby demonstrating whether a gap between college students' perceptions of rape and the legal definition of rape, exists. Therefore, the following research question was examined: *Are college students able to correctly identify* rape. Thus, the following alternate hypotheses were tested:

H_1: Females are more likely to identify the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation and the ambiguous violation of law simulation as depicting rape than males.

H_2: White students are less likely to identify the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation and the ambiguous violation of law simulation as depicting rape than students of other races.

H_3: Students who participated in an event promoting sexual assault awareness are more likely to correctly identify simulations as to whether they depict rape or not than students who have not participated in a sexual assault event.

H_4: Students who know of or have read Indiana University of Pennsylvania's sexual assault policy are more likely to correctly identify simulations as to whether they depict rape or not than students who do not know of Indiana University of Pennsylvania's sexual assault policy.

H_5: Students are less likely to depict a rape occurred the more they place blameworthiness of the act within the simulation on the victim.

H_6: Students are more likely to depict a rape occurred the less they place blameworthiness of the act within the simulation on the offender.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This section will provide the study's methodology. First, an overview of the study's setting will be provided, followed by a detailed discussion of the research design. A synopsis of the survey methodology will be explained, followed by a comprehensive discussion of the survey items, and an explanation as to how the collected data will be analyzed. Lastly, methodological limitations will be provided, followed by a reiteration of the potential implications which this study could hold.

The Setting

For this study, a random sample of 2,000 students attending Indiana University of Pennsylvania main campus during the fall 2018 semester, was taken. Due to the researcher attending IUP, IUP students were selected for the sample due to the ease of access they posed. In terms of sample size, 2,000 students were randomly selected due to the guidelines set by IUP's Applied Research Lab (ARL). This section provides demographic and crime statistics for IUP.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) is located in the heart of Indiana Borough, Pennsylvania, which is roughly an hour east of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. IUP, which offers 132 undergraduate programs, 52 master's programs, and 12 doctoral programs, comprises 13,775 students, consists of undergraduate (11,537) and graduate students (2,238). Over half of the students are female (56 %), 20 % of the students are minorities (2,776), and seven % are international students (969). Furthermore, only 28 % of students live on campus (3,829), meaning that majority of the students (72 %) live off campus (Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 2015), most of which live within the city limits of Indiana Borough, Pennsylvania.

In relation to crime statistics, information is provided for 2012, 2013, and 2014. While in Indiana Borough, Pennsylvania, rape was not one of the higher crimes reported to police, the situation is different on campus. In fact, forcible sex offenses were the second highest reported crime for 2012, 2013, and 2014, with non-forcible burglary being the highest reported offense. While forcible sex offenses were the second highest reported crime, the number of reported incidents themselves was in fact low. In total, from 2012 to 2014, only12 forcible sex offenses were reported on campus (IUP Office of Public Safety, 2015). Although rape does not appear to be a large issue on IUP campus, the fact that even one forcible sex offense has been reported, is one too many, especially due to the horrific nature of the crime of rape.

Research Design

This study explores whether college students can accurately identify crime, specifically rape, based on visual simulations. The research question is important because it explores whether college students are able to accurately identify rape, as well as what influences them to perceive such incidents as they do. In order to determine how college students, identify rape incidents, data were collected through the use of online surveys, distributed via Qualtrix, via IUP email. Students were shown four videos and were asked to provide their perceptions of each of the videos. Thus, the unit of analysis for this study is the individual.

This section will discuss how the sample was selected for this study, followed by a detailed synopsis of the characteristics of the survey respondents. Next will be a discussion of the design of the study, along with an explanation as to why each of the selected variables are included in the study, as well as a detailed discussion as to how each of the variables will be measured.

Sample

Due to the high rates of sexual assault that occur on college campuses, as discussed in the literature review, college students were surveyed. More specifically, a random sample of 2,000 college students attending Indiana University of Pennsylvania main campus, in Indiana, Pennsylvania during the fall 2018 semester, were invited to participate in the study. Since the researcher is currently attending IUP, there is an increased ease of access to study participants, with IUP ARL guidelines limited the maximum random sample to 2,000 students.

In order to obtain a sample, the ARL at IUP gathered a random sample of 2,000 students from all students attending IUP main campus during the fall 2018 semester. These 2,000 students were e-mailed and asked to participate in the study. The e-mail, as demonstrated in Appendix A, informed the students of the study, while clearly explaining the potential risks of the study, and then asked the students to participate in the study. Students who were interested in participating in the study clicked the Qualtrix provided link, which took them straight to the informed consent. Students who agreed to participate in the study gave consent by clicking "yes" when asked if they wanted to participate in the study, while those who did not want to participate, simply clicked "no" and exited out of the e-mail.

Of the 2,000 students who comprised of the original sample, 173 opened the link to the survey, with 158 agreeing to participate in the study, and 81 fully completing the study. As a result, the final sample size consists of 81 individuals[40]. The sample comprised majority of White (84.0%) females (70.4%), 14.8 % criminology/criminal justice majors, 92.6% non-athletes, and 92.6% in neither a sorority or fraternity. Of the 81 individuals, 79.0% reported having read or had the IUP sexual assault policy explained to them. In terms of attending campus events relating

[40] Even though the required sample size was 300, a sample size of 81 individuals provides a power analysis of 80.3%.

to sexual assault, attending each event was reported as follows from highest to lowest reported attendance: Take Back the Night (33.3%), Haven Project (21.0%), Six O'clock Series (16.0%), Rainn Day (13.6%), Sexual Assault Awareness Month (12.3%) Bystander Step Up Training (8.6%), Green Light Campaign (4.9%), and Turn the Red Zone Green (2.5%), as demonstrated in Table 1.

Table 1

Sample Demographic Characteristics

Item	*Item Categories*	*N*	*Percent (%)*
Gender	Male	24	29.6
	Female	57	70.4
Race	White	68	84.0
	Non-White	13	16.0
Major	CJ/Criminology	12	14.8
	Other	66	81.5
Athlete	Athlete	5	6.2
	Non-Athlete	75	92.6
Greek Life Member	Greek Life Member	5	6.2
	Non-Greek Life Member	75	92.6
Knowledge of IUP Policy	Knowledge	64	79.0
	No Knowledge	7	8.6
	Unknown	10	12.3
Event Promoting Sexual Assault Awareness			
Six O'clock Series	Attended	13	16.0
	Did Not Attend	68	84.0
Haven Project	Attended	17	21.0
	Did Not Attend	64	79.0
Take Back the Night	Attended	27	33.3
	Did Not Attend	54	66.7

Green Light Campaign	Attended	4	4.9
	Did Not Attend	77	95.1
Rainn Day	Attended	11	13.6
	Did Not Attend	70	86.4
Turn the Red Zone Green	Attended	2	2.5
	Did Not Attend	79	97.5
Bystander Step Up Training	Attended	7	8.6
	Did Not Attend	74	91.4
Sexual Assault Awareness Month	Attended	10	12.3
	Did Not Attend	71	87.7

Note. N = 81. Missing values account for the sum of certain variables not equaling 81.

Design

For this study, a cross-sectional study will be conducted. With a cross-sectional study, each individual in the sample will be measured once, at one point in time (Maxfield & Babbie, 2011; Menard[2], 2002). It is important to note that a survey will be administered to students after each simulation viewing. This means that students will be provided with four surveys in total. In order to link each students' responses together for all four surveys, at the top of each survey, students will be asked to write their month of birth, day of birth, and middle initial, as demonstrated in Appendix C.

In terms of the content of the surveys, each of the four surveys will contain questions pertaining to the independent variable, dependent variable, covariate variables, and conditional results variables. Thus, students will be asked questions about the level of control the victim and the offender had over the situation, the level of responsibility the victim and the offender had in the situation, and whether or not students believe a rape occurred in the simulation. Furthermore, in the fourth survey, students will be asked questions pertaining to demographic characteristics and control variables.

As discussed below, a limitation of using a cross-sectional study design is that spurious variables could be present (Maxfield & Babbie, 2011). Such variables could influence respondents' definitions of sexual assault, thereby impacting the effects of the independent variables (each of the four simulations) on the dependent variable (rape identification). In an attempt to mitigate for the potential spurious variables, seven control variables pertaining to the survey respondents' demographic characteristics will be used. These control variables include: 1) gender; 2) race; 3) major; 4) athlete; 5) Greek life member; 6) event promoting sexual assault awareness; and 7) knowledge of IUP policy[41].

Variables

This study consists of one dependent variable, four conditional result variables, four independent variables, two covariates, and seven control variables. The dependent variable is rape identification, and the conditional results variables are: 1) force identification; 2) threat identification; 3) victim conscious identification; and 4) drug/alcohol impairment. The independent variables, which consist of the four rape-based simulations, are: 1) clear violation of law; 2) ambiguous violation of law; 3) clear non-violation of law; and 4) ambiguous non-violation of law, and the two covariates are: 1) victim blameworthiness; and 2) offender blameworthiness. Lastly, the control variables, which pertain specifically to the survey respondents, are: 1) gender; 2) race; 3) major; 4) athlete; 5) Greek life member; 6) event promoting sexual assault awareness; and 7) knowledge of IUP policy.

Dependent variable. Due to the purpose of this study being whether or not college students can accurately identify crime, specifically rape, "rape identification" was selected as a dependent variable. Due to the nature of the dependent variable, it is important that the definition

[41] The importance of controlling for these specific factors will be discussed in the *Control Variables* section below.

of rape be provided[42]. Under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, rape is a felony of the first degree. An individual commits rape when:

> The person engages in sexual intercourse with a complainant: 1) By forcible compulsion. 2) By threat of forcible compulsion that would prevent resistance by a person of reasonable resolution. 3) Who is unconscious or where the person knows that the complainant is unaware that the sexual intercourse is occurring. 4) Where the person has substantially impaired the complainant's power to appraise or control his or her conduct by administering or employing, without the knowledge of the complainant, drugs, intoxicants or other means for the purpose of preventing resistance. 5) Who suffers from a mental disability which renders the complainant incapable of consent. (18 PA. CONS. STAT. § 3121(a)(1-5) (2016))

In order to measure the dependent variable "rape identification," for each simulation survey, respondents will be asked, *Do you consider this incident to be a rape?*[43] For this question, respondents will be provided with *yes* or *no* response choices.

Independent variables. In order to determine whether or not college students perceive the provided rape-based simulations as that of a crime or not, each of the simulations serves as an independent variable. To start, the two simulations implying a rape occurred will be based off the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's legal definition of rape, as provided above.

While there are five subsections within the definition of rape, for the purposes of this study, the simulations implying rape occurred will potentially be based on the first four subsections[44] (by forcible compulsion, by threat of force, unconscious victim, influence of drugs). Thus, for the purposes of this study, the two simulations implying a rape occurred will be based off of some aspect of the definition of rape, as demonstrated above. While each of the

[42] In order to gain an understanding of whether or not students can accurately identify rape, they will not be provided with the definition. Doing so would alter their perceptions.
[43] This question was adapted from the *Rape Minimization Scale*.
[44] Due to the limited likelihood that the rape of an individual with a mental disability will occur on a college campus, this aspect of the definition will be excluded from study. The reason the likelihood is so low is because none (zero %) of students at IUP have been diagnosed with a mental disability that renders them incapable of providing consent (C. Dugan, personal communication, September 21, 2016). Therefore, it is highly unlikely that IUP college students would face the possibility of engaging in sexual activity with an individual who is non-consenting because of a diagnosed mental disability.

simulations is based off of this definition of rape, the simulations will differ in terms of what is portrayed within them. One simulation will depict a clear violation of law, which means it will clearly imply that a rape has occurred. A second simulation will depict an ambiguous violation of law, which means it will imply that a rape has occurred, but the actions that occurred within the simulation could cause one to question whether or not such actions were legal, as per a respondent's perceptions. The third simulation will depict a clear non-violation of law, which means it will clearly imply that a rape has not occurred. Lastly, the fourth simulation will depict an ambiguous non-violation of law, which means it will imply that a rape has not occurred, but the actions that occurred within the simulation could cause one to question whether or not such actions were legal.

It is important to have four simulations, so an overall picture of students' perceptions of rape can be obtained. In order to identify if students can correctly identify what was a rape and was not a rape, a simulation providing a clear-cut depiction of what a rape is, is needed, as well as a simulation providing a clear-cut depiction of a rape not occurring. This provides an analysis if students know simply what right from wrong is in terms of rape. It is important to have ambiguous definitions to determine if students correctly can identify rape when the depicting is not so clear. Therefore, a simulation depicting an ambiguous non-violation of the law and a simulation depicting an ambiguous violation of the law are provided. With all four simulations, it will be determined if students correctly can identify clear cut incidents of rape and non-rape, as well as ambiguous incidents of rape and non-rape.

Video #1 – Clear violation of law. The victim and the perpetrators are talking at a party. The perpetrators forcefully pull the victim (who is clearly exceedingly intoxicated) to a bedroom.

The perpetrators push the victim onto the bed and starts to undress the victim. The victim tells the perpetrators to stop. The perpetrators ignore the victim and continue to undress them.

Video #2 – Ambiguous violation of law. The victim and the perpetrators are talking at a party. During their conversation, the victim agreed (gave consent) to have sex with the perpetrators. The perpetrators and the victim walk to the bedroom together. While undressing, the victim passes out. The perpetrators continue to engage in sexual relations with the victim.

Video #3 – Clear non-violation of law. The victim and the perpetrators are talking at a party. The perpetrators and the victim walk to the bedroom together. They start kissing, falling onto the bed, where they begin to undress each other.

Video #4 – Ambiguous non-violation of law. The victim and the perpetrators are talking at a party. During their conversation, the victim agreed (gave consent) to have sex with the perpetrators. They victim and the perpetrators walk to the bedroom together, where they begin undressing one another. In a playful manner, the victim pulls away from the perpetrators. The perpetrators push the victim against the wall. The perpetrators, in an aggressive manner, continue undressing the victim, pushing the victim to the bed. The victim does not take back consent, thereby consent is still present.

Covariates. In following past research about college students' perceptions of rape, the level of control and responsibility placed on the victim and the offender will be measured as well. Therefore, "victim blameworthiness," and "offender blameworthiness" were selected as covariates. They were selected as covariates because they may potentially influence respondents' perceptions of each simulation, and thus help to explain their perceptions of the dependent variable; but, they do not qualify as an independent variable for this study, just simply a potential influencing variable (Sentürk & Müller, 2005). In order to measure these covariates, the surveys

consist of questions adapted from the *Rape Minimization Scale* and the *Victim Blame Attribution Scale,* both of which are highly tested scales, as will be discussed in the *Validity* and *Reliability* sections below. Furthermore, questions were created to further address "victim blameworthiness" and "offender blameworthiness" regarding the victim's dress and the relationship between the victim and offender.

For the covariate "victim blameworthiness," respondents were asked the following questions: 1) *How much control did John have of this situation*; 2) *How much responsibility did John have in this situation;*[45][46] 3) *How much desire did John have for intercourse*; 4) *How much did John provoke this situation*[47]; 5) *John was dressed in a provocative manner*; and 6) *John knew Rebecca and Emily*. Similarly, for the covariate "offender blameworthiness," respondents were asked the following questions: 1) *How much control do you think Rebecca and Emily had of this situation*; and 2) *How much responsibility did Rebecca and Emily have in this situation;*[48][49] 3) *How much desire did Rebecca and Emily have for intercourse*; 4) *How much did Rebecca and Emily provoke the situation*[50]*;* and 5) *Rebecca and Emily knew John*.

For the questions pertaining to control, respondents were provided with an eleven-point Likert scale, ranging from zero (*no control*) to ten (*complete control*), while for the questions pertaining to responsibility, respondents were provided with an eleven-point Likert scale, ranging from zero (*no responsibility*) to ten (*complete responsibility*). For the questions pertaining to victim desire and provocation, respondents were provided with eleven-point Likert scales ranging from zero (no desire, not at all, respectively) to ten (complete desire, not at all,

[45] These questions were adapted from the *Victim Blame Attribution Scale*.
[46] Due to the question pertaining to the responsibility of the victim, not being asked due to human error, the question pertaining to victim responsibility was omitted from the data analysis.
[47] These questions were adapted from the *Victim Blame Attribution Scale*.
[48] These questions were adapted from the *Victim Blame Attribution Scale*.
[49] The question pertaining to the responsibility of the perpetrator was not included in the survey due to human error.
[50] These questions were adapted from the *Victim Blame Attribution Scale*.

respectively), while for the questions pertaining to victim dress and the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator, respondents were provided with eleven-point Likert scales ranging from zero (strongly disagree) to ten (strongly agree). Similarly, for the questions pertaining to perpetrator desire and provocation, respondents were provided with eleven-point Likert scales ranging from zero (no desire, not at all, respectively) to ten (complete desire, not at all, respectively), while for the questions pertaining to the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator, respondents were provided with eleven-point Likert scales ranging from zero (strongly disagree) to ten (strongly agree).

Since victim blameworthiness and perpetrator blameworthiness cannot be observed, in order to obtain a score for each of the covariates, a factor analysis was conducted, as explained below the in the results section. In using a factor analysis, the extent to which the questions measuring each covariate are correlated will be determined (Fabrigar & Wegener, 2012; Polit & Beck, 2012).

Conditional results variables. As per the definition of rape according to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, as discussed above, there are five possible aspects of rape, four of which will be used for this study, as discussed below, "force identification," "threat identification," victim conscious identification," and "drug/alcohol impairment," were selected as conditional results variables. Although these variables are not present in each of the simulations, if any, it is important to gain an understanding of how the survey respondents viewed the simulations. While these aspects may not be present, the respondents might have believed they occurred, so it is important to measure such information in order to gain an understanding of why students perceived simulations to be that or rape or not rape.

In order to measure the conditional results variables "force identification," "threat identification," "victim conscious identification," "drug/alcohol impairment," and "rape identification," for each simulation survey, respondents will be asked four questions, pertaining to one conditional results variable each. The questions are: 1) *Did Rebecca and Emily use force to engage in sexual activity with John?* – "force identification;" – 2) *Did Rebecca and Emily threaten to harm John?* – "threat identification;" – 3) *Was John conscious during the incident?* – "victim conscious identification;" – and 4) *Was John's actions influenced by the use of drugs or alcohol?* – "drug/alcohol identification." For each of the questions, respondents were provided with *yes* or *no* response choices. These questions, which constitute various aspects of the legal definitions of rape, allow for a lead-up to the overall question of whether or not respondents believe a rape occurred. For example, if respondents report that they perceived force used, threat of force, an unconscious victim, or a victim impaired by drugs or alcohol, then respondents also should report that a rape occurred.

Control variables. Demographic characteristics – gender, race, major, athlete, Greek life member, event promoting sexual assault awareness, and knowledge of IUP policy – will be obtained through the use of self-report surveys. These characteristics have been selected as control variables because they can each influence an individual's perceptions of rape, whether it is because they are members of IUP Greek life, they have participated in an event that promotes sexual assault awareness, or simply their gender could cause them to view simulations differently than others in terms of the level of sexual assault the simulation is depicting. An explanation as to why each of these characteristics were selected as control variables will be provided.

Gender. Previous research has demonstrated that a respondent's gender influences their opinion about rape. Research has found that males tend to blame victims more than females

(Bell, Kuriloff, & Lottes, 1994; Brekke & Borgida, 1988; ; Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001; Deitz, Litman, & Bentley, 1984; Edmonts & Cahoon, 1986; Gerdes, Dammann, & Heilig, 1988; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Johnson & Jackson, 1988; Johnson, Jackson, & Smith, 1989; Kanekar & Nazareth, 1988; Kleinke & Meyer, 1990; Schneider et al., 2009; Sheldon-Keller et al., 1994), while females tend to be more sympathetic towards rape victims the more they perceive themselves as similar to the victims (Bell, Kuriloff, &Lottes, 1994; Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001; Doherty & Anderson, 2004; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Johnson et al., 1995; Mason, Riger, & Foley, 2004; Miller, Amacker, & King, 2011). Although this research does not pertain specifically to perceptions of laws, as stated previously, it can be assumed that the more blame is placed on the victim, the less likely respondents are to determine a rape as occurred. Similarly, it can be suggested that the more females sympathize with the victim, the more likely they are to determine a rape has occurred. Due to these assumptions, as well as support from previous research, "gender" is included in this study as a control variable, and is coded as: 0 = male and 1 = female.

Race. Although there is very little research pertaining to how an individual's race influences their perceptions of rape, research has demonstrated that individuals of different races/ethnicities have differing views of sexual assault. For example, Japanese college students are more likely than American college students to minimize the seriousness of the rape, blame the victim, and excuse the perpetrator (Yamawaki & Tschanz, 2005; Lee et al., 2005), and Spanish college students placed less blame on the victim when the perpetrator used forced, and more blame when the victim was intoxicated (Romero-Sanchez, Megías, & Krahé, 2012). Furthermore, White students were more likely than Black students to blame a male perpetrator, no matter what his race, while Black students were more likely to blame the victim, no matter

what her race (Varelas & Foley, 1998). Due to the bias that can occur because of an individual's race/ethnicity, race is controlled for. Race was originally coded as: 0 = White, 1 = Black, 2 = Asian, 3 = Native American, 4 = Hispanic, and 5 = Other[51], however due to 84.0 % of the sample identifying as White, race was recoded as 0 = White and 1 = Non-White.

Major. Research examining how college students' major of study impacts their knowledge of criminal justice issues is limited. Specifically, it has tended to focus on students' perceptions of police professionalization and law enforcement (Farnworth, Longmire, & West, 1998), and their perceptions of issues within the criminal justice system (Bohm, 1990; Carlan & Byxbe, 2000; Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Miller, Tewksbury, & Hensley, 2004; Lane, 1997; Payne & Coogle, 1998; Payne & Gainey, 1999; Sandys, 1995). Due to this, as of current, there is no research pertaining to how a students' major of study influences their perceptions of laws. However, as previous literature has demonstrated, due to criminology/criminal justice majors receiving information pertaining to issues within the criminal justice system, such students appear to have a slightly more realistic and accurate perception of criminal justice issues compared to non-criminal justice majors (Lambert, 2004; Tsoudis, 2000; McCarthy & McCarthy, 1981). Therefore, it can be suggested that in relation to college students' perceptions of laws, specifically rape laws, criminology/criminal justice majors can more accurately identify rape than non-criminology/criminal justice majors. Therefore, it is important to control for the major in which the survey respondents are studying. Due to this, major was coded as: 0 = criminology/criminal justice major and 1 = other major.

Athlete. College athletics have been found to host a culture that degrades women and femininity (McCray, 2015; Curry, 1991). Furthermore, the culture highly emphasizes secrecy, in

[51] Respondents who choose "other" were provided with a line to write their race.

an attempt to keep scandals from occurring (Martin, 2016). This means that when a sexual assault is committed by an athlete, it is encouraged that this incident be kept secret so as not to cause a scandal and ruin not only the athlete's career, but damage the reputation of his sports team and college affiliation. In fact, due to the entitlement that athletes at times portray, because of how they are looked at due to their special talent, sexual assaults committed by athletes tend to be swept under the rug compared to sexual assault committed by non-athletes (Messner, 1992). In addition, Koss and Gaines (1993) found that athletes tend to be more sexually aggressive than non-athletes, with Humphrey and Kahn (2000) supporting such research while also stating that not all athletes are highly sexually aggressive. Boeringer (1999) found that athletes tended to have more rape-supportive attitudes than non-athletes, and that athletes had a higher tendency to perpetrate rape than other individuals (Boeringer, 1996). In fact, Frintner and Rubinson (1993), while surveying female college sexual assault victims, found that the victims reported being sexually assaulted by athletes at higher rates than non-athletes. Due to research finding that athletes tend to be more likely to commit rape than their peers, it is important that whether or not a respondent is an athlete, be controlled for. Athlete was coded as: 0 = no and 1 = yes.

Greek life member. Fraternities, specifically, over the years, have been found to support a culture which is prone to rape, as well as provide venues through fraternity parties, that increase the risk of sexual assault (Decker & Baroni, 2011; Harkins & Dixon, 2010; Armstrong, Hamilton, & Sweeney, 2006). Part of this is due to the fact that males who belong to fraternities tend to have more rape-supportive attitudes than non-Greek males (Canan, Jozkowski, & Crawford, 2016; Boeringer, 1999; Bleecker & Murnen, 2005). Furthermore, as a means to bond, some fraternities bond through "getting sex" (Sunday, 1996), usually by encouraging women to consume large amounts of alcohol, in an attempt to get them intoxicated enough to have sexual

intercourse with (Boswell & Spade, 1994; Boeringer, 1996; Boeringer, Shehan, & Akers, 1991). Due to the bonding mechanism, as well as being more likely to have rape-supportive attitudes, research has found that males who belong to fraternities in which this form of bonding is established, are more likely to not only rape, but commit a sexual assault (Foubert, Brosi, & Bannon, 2011; Boswell & Spade, 1996; Schwartz & Nogrady, 1996). Additionally, research has found that the likelihood of sexual assault occurring at a fraternity party is higher than the likelihood of it occurring at a non-fraternity party, and that non-fraternity parties in general are safer (Menning, 2009). In relation to females who are sorority members, research has found that such individuals are not only more likely to blame the victim for the victimization, but they are more likely to be accepting of rape myths and interpersonal violence (Kalof, 1993). Due to the increased acceptance of rape myths, as well as the increased likelihood that sexual assaults will occur at fraternity parties, it is important that membership of Greek life be included in this study as a control variable. Greek life membership was coded as: 0 = not a member, 1 = Fraternity/Sorority member.

Event promoting sexual assault awareness. As discussed above, IUP provides students with the opportunity to attend as well as participate in various events which bring about sexual assault awareness. Attending, or participating in such events could increase the awareness and knowledge individuals have about rape and sexual assault on campus. As a result, such individuals, while participating in the study, could have biased opinions of the simulations provided, due to their participation or attendance to such events. In order to determine whether students have attended such events or know about such events, in an attempt to control for such bias, there is a question on the survey that asks respondents to mark which events they have participated in that were specifically related to sexual assault events. Due to this, the control

variable ‘event promoting sexual assault awareness’ was coded as: 0 = no program participation, 1 = participation in a program.

Knowledge of IUP policy. IUP is required to have a sexual assault policy, in order to explain to students how IUP defines rape and sexual assault as well as to explain how rapes and sexual assaults that occur on campus will be handled by the university. Although IUP is not required to provide this policy to students directly, the policy is provided on the university’s website for students to access. Furthermore, this policy is less comprehensive than the definitions provided by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, thereby providing students a “lesser” knowledge of sexual assault definitions than what the state law provides. Due to this, there is a possibility that some study participants will have read, or have had explained to them, the IUP sexual assault policy, and thus, provide answers to the survey questions are biased due to them reading or having read to them, the policy. Therefore, as with “sexual assault event participation,” “knowledge of IUP policy” needs to be controlled for, to prevent bias from reading or having the policy explained to them, from influencing survey respondents’ responses. In order to control for this, students were asked if they have read or had the policy explained to them. Thus, knowledge of IUP policy was coded as: 0 = no, and 1 = yes.

Table 2

Coding Scheme for Control Variables

Variable Name	*Code*
Gender	0 = male 1 = female
Race	0 = White 1 = Non-White
Major	0 = Criminology/Criminal Justice major 1 = Other major
Athlete	0 = no 1 = yes
Greek Life Member	0 = Not a member 1 = Fraternity/Sorority member
Event Promoting Sexual Assault Awareness	0 = no program participation 1 = participation in a program
Knowledge of IUP Policy	0 = no 1 = yes

Survey Methodology

In order to obtain information about how each college student perceives each of the four simulations, self-report surveys were used. In using self-report surveys, not only can study participants provide information pertaining to their demographic characteristics, but they also can report on whether they do or do not believe each of the videos portrays a crime, as well as the level of victim and offender control and responsibility of the situation. Additionally, the anonymity associated with completing self-report surveys, increases the likelihood of individuals providing accurate and honest perceptions of the simulations. Due to the effectiveness and

efficiency of the data collected through the use of self-report surveys, one survey, split into four parts, was used for this study to obtain college students' demographic information, and their perceptions of each of the four simulations.

Survey Administration

The survey was administered to the sample via Qualtrix through student's IUP e-mail accounts. As stated above, a random sample of 2,000 students were selected for the study. These students were e-mailed and asked to participate in the study. Those who wanted to gather more information about the study, were asked to click on the Qualtrix link provided in the e-mail, which took them straight to the informed consent portion of the survey. Thus, the survey and the videos were administered to the sample via Qualtrix, after first introducing the study to the sample via their IUP e-mail. The individuals who agreed to participate in the study, were asked to click "yes" after reading the informed consent. Those who agreed to participate in the survey, were provided with the four videos, and asked to answer questions about each video, followed by demographic characteristics at the end of the fourth survey. Thus, students viewed one video at a time, and were provided with a survey containing questions pertaining to that specific video, after such viewing. Upon completion of the first survey questions, the second video automatically appeared to the respondents. This occurred until all four videos were viewed, and all four surveys and all four had been completed. It is important that respondents received and completed a survey after each simulation, so as to prevent their perceptions of the simulations from overlapping as much as possible.

Before the respondents were shown the first video, they were provided with the informed consent, as demonstrated in Appendix B. Through the informed consent, respondents were informed about the study, that their information will remain anonymous, and participation in the

study is voluntary. The potential emotional risks that could occur from participating in the study were clearly expressed to the respondents, and respondents also were informed that by clicking "yes" at the bottom of the page, they are providing their consent to participate in the study. Additionally, respondents were informed that they could stop participating in the study at any time, by simply exiting out of the survey. Upon agreeing to participate in the study, by clicking "yes" at the bottom of the informed consent page, students were automatically shown the first video.

Survey Items

In order to determine college students' perceptions of whether a rape occurred in each of the simulations, as well as the level of control and responsibility they perceived the victim and offender to have of the incident, participants were provided with four surveys, one for each video. The first three surveys, consisted of questions pertaining specifically to the independent, dependent, covariate, and conditional results variables, while the fourth survey, contained the same questions, but also included questions pertaining to the respondents' demographic characteristics, as demonstrated in Appendix C. Information pertaining to the construction of the survey was collected from Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2009).

Demographic characteristics. Demographic characteristics, which are used as control variables, were measured at the very end of the fourth survey. As mentioned above, the demographic characteristics include "gender," "race," "major," "athlete," "Greek life member," "event promoting sexual assault awareness," and "knowledge of IUP policy." Questions 17 through 23 in Appendix C, demonstrate how the control variables will be collected and measured. For example, question 18 asks: *What racial group do you most identify with?* and participants are provided with the following response categories: 1) White; 2) Black; 3) Asian; 4)

Native American; 5) Hispanic; and 6) Other. If the participants choose the category *Other*, they are provided with a line, allowing them to write in their answer.

Simulations. In order to measure the dependent variable "rape identification," the conditional results variables "force identification," "threat identification," "victim conscious identification," and "drug/alcohol identification," and the covariates "victim blameworthiness" and "offender blameworthiness," study participants were asked to watch four videos, each of which is an independent variable, as discussed above. After the viewing of one video, study participants were provided with a survey containing questions pertaining to the independent, dependent, covariates, and conditional results variables. The questions pertaining to these variables were discussed above. However, it is important to note that question one measures "rape identification," question thirteen measures "force identification," question fifteen measures "threat identification," question sixteen measures "victim conscious identification," and question five measures "drug/alcohol identification." Furthermore, questions three, four, six, seven, eight, and nine measures "victim blameworthiness," and questions two, ten, eleven, twelve, and fourteen measures "offender blameworthiness."

Reliability

In relation to the reliability of the surveys, internal consistency reliability is used. To start, the survey questions pertaining to the dependent variable and the covariate variables, were adapted from a highly tested scale. Questions two, and six through twelve, were adapted from the *Victim Blame Attribution Scale*. When tested for reliability, this scale was found to have an internal consistency of 0.82 in its original use (Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Monson, 1998), and 0.80 when further tested in more current research (White & Yamawaki, 2009). While previous testing of the scale demonstrates reliability of the surveys, this does not necessarily mean that the

current survey will be reliable as well, since it was created as an adaptation of the tested scale. Due to this, the Cronbach's alphas of the victim blameworthiness scale and the perpetrator blameworthiness scale were determined to measure each scales' reliability (Carmine & Zeller, 1979; Thornberry & Krohn, 2000). The victim blameworthiness scale has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.862, while the perpetrator blameworthiness scale has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.794, demonstrating victim blameworthiness scale of this study has high internal consistency, while the perpetrator blameworthiness scale for this study has a moderate to high internal consistency[52].

Validity

With the aim of determining the validity of the survey, face validity as well as construct validity will be used. In using face validity, each variable was looked at separately to determine if the questions pertaining to each specific variable were in fact measuring the variables which the questions were intended to measure. Furthermore, it was determined if the questions on the survey were fully measuring each variable (Carmines & Zeller, 1979; Thornberry & Krohn, 2000). This means that the simulations must depict what they are intended to depict, and fit with the legal definition of forcible rape, in order for the survey items to measure what they are indented to measure. For example, one simulation implies a clear violation of crime occurred, whereas another simulation implies an ambiguous non-violation of crime occurred. It is necessary that what is depicted is either clear or ambiguous, or does or does not violate the crime of rape, where appropriate.

In order to determine whether or not the simulations were appropriately depicting what they were intended to, a panel of experts within the field of criminal justice will be used. This

[52] The process of determining the questions to be included in the scales for analysis is explained in the *Scale Variable Descriptive Statistics, Factor Analysis, and Scale Reliability* section below.

panel, whom determined the validity of the simulations by determining if each simulation is depicting what it was intended to, will consisted of a former law enforcement member who is also a criminologist, a criminal defense attorney, and three additional criminologists. Due to this, it can be stated that the simulations have validity (Carmines & Zeller, 1979; Thornberry & Krohn, 2000).

In relation to the validity of the survey measures, questions supporting the dependent variable measure (conditional results variables) were used to make sure answers to such questions followed the answers to the dependent variable measure. Thus, construct validity was used to determine the validity of the survey measures as well (Carmines & Zeller, 1979; Thornberry & Krohn, 2000). For example, if a respondent considers the incident in the simulation as that of a sexual assault, the respondent also should have demonstrated perceiving one of the following to have occurred as well: 1) force used (question thirteen), harm threatened (question fifteen), victim impairment via drug or alcohol use (question sixteen), or there being an unconscious victim (question five).

Human Subject Protections

There are several ways in which the safety and overall protection of the individuals who participate in the study, was maintained. First, anonymity was maintained. Through anonymity, the identity of the individuals participating in the study are not known. In order to maintain anonymity, not only was the study conducted via e-mail, but the researcher does not know what e-mails the study was sent to. In addition, respondents' signatures were not required on the informed consent. Instead, respondents were informed that by clicking "yes" they agree to participate in the study, they are giving their consent for participation. Second, the informed consent form was provided to the sample before they were permitted access to the survey. In

order to watch the first video, respondents were required to click "yes," demonstrating their voluntary agreement to participate in the study. Before deciding whether to participate in the study, students were informed via the informed consent page how their anonymity would be maintained. Students were also informed that the information which they provide can in no way be traced back to them. Third, students were informed in the informed consent that if they felt uncomfortable at any point, and wished to stop participation in the study, they could do so by exiting out of the survey, without any negative repercussions, and that the data they provided until that point would be destroyed.

A fourth and final protection is that due to the survey consisting of sensitive information pertaining to sexual activities, which may emotionally impact students, contact information for not only the counseling center at IUP, but in the community, was provided to students, as demonstrated in Appendix D. No matter what point the respondents exited out of the survey, whether it was after reading the informed consent, in the middle of the survey, or after completing the survey, an automatic e-mail was sent to them containing the contact information of the resources provided in Appendix D. Lastly, students were informed that in compliance with federal regulations, the data collected will be retained for at least three years. Informing students of this regulation allows them to gain an understanding that the information they provide will be kept safe, and that it can be destroyed after a specific, federally regulated time period.

Method of Analysis

Five statistical analyses were conducted to analyze the data. SPSS was used for each of the statistical analyses. First, frequency statistics were calculated. Frequency statistics include mean, mode, percentages, and standard deviation. Second, bivariate statistics such as Pearson's *r* were conducted, in order to determine the correlations between the independent, dependent, and

control variables (Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2011; Salkind, 2011; Fitzgerald & Fitzgerald, 2014; Champion & Hartley, 2010; Maxfield & Babbie, 2011). Third, a cross tabulation of the frequency distribution of the conditional results variables, and a factor analysis of the covariate variables, were conducted.

Lastly, multivariate statistics such as regression was measured after completing the frequency and bivariate statistics. Regression analysis is needed in order to remove the effect of the control variables on the dependent variable, which will allow for the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable to be observed (Champion & Hartley, 2010; Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2011; Maxfield & Babbie, 2011). More specifically, logistic regression, which is used for dichotomous variables (Champion & Hartley, 2010), was used for the dichotomous dependent variable (force identification) for each video, since the dependent variable is measured through yes/no responses and is thus, dichotomous. Since there are four independent simulations, four regression models were run. In running each simulation separately from the others, the students' perceptions of each of the simulations can be looked at separately from one another.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This section will provide the statistical results of the study. Descriptive statistics of the dependent and conditional results variables will be provided, along with the cross tabulations of the conditional results variables. The descriptive statistics of the scaled variables, scale reliability, and factor analysis for the covariates will be provided separately, followed by bivariate statistics, and lastly, regression. The results for each independent variable, will be provided separately from the others in each statistical section, except for the *Scaled Variables, Scale Reliability, and Factor Analysis* section.

Descriptive Statistics

This section will provide the frequencies of the control variables, and descriptive statistics for each independent variable separately. The statistics will include the frequency statistics of each of the variables in relation to the dependent variable, and the cross tabulations of the conditional results variables.

Table 3

Control Variable Frequencies

Item	*Item Categories*	*N*	*Percent (%)*
Gender	Male	24	29.6
	Female	57	70.4
Race	White	68	83.9
	Black	4	4.9
	Asian	3	3.7
	Hispanic	2	2.4
	Other	3	3.7
Major	CJ/Criminology	12	14.8
	Other	66	81.5

Athlete	Athlete	5	6.2
	Non-Athlete	75	92.6
Greek Life Member	Greek Life Member	5	6.2
	Non-Greek Life Member	75	92.6
Knowledge of IUP Policy	Knowledge	64	79.0
	No Knowledge	7	8.6
	Unknown	10	12.3
Event Promoting Sexual Assault Awareness			
Six O'clock Series	Attended	13	16.0
	Did Not Attend	68	84.0
Haven Project	Attended	17	21.0
	Did Not Attend	64	79.0
Take Back the Night	Attended	27	33.3
	Did Not Attend	54	66.7
Green Light Campaign	Attended	4	4.9
	Did Not Attend	77	95.1
Rainn Day	Attended	11	13.6
	Did Not Attend	70	86.4
Turn the Red Zone Green	Attended	2	2.5
	Did Not Attend	79	97.5
Bystander Step Up Training	Attended	7	8.6
	Did Not Attend	74	91.4
Sexual Assault Awareness Month	Attended	10	12.3
	Did Not Attend	71	87.7

Note. N = 81. Missing values account for the sum of certain variables not equaling 81[53].

[53] The two cases that are missing values were left in the analyses instead of being removed because the data was missing for the second or third simulations. This means that these individuals may not have purposefully skipped the questions, because they continued with the simulation following the missing simulation information. This demonstrates a potential issues in the survey link, instead of the individuals purposefully skipping the questions.

As demonstrated in Table 3, the sample comprised majority of White (84.0%) females (70.4%). Criminology/criminal justice majors comprised only 14.8% of the sample, with 92.6% of the sample identifying as non-athletes, and 92.6% identifying as non-Greek Life members. Seventy nine percent stated they had knowledge of the IUP sexual assault policy, 8.6% stated they had no such knowledge, and 12.3% did not know. In relation to attending an event promoting sexual assault awareness, 16.0% attended the Six O'clock Series, 21.0% attended the Haven Project, 33.3% attended Take Back the Night, 4.9% attended the Green Light Campaign, 13.6% attended Rainn Day, 2.5% attended Turn the Red Zone Green, 8.6% attended a Bystander Step Up Training, and 12.3% participating the Sexual Assault Awareness Month.

Table 4

Dependent Variable Frequencies

IV	Respondent Responses	N	Percent (%)
Video #1 – Clear Violation	Not Rape	4	4.9
	Rape	77	95.1
Video #2 – Ambiguous Violation	Not Rape	8	9.9
	Rape	73	90.1
Video #3 – Clear Non-Violation	Not Rape	64	79.0
	Rape	16	19.8
Video #4 – Ambiguous Non-Violation	Not Rape	28	34.6
	Rape	52	64.2

Note. N = 81

Video #1 – Clear Violation of Law

Video #1 examined whether the respondents could accurately identify an obvious rape situation. Seventy-seven of the respondents (95.1%) accurately identified the video as a rape, with four (4.9%) inaccurately identifying the video as not a rape, as demonstrated in Table 4. In

terms of the conditional results variables, as demonstrated in Table 5, of the 77 respondents who accurately identified the video as rape, 66 believed the offenders used force against the victim, nine believed the offenders threatened the victim, 26 believed the offender was not conscious, and 68 believed the victim's actions were influenced by drugs or alcohol. Out of the four respondents who inaccurately identified the video as a non-rape, three believed the offenders used force against the victim, one believed the offenders threatened the victim, two believed the victim was not conscious, and three believed the victim's actions were influenced by drugs or alcohol[54].

Table 5

Clear Violation and Conditional Results Variables Cross Tabulation

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?		
		No	Yes	Total
Offenders Used Force against Victim	No	1	11	12
	Yes	3	66	69
	Total	4	77	81
Offenders Threatened Victim	No	3	68	71
	Yes	1	9	10
	Total	4	77	81
Victim was Conscious	No	2	26	28
	Yes	2	51	53
	Total	4	77	81
Victim's Actions Influenced by Drugs/Alcohol	No	1	9	10
	Yes	3	68	71
	Total	4	77	81

Note. N = 81

[54] It is important to note that respondents answered each question separately.

In relation to the total number of conditional results variables each respondent found to be present, as demonstrated in Table 6, of the four respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape, none failed to identify any of the conditional results variables, one identified one, one identified two, two identified three, and none identified all four. Of the respondents who identified this incident as a rape, only one did not identify any of the conditional results variables. Twelve respondents identified one conditional results variable, 37 identified two, 25 identified three, and two identified all four.

Table 6

Clear Violation and Total Conditional Results Variables

Do you consider video 1 rape?	*Number of Conditional Variables Identified*	*Frequency*	*Percent (%)*
No	0	0	0
	1	1	25.0
	2	1	25.0
	3	2	50.0
	4	0	0
	Total	4	100
Yes	0	1	1.3
	1	12	15.6
	2	37	48.1
	3	25	32.5
	4	2	2.6
	Total	77	100

In relation to the control variables, as demonstrated in Table 7, 22 males and 55 females considered the incident to be a rape, two males and two females identified the incident as a non-rape, 65 White respondents and 12 non-White respondents identified the incident as rape, and three White and one non-White respondent identified the incident as a non-rape. All the criminal justice/criminology majors and all but three of the respondents with other majors identified the incident as rape, all the athletes and all but four of the non-athletes identified the incident as a

non-rape, and all the Greek Life members and all but four of the non-Greek Life members identified the incident as a non-rape. In terms of having knowledge of the IUP sexual assault policy, of the four individuals who identified the incident as a non-rape, one reported they had no knowledge of the policy, one reported they had such knowledge, and two were unsure. Of the respondents who did identify the incident as a rape, six reported they had no knowledge of the policy, 63 reported they had such knowledge, and eight were unsure. Out of the four individuals who did not identify the incident as a rape, none of them attended an event promoting sexual assault awareness. Of those who did identify the incident as that of a rape (77 respondents), 13 attended the Six O'clock Series, 17 attended the Haven Project, 27 attended Take Back the Night, four attended the Green Light Campaign, 11 attended Rainn Day, two attended Turn the Red Zone Green, seven attended the Bystander Step Up Training, and ten attended some part of the Sexual Assault Awareness Month.

Of the respondents who identified this incident as a rape, 40 did not attend an event promoting sexual assault awareness, as demonstrated in Table 8. Thirteen individuals attended one event, 10 attended two events, six attended three events, three attended four events, two attended five events, and three attended six events. At stated above, none of the individuals who identified this incident as a non-rape attended an event promoting sexual assault awareness.

Table 7

Clear Violation and Control Variable Frequencies

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?		
Variable	*Categories*	No	Yes	Total
Gender	Male	2	22	24
	Female	2	55	57
	Total	4	77	81
Race	White	3	65	68
	Non-White	1	12	13
	Total	4	77	81
Major	CCJ	0	12	12
	Other	3	63	66
	Total	3	75	78
Athlete	No	4	71	75
	Yes	0	5	5
	Total	4	76	80
Greek Life Member	No	4	71	75
	Yes	0	6	8
	Total	0	77	81
Knowledge of IUP Policy	No	1	6	7
	Yes	1	63	64
	Unknown	2	8	10
	Total	4	77	81

Event Promoting Sexual Assault Awareness				
Six O'clock Series	No	4	64	68
	Yes	0	13	13
	Total	4	77	81
Haven Project	No	4	60	64
	Yes	0	17	17
	Total	4	77	81
Take Back the Night	No	4	50	54
	Yes	0	27	27
	Total	4	77	81
Green Light Campaign	No	4	73	77
	Yes	0	4	4
	Total	4	77	81
Rainn Day	No	4	66	70
	Yes	0	11	11
	Total	4	77	81
Turn the Red Zone Green	No	4	75	79
	Yes	0	2	2
	Total	4	77	81
Bystander Step Up Training	No	4	70	74
	Yes	0	7	7
	Total	4	77	81
Sexual Assault Awareness Month	No	4	67	71
	Yes	0	10	10
	Total	4	77	81

Note. N = 81. Some values may be missing.

Table 8

Clear Violation and Total Event Participation

Do you consider video 1 rape?	*Number Events Attended*	*Frequency*	*Percent (%)*
No	0	4	100
	Total	4	100
Yes	0	40	51.9
	1	13	16.9
	2	10	13.0
	3	6	7.8
	4	3	3.9
	5	2	2.6
	6	3	3.9
	Total	77	100

Note. N = 81.

Video #2 – Ambiguous Violation of Law

Video #2 examined whether respondents could accurately identify an ambiguous rape situation. Seventy-three of the respondents (90.1%) accurately identified the video as rape, with eight (9.9%) inaccurately identifying the video as not a rape, as demonstrated in Table 4. In terms of the conditional results variables, as demonstrated in Table 9, of the 73 respondents who accurately identified the video as rape, 40 believed the offenders used force against the victim, four believed the offenders threatened the victim, 72 believed the offender was not conscious, and 69 believed the victim's actions were influenced by drugs or alcohol. Of the eight respondents who inaccurately identified the video as a non-rape, two believed the offenders used force against the victim, one believed the offenders threatened the victim, six believed the victim was not conscious, and seven believed the victim's actions were influenced by drugs or alcohol.

Table 9

Ambiguous Violation and Conditional Results Variables Cross Tabulation

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?		
		No	Yes	Total
Offenders Used Force against Victim	No	6	33	39
	Yes	2	40	42
	Total	8	73	81
Offenders Threatened Victim	No	7	69	76
	Yes	1	4	5
	Total	8	73	81
Victim was Conscious	No	6	72	78
	Yes	2	1	3
	Total	8	73	81
Victim's Actions Influenced by Drugs/Alcohol	No	1	4	5
	Yes	7	69	76
	Total	8	73	81

Note. N = 81

In relation to the total number of conditional results variables each respondent found to be present, of the respondents who identified this incident as a non-rape, one did not identify any of the conditional results variables, one identified one of the variables, four identified two of the variables, one identified three of the variables, and one identified all four of the variables, as demonstrated in Table 10. Of the individuals who identified this incident as a rape, none failed to identify any of the conditional results variables, two identified one of the variables, 33 identified two of the variables, 35 identified three of the variables, and three identified all four of the variables.

Table 10

Ambiguous Violation and Total Conditional Results Variables

Do you consider video 2 rape?	*Number of Conditional Variables Identified*	*Frequency*	*Percent (%)*
No	0	1	12.5
	1	1	12.5
	2	4	50.0
	3	1	12.5
	4	1	12.5
	Total	8	100
Yes	0	0	0
	1	2	2.7
	2	33	45.2
	3	35	47.9
	4	3	4.1
	Total	73	100

In relation to the control variables, as demonstrated in Table 11, 20 males and 53 females considered this incident to be a rape, four males and four females identified the incident as a non-rape, 61 White respondents and 12 non-White respondents identified the incident as rape, and seven White and one non-White respondent identified the incident as a non-rape. All the criminal justice/criminology majors and all but seven of the respondents with other majors identified the incident as rape, all but one athlete and seven non-athletes identified the incident as a non-rape, and all the Greek Life members and all but eight of the non-Greek Life members identified the incident as a non-rape. In terms of having knowledge of the IUP sexual assault policy, of the eight individuals who identified the incident as a non-rape, two reported having no knowledge of the policy, four reported they had such knowledge, and two were unsure. Of the respondents who did identify the incident as rape, five reported they had no knowledge of the policy, 60 reported they had such knowledge, and eight were unsure. Of the eight individuals who did not identify the incident as a rape, very few attended an event promoting sexual assault awareness. One

attended the Six O'clock Series, one the Haven Project, two attended Take Back the Night, one attended the Bystander Step Up Training, and one participated in some form in the sexual assault awareness month. Of those who did identify the incident as that of a rape (73 respondents), 12 attended the Six O'clock Series, 16 attended the Haven Project, 25 attended Take Back the Night, four attended the Green Light Campaign, 11 attended Rainn Day, two attended Turn the Red Zone Green, six attended the Bystander Step Up Training, and nine attended some part of the Sexual Assault Awareness Month.

Of the respondents who identified this incident as a rape, 39 did not attend an event promoting sexual assault awareness, as demonstrated in Table 12. Twelve attended one event, nine attended two events, five attended three events, three attended four events, two attended five events, and three attended six events. Of the respondents who identified this incident as a non-rape, five did not attend an event promoting sexual assault awareness. One attended one event, one attended two events, and one attended three events.

Table 11

Ambiguous Violation and Control Variable Frequencies

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?		
Variable	*Categories*	No	Yes	Total
Gender	Male	4	20	24
	Female	4	53	57
	Total	8	73	81
Race	White	7	61	68
	Non-White	1	12	13
	Total	8	73	81
Major	CCJ	0	12	12
	Other	7	59	66
	Total	7	71	78
Athlete	No	7	68	75
	Yes	1	4	5
	Total	8	72	80
Greek Life Member	No	8	67	75
	Yes	0	6	6
	Total	8	73	81
Knowledge of IUP Policy	No	2	5	7
	Yes	4	60	64
	Unknown	2	8	10
	Total	8	73	81

Event Promoting Sexual Assault Awareness				
Six O'clock Series	No	7	61	68
	Yes	1	12	13
	Total	8	73	81
Haven Project	No	7	57	65
	Yes	1	16	17
	Total	8	73	81
Take Back the Night	No	6	48	56
	Yes	2	25	27
	Total	8	73	81
Green Light Campaign	No	8	69	77
	Yes	0	4	4
	Total	8	73	81
Rainn Day	No	8	62	70
	Yes	0	11	11
	Total	8	73	81
Turn the Red Zone Green	No	8	71	79
	Yes	0	2	2
	Total	8	73	81
Bystander Step Up Training	No	7	67	74
	Yes	1	6	7
	Total	8	73	81
Sexual Assault Awareness Month	No	7	64	71
	Yes	1	9	10
	Total	8	73	81

Note. N = 81. Some values may be missing.

Table 12

Ambiguous Violation and Total Event Participation

Do you consider video 2 rape?	*Number Events Attended*	*Frequency*	*Percent (%)*
No	0	5	62.5
	1	1	12.5
	2	1	12.5
	3	1	12.5
	Total	8	100
Yes	0	39	53.4
	1	12	16.4
	2	9	12.3
	3	5	6.8
	4	3	4.1
	5	2	2.7
	6	3	4.1
	Total	73	100

Note. N = 81.

Video #3 – Clear Non-Violation of Law

Video #3 examined whether respondents could accurately identify an obvious non-rape situation. Sixty-four of the respondents (79.0%) accurately identified the video as not a rape, with 16 (19.8%) inaccurately identifying the video as a rape[55][56], as demonstrated in Table 4. In terms of the conditional results variables, as demonstrated in Table 13, of the 64 respondents who accurately identified the video as a non-rape, one believed the offenders used force against the victim, none believed the offenders threatened the victim, two believed the offender was not conscious, and 45 believed the victim's actions were influenced by drugs or alcohol. Of the 16

[55] There is one missing value for this video.

[56] It is possible that due to watching the violation of law simulation and ambiguous violation of law before watching the non-violation of law simulation and the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation, that the respondents identified the non-violation of law simulation and the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation as rape because they were influenced by the simulations depicting a violation of law.

respondents who inaccurately identified the video as a rape, nine believed the offenders used force against the victim, two believed the offenders threatened the victim, five believed the victim was not conscious, and 15 believed the victim's actions were influenced by drugs or alcohol.

Table 13

Clear Non-Violation and Conditional Results Variables Cross Tabulation

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?		
		No	Yes	Total
Offenders Used Force against Victim	No	63	7	70
	Yes	1	9	10
	Total	64	16	80
Offenders Threatened Victim	No	64	14	78
	Yes	0	2	2
	Total	64	16	80
Victim was Conscious	No	2	5	7
	Yes	61	11	72
	Total	63	16	79
Victim's Actions Influenced by Drugs/Alcohol	No	19	1	20
	Yes	45	15	60
	Total	64	16	80

Note. N = 80. Some values may be missing.

As demonstrated in Table 14, in relation to the total number of conditional results variables each respondent found to be present, of the 16 respondents who identified this incident as a rape, none failed to identify any of the conditional results variables, three identified one variable, six identified two variables, six identified three variables, and one identified all four of the variables. Of the respondents who identified this incident as a non-rape, none of the respondents failed to identify any of the conditional results variables, 21 identified one of the

variables, 41 identified two of the variables, one identified three of the variables, and none identified all four of the variables.

Table 14

Clear Non-Violation and Total Conditional Results Variables

Do you consider video 3 rape?	*Number of Conditional Variables Identified*	*Frequency*	*Percent (%)*
No	0	0	0
	1	21	32.8
	2	41	64.1
	3	1	1.6
	4	0	0
	Total	63	100
Yes	0	0	0
	1	3	18.8
	2	6	37.5
	3	6	37.5
	4	1	6.3
	Total	16	100

In relation to the control variables, as demonstrated in Table 15, 22 males and 42 females considered this incident to be a non-rape, two males and 14 females identified the incident as a rape, 52 White respondents and 12 non-White respondents identified the incident as a non-rape, and 15 White and one non-White respondent identified the incident as a rape. All but one of the criminal justice/criminology majors identified the incident as a non-rape, 50 out of 65 other majors identified the incident as a non-rape, four out of five athletes and 59 out of 79 non-athletes identified the incident as a rape, and four out of six Greek Life members and 60 out of 74 non-Greek Life members identified the incident as a non-rape. In terms of having knowledge of the IUP sexual assault policy, of the 64 respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape, six reported having no knowledge of the policy, 50 reported they had such knowledge, and eight were unsure. Of the respondents who did identify the incident as a rape, 14 reported they had no

knowledge of the policy, and two were unsure. Of the 64 respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape, eight attended the Six O'clock Series, 13 attended the Haven Project, 19 attended Take Back the Night, one attended the Green Light Campaign, seven attended Rainn Day, one attended Turn the Red Zone Green, five attended the Bystander Step Up Training, and six participated in some form in the sexual assault awareness month. Of those who did identify the incident as that of a rape (16 respondents), four attended the Six O'clock Series, four attended the Haven Project, seven attended Take Back the Night, three attended the Green Light Campaign, four attended Rainn Day, one attended Turn the Red Zone Green, two attended the Bystander Step Up Training, and three attended some part of the Sexual Assault Awareness Month.

Of the respondents who identified this incident as a non-rape, 38 did not attend an event promoting sexual assault awareness, as demonstrated in Table 16. Eleven attended one event, seven attended two events, three attended three events, one attended four events, two attended five events, and two attended six events. Of the respondents who identified this incident as a rape, six did not attend an event promoting sexual assault awareness. Two attended one event, three attended two events, two attended three events, two attended four events, and one attended six events.

Table 15

Clear Non-Violation and Control Variable Frequencies

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?		
Variable	*Categories*	No	Yes	Total
Gender	Male	22	2	24
	Female	42	14	56
	Total	64	16	80
Race	White	52	15	67
	Non-White	12	1	13
	Total	64	16	80
Major	CCJ	11	1	12
	Other	50	15	65
	Total	61	16	77
Athlete	No	59	15	73
	Yes	4	1	5
	Total	63	16	78
Greek Life Member	No	60	14	74
	Yes	4	2	6
	Total	64	16	80
Knowledge of IUP Policy	No	6	14	20
	Yes	50	0	50
	Unknown	8	2	10
	Total	64	16	80

Event Promoting Sexual Assault Awareness				
Six O'clock Series	No	56	12	68
	Yes	8	4	12
	Total	64	16	80
Haven Project	No	51	12	63
	Yes	13	4	17
	Total	64	16	80
Take Back the Night	No	45	9	54
	Yes	19	7	26
	Total	64	16	80
Green Light Campaign	No	63	13	76
	Yes	1	3	4
	Total	64	16	80
Rainn Day	No	57	12	69
	Yes	7	4	11
	Total	64	16	80
Turn the Red Zone Green	No	63	15	78
	Yes	1	1	2
	Total	64	16	80
Bystander Step Up Training	No	59	14	73
	Yes	5	2	7
	Total	64	16	80
Sexual Assault Awareness Month	No	58	13	71
	Yes	6	3	9
	Total	64	16	80

Note. N = 80. Some values may be missing.

Table 16

Clear Non-Violation and Total Event Participation

Do you consider video 3 rape?	*Number Events Attended*	*Frequency*	*Percent (%)*
No	0	38	59.4
	1	11	17.2
	2	7	10.9
	3	3	4.7
	4	1	1.6
	5	2	3.1
	6	2	3.1
	Total	64	100
Yes	0	6	37.5
	1	2	12.5
	2	3	18.8
	3	2	12.5
	4	2	12.5
	6	1	6.3
	Total	16	100

Note. N = 80. Some values may be missing.

Video #4 – Ambiguous Non-Violation of Law

Video #4 examined whether respondents could accurately identify an ambiguous non-rape situation. Twenty-eight of the respondents (34.6%) accurately identified the video as not a rape, with 52 (64.2%) inaccurately identifying the video as a rape[57], as demonstrated in Table 4. In terms of the conditional results variables, as demonstrated in Table 17, of the 28 respondents who accurately identified the video as a non-rape, 18 believed the offenders used force against the victim, one believed the offenders threatened the victim, two believed the offender was not conscious, and 23 believed the victim's actions were influenced by drugs or alcohol. Of the 52 respondents who inaccurately identified the video as a rape, 46 believed the offenders used force

[57] There is one missing value for this video.

against the victim, 9 believed the offenders threatened the victim, 27 believed the victim was not conscious, and 50 believed the victim's actions were influenced by drugs or alcohol.

Table 17

Ambiguous Non-Violation and Conditional Results Variables Cross Tabulation

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?		
		No	Yes	Total
Offenders Used Force against Victim	No	10	6	16
	Yes	18	46	64
	Total	28	52	80
Offenders Threatened Victim	No	27	42	69
	Yes	1	9	10
	Total	28	51	79
Victim was Conscious	No	2	27	29
	Yes	26	25	51
	Total	28	52	80
Victim's Actions Influenced by Drugs/Alcohol	No	5	2	7
	Yes	23	50	73
	Total	28	52	80

Note. N = 81. Some values may be missing.

In relation to the control variables, as demonstrated in Table 18, 15 males and 13 females considered this incident to be a non-rape, nine males and 43 females identified the incident as a rape, 24 White and four non-White respondents identified the incident as a non-rape, and 44 White and eight non-White respondents identified the incident as a rape. Three criminal justice/criminology majors identified the incident as a non-rape, while nine identified it as a rape; one of five athletes and 26 out of 48 non-athletes identified the incident as non-rape, and 50% (3 of 6) Greek Life members and 25 of 74 non-Greek Life members identified the incident as a non-rape. In terms of having knowledge of the IUP sexual assault policy, of the 28 respondents who

identified the incident as a non-rape, 3 had no knowledge of the policy, 21 had such knowledge, and four were unsure. Of the respondents who identified the incident as a rape, four reported they had no knowledge of the policy, 42 reported having such knowledge, and six were unsure. Of the 28 respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape, four attended the Six O'clock Series, four attended the Haven Project, eight attended Take Back the Night, two attended the Green Light Campaign, two attended Rainn Day, none attended Turn the Red Zone Green, two attended the Bystander Step Up Training, and two participated in some form in the sexual assault awareness month. Of those who did identify the incident as that of a rape (52 respondents), nine attended the Six O'clock Series, 13 attended the Haven Project, 19 attended Take Back the Night, two attended the Green Light Campaign, nine attended Rainn Day, two attended Turn the Red Zone Green, five attended the Bystander Step Up Training, and eight attended some part of the Sexual Assault Awareness Month.

Of the respondents who identified this incident as a non-rape, 18 did not attend an event promoting sexual assault awareness, as demonstrated in Table 19. Four attended one event, two attended two events, two attended three events, one attended four events, and one attended six events. Of the respondents who identified this incident as a rape, 25 did not attend an event promoting sexual assault awareness. Nine attended one event, eight attended two events, four attended three events, two attended four events, two attended five events, and two attended six events.

Table 18

Ambiguous Non-Violation and Control Variable Frequencies

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?		
Variable	*Categories*	No	Yes	Total
Gender	Male	15	9	24
	Female	13	43	56
	Total	28	52	80
Race	White	24	44	68
	Non-White	4	8	12
	Total	28	52	80
Major	CCJ	3	9	12
	Other	24	41	65
	Total	27	50	77
Athlete	No	26	48	74
	Yes	1	4	5
	Total	27	52	79
Greek Life Member	No	25	49	74
	Yes	3	3	6
	Total	28	52	80
Knowledge of IUP Policy	No	3	4	7
	Yes	21	42	63
	Unknown	4	6	10
	Total	28	52	80

Event Promoting Sexual Assault Awareness				
Six O'clock Series	No	24	43	67
	Yes	4	9	13
	Total	28	52	80
Haven Project	No	24	39	63
	Yes	4	13	17
	Total	28	52	80
Take Back the Night	No	20	33	53
	Yes	8	19	27
	Total	28	52	80
Green Light Campaign	No	26	50	76
	Yes	2	2	4
	Total	28	52	80
Rainn Day	No	26	43	69
	Yes	2	9	11
	Total	28	52	80
Turn the Red Zone Green	No	28	50	78
	Yes	0	2	2
	Total	28	52	80
Bystander Step Up Training	No	26	47	73
	Yes	2	5	7
	Total	28	52	80
Sexual Assault Awareness Month	No	26	44	70
	Yes	2	8	10
	Total	28	52	80

Note. N = 80. Some values may be missing.

Table 19

Ambiguous Non-Violation and Total Event Participation

Do you consider video 4 rape?	*Number Events Attended*	*Frequency*	*Percent (%)*
No	0	18	64.3
	1	4	14.3
	2	2	7.1
	3	2	7.1
	4	1	3.6
	6	1	3.6
	Total	28	100
Yes	0	25	48.1
	1	9	17.3
	2	8	15.4
	3	4	7.7
	4	2	3.8
	5	2	3.8
	6	2	3.8
	Total	52	100

Note. N = 80. Some values may be missing.

In relation to the total number of conditional results variables each respondent found to be present, as demonstrated in Table 20, of the respondents who identified this incident as a non-rape, four did not identify any of the conditional results variables, six identified one, 16 identified two, two identified three, and on identified all four. Of the respondents who identified this incident as a rape, none failed to identify any conditional results variables, five identified one, 18 identified two 24 identified three, and four identified all four.

Table 20

Ambiguous Non-Violation and Total Conditional Results Variables

Do you consider video 4 rape?	*Number of Conditional Variables Identified*	*Frequency*	*Percent (%)*
No	0	4	14.3
	1	6	21.4
	2	16	57.1
	3	2	7.1
	4	0	0
	Total	28	100
Yes	0	0	0
	1	5	9.8
	2	18	35.3
	3	24	47.1
	4	4	7.8
	Total	54	100

Scale Variable Descriptive Statistics, Factor Analysis, and Scale Reliability

This section will provide the descriptive statistics of the questions pertaining to the victim blameworthiness and offender blameworthiness scales. The factor analysis for each scale will be provided, along with the overall reliability of each scale.

Victim Blameworthiness

This section examines the questions pertaining to the variable "victim blameworthiness." The questions, all measured via 11-point Likert scales, examined the respondents' perceptions on the provocativeness of the way the victim was dressed, how well the victim knew his perpetrators, how much the victim provoked the situation, how much control and responsibility the victim had of the situation, and how much desire the victim had for intercourse. An examination of the descriptive statistics for these scores are individually analyzed to gain an understanding of the impact each aspect had on the dependent variable. The higher each of these scores, the more provocatively dressed the victim was viewed as, the more the victim knew his

perpetrators, the more the victim provoked the situation, the more control and responsibility the victim had of the situation, and the more desire the victim had for intercourse. The scores for the variable "victim blameworthiness," as discussed in the *Factor Analysis* section below, ranges from zero to 50. The higher the score, the more blame respondents placed on the victim.

Descriptive statistics IV 1 – Clear violation of law. Overall, respondents tended to place a low level of blame on the victim, as demonstrated in Table 21. The average scores ranged from 0.58 (SD = 1.635) for how provocatively the victim was dressed to 3.04 (SD = 2.683) for how much the victim knew the perpetrators. The overall "victim blameworthiness" score was relatively low at 6.43 (SD = 8.50), with a range of 0 – 50.

Table 21

Clear Violation "Victim Blameworthiness" Means

Variable	$\bar{X}$	*SD*	*Mode*	*Min.*	*Max.*
Victim's Desire for Intercourse	0.88	2.299	0	0	10
Victim Knew Perpetrators	3.04	2.683	5	0	10
Victim's Control of Situation	0.99	2.052	0	0	10
Victim's Provocation of Situation	0.99	1.907	0	0	10
Victim Provocatively Dressed	0.58	1.635	0	0	10
Victim's Responsibility of Situation	1.64	2.541	0	0	10
Victim Blameworthiness	6.43	8.50	0	0	50

The respondents who accurately identified this incident as rape, not only had lower average scores on the questions pertaining to "victim blameworthiness," but they overall blamed the victim less than the respondents who inaccurately identified the incident as a non-rape, as demonstrated in Table 22. In terms of the victim's desire for intercourse and how provocatively

dressed the victim was, respondents who identified the incident as rape had an average score of 0.83 (SD = 2.279) and 0.57 (SD = 1.666), respectively, while respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape had an average score of 1.75 (SD = 2.872) and 0.75 (SD = 0.957), respectively. Respondents who identified the incident a rape had average scores of 2.97 (SD = 2.723) for the victim knowing the perpetrators, 0.90 (SD = 1.971) for the victim's control of the situation, 0.97 (SD = 1.933) for how much the victim provoked the situation, and 1.51 (SD = 2.501) for the victim's level of responsibility, while their counterparts had average scores of 4.25 (SD = 1.500) for the victim knowing the perpetrators, 2.75 (SD = 3.096) for the victim's control of the situation, 1.25 (SD = 1.500) for how much the victim provoked the situation, and 4.25 (SD = 2.062) for the victim's level of responsibility. Overall, the respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape had an average score of 10.75 (SD = 8.655) for "victim blameworthiness," while those who identified the incident as a rape, had a lesser overall score of 6.21 (SD = 8.489).

Table 22

Clear Violation "Victim Blameworthiness" Means Comparison

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?	
Variable	$\bar{X}$ *and SD*	No	Yes
Victim's Desire for Intercourse	$\bar{X}$	1.75	0.83
	SD	2.872	2.279
Victim Knew Perpetrators	$\bar{X}$	4.25	2.97
	SD	1.500	2.723
Victim's Control of Situation	$\bar{X}$	2.75	0.90
	SD	3.096	1.971
Victim's Provocation of Situation	$\bar{X}$	1.25	0.97
	SD	1.500	1.933
Victim Provocatively Dressed	$\bar{X}$	0.75	0.57
	SD	0.957	1.666
Victim's Responsibility of Situation	$\bar{X}$	4.25	1.51
	SD	2.062	2.501
Victim Blameworthiness	$\bar{X}$	10.75	6.21
	SD	8.655	8.489

Note. Scores range from 0-10, except for "Victim Blameworthiness" which ranges from 0-50.

Descriptive statistics IV 2 – Ambiguous violation of law. Overall, respondents tended to place very little blame on the victim. In examining the blameworthiness variables, as demonstrated in Table 23, average scores ranged from 0.42 (SD = 0.920) for how provocatively the victim was dressed, to 2.51 (SD = 2.648) for the victim's desire for intercourse. The overall average for "victim blameworthiness" was relatively small at 7.73 (SD = 6.673), with a range of 0 – 28.

Table 23

Ambiguous Violation "Victim Blameworthiness" Means

Variable	$\bar{X}$	*SD*	*Mode*	*Min.*	*Max.*
Victim's Desire for Intercourse	2.51	2.648	0	0	10
Victim Knew Perpetrators	1.77	2.123	0	0	10
Victim's Control of Situation	1.20	1.735	0	0	8
Victim's Provocation of Situation	1.86	2.114	0	0	9
Victim Provocatively Dressed	0.42	0.920	0	0	5
Victim's Responsibility of Situation	1.66	2.294	0	0	10
Victim Blameworthiness	7.73	6.673	0	0	28

As demonstrated in Table 24, respondents who accurately identified this incident as rape, had lower average scores on the questions pertaining to "victim blameworthiness," and blamed the victim overall less than the respondents who inaccurately identified the incident as a non-rape. Respondents who identified the incident as a rape had average scores of 2.29 (SD = 2.514) for victim's desire for intercourse, 0.41 (SD = 0.940) for how provocatively the victim was dressed, and 1.66 (SD = 2.110) for how well the victim knew the perpetrators. In contrast, the respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape had average scores of 4.50 (SD = 3.162), 0.50 (SD = 0.756), and 2.75 (SD = 2.121), respectively. The average scores for the victim's control of the situation, how much the victim provoked the situation, and the victim's level of responsibility were 0.96 (SD = 1.419), 1.77 (SD = 2.112), and 1.43 (SD = 2.194), respectively, for respondents who identified the incident as rape, and 3.37 (SD = 2.774), 2.75 (SD = 2.053), and 3.75 (SD = 2.252), respectively, for respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape.

Table 24

Ambiguous Violation "Victim Blameworthiness" Means Comparison

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?	
Variable	$\bar{X}$ *and SD*	No	Yes
Victim's Desire for Intercourse	$\bar{X}$	4.50	2.29
	SD	3.162	2.514
Victim Knew Perpetrators	$\bar{X}$	2.75	1.66
	SD	2.121	2.110
Victim's Control of Situation	$\bar{X}$	3.37	0.96
	SD	2.774	1.419
Victim's Provocation of Situation	$\bar{X}$	2.75	1.77
	SD	2.053	2.112
Victim Provocatively Dressed	$\bar{X}$	0.50	0.41
	SD	0.756	0.940
Victim's Responsibility of Situation	$\bar{X}$	3.75	1.43
	SD	2.252	2.194
Victim Blameworthiness	$\bar{X}$	13.88	7.05
	SD	8.659	6.126

Note. Scores range from 0-10, except for "Victim Blameworthiness" which ranges from 0-50.

Descriptive statistics IV 3 – Clear non-violation of law. As demonstrated in Table 25, the average scores for the blame factors tended to be higher than the previous two videos. The scores ranged from 0.61 (SD = 1.238) for how provocatively the victim was dressed, to 8.06 (SD = 2.502) for the victim's desire for intercourse. The overall average of "victim blameworthiness" was not only higher than the previous videos but had a larger range as well, with an average of 22.81 (SD = 8.983) and a range of 1 – 40.

Table 25

Clear Non-Violation "Victim Blameworthiness" Means

Variable	$\bar{X}$	*SD*	*Mode*	*Min.*	*Max.*
Victim's Desire for Intercourse	8.06	2.502	10	1	10
Victim Knew Perpetrators	2.49	2.705	0	0	10
Victim's Control of Situation	6.50	3.098	10	0	10
Victim's Provocation of Situation	5.15	3.663	0	0	10
Victim Provocatively Dressed	0.61	1.238	0	0	5
Victim's Responsibility of Situation	6.19	3.044	8	0	10
Victim Blameworthiness	22.81	8.983	27	1	40

On average, the respondents who accurately identified this incident as a non-rape, were more likely to blame the victim than the respondents who inaccurately identified the incident as a rape, as demonstrated in Table 26. For the victim's desire for intercourse, how provocatively the victim was dressed, and how well the victim knew the perpetrators, the respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape had averages of 8.89 (SD = 1.544), 0.66 (SD = 1.237), and 2.63 (SD = 2.837), respectively, while the respondents who identified the incident as a rape had averages of 4.75 (SD = 2.887), 0.44 (SD = 1.263), and 1.94 (SD = 2.081), respectively. In relation to the level of control and responsibility the victim had, and how much the victim provoked the situation, respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape had averages scores of 7.63 (SD = 2.164), 7.09 (SD = 2.422), and 5.86 (SD = 3.532), respectively, while the respondents who did not identify the incident as a non-rape had average scores of 2.00 (SD = 1.966), 2.56 (SD = 2.581), and 2.31 (SD = 2.750), respectively. Overall, respondents who accurately identified this incident has rape had a higher overall victim blameworthiness score,

25.66 (SD = 6.696), than respondents who inaccurately identified the incident as rape, 11.44 (SD = 8.008).

Table 26

Clear Non-Violation "Victim Blameworthiness" Means Comparison

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?	
Variable	$\bar{X}$ *and SD*	No	Yes
Victim's Desire for Intercourse	$\bar{X}$	8.89	4.75
	SD	1.544	2.887
Victim Knew Perpetrators	$\bar{X}$	2.63	1.94
	SD	2.837	2.081
Victim's Control of Situation	$\bar{X}$	7.63	2.00
	SD	2.164	1.966
Victim's Provocation of Situation	$\bar{X}$	5.86	2.31
	SD	3.532	2.750
Victim Provocatively Dressed	$\bar{X}$	0.66	0.44
	SD	1.237	1.263
Victim's Responsibility of Situation	$\bar{X}$	7.09	2.56
	SD	2.422	2.581
Victim Blameworthiness	$\bar{X}$	25.66	11.44
	SD	6.696	8.008

Note. Scores range from 0-10, except for "Victim Blameworthiness" which ranges from 0-50.

Descriptive statistics IV 4 – Ambiguous non-violation of law. The overall averages for the factors pertaining to victim blame were relatively low. As demonstrated in Table 27, the scores ranged from 0.46 (SD = 1.124) for how provocatively the victim was dressed, to 4.33 (SD = 2.946) for the victim's desire for intercourse. Similarly, the overall average for "victim blameworthiness" was relatively low at 11.96 (SD = 8.772), with a range of 0 – 35.

Table 27

Ambiguous Non-Violation "Victim Blameworthiness" Means

Variable	$\bar{X}$	*SD*	*Mode*	*Min.*	*Max.*
Victim's Desire for Intercourse	4.33	2.946	3	0	10
Victim Knew Perpetrators	2.03	2.562	0	0	10
Victim's Control of Situation	2.88	2.748	0	0	10
Victim's Provocation of Situation	2.30	2.548	0	0	10
Victim Provocatively Dressed	0.46	1.124	0	0	5
Victim's Responsibility of Situation	3.39	3.107	0	0	10
Victim Blameworthiness	11.96	8.772	3	0	35

As demonstrated in Table 28, respondents who accurately identified this incident as a non-rape, had higher average scores on questions pertaining to "victim blameworthiness," and blamed the victim more overall, than respondents who inaccurately identified the incident as a rape. In comparing the scores of respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape to those who identified the incident as a rape, respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape had average scores of 6.43 (SD = 2.631) for victim's desire for intercourse, 0.54 (SD = 1.290) for how provocatively dressed the victim was, 2.11 (SD = 2.347) for how well the victim knew the perpetrators, 4.64 (SD = 2.765) for how much control the victim had, 5.43 (SD = 2.937) for how much responsibility the victim had, and 3.46 (SD = 2.822) and how much the victim provoked the situation, while respondents who did not identify the incident as a rape had average scores of 3.19 (SD = 2.458), 0.42 (SD = 1.036), 1.98 (SD = 2.684), 1.92 (SD = 2.239), 2.27 (SD = 2.608), and 1.67 (SD = 2.167), respectively. Overall, respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape blamed the victim more with an average score of 17.18 (SD = 8.060), while respondents

who identified the incident as a rape blamed the victim less with an average score of 9.15 (SD = 7.863).

Table 28

Ambiguous Non-Violation "Victim Blameworthiness" Means Comparison

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?	
Variable	$\bar{X}$ *and SD*	No	Yes
Victim's Desire for Intercourse	$\bar{X}$	6.43	3.19
	SD	2.631	2.458
Victim Knew Perpetrators	$\bar{X}$	2.11	1.98
	SD	2.347	2.684
Victim's Control of Situation	$\bar{X}$	4.64	1.92
	SD	2.765	2.239
Victim's Provocation of Situation	$\bar{X}$	3.46	1.67
	SD	2.822	2.167
Victim Provocatively Dressed	$\bar{X}$	0.54	0.42
	SD	1.290	1.036
Victim's Responsibility of Situation	$\bar{X}$	5.43	2.27
	SD	2.937	2.608
Victim Blameworthiness	$\bar{X}$	17.18	9.15
	SD	8.060	7.863

Note. Scores range from 0-10, except for "Victim Blameworthiness" which ranges from 0-50.

Factor analysis. A factor analysis was conducted to determine the extent to which the questions measuring the variable "victim blameworthiness" were correlated. Due to the responsibility question for "perpetrator blameworthiness" not being included in the survey, this question was not analyzed for "victim blameworthiness." Upon analyzing the five questions pertaining to "victim blameworthiness," for each of the four independent variables, together, the

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure was 0.721, with the initial Eigenvalues demonstrating that six of the 20 components accounted for 78.41% of the total explained variance. While this in relation with the scree plot suggests that the components with an Eigenvalue over 1.000 should be retained, doing so would get rid of the questions pertaining to "victim blameworthiness" for the second, third, and fourth independent variables. Due to the presence of multiple factors, the varimax rotation utilizing the maximum likelihood estimation was examined. Typically, "if an item has a factor loading below .30, it is not really a strong indicator of that factor" (Urdan, 2010, p. 174). None of the factors had a value below 0.515, so none were excluded from the variable "victim blameworthiness."

To create the "victim blameworthiness" scale, a variable was created for each of the four independent variables. Creating a "victim blameworthiness" scale for each independent variable, from the overall "victim blameworthiness" scale, allowed for the questions pertaining to each specific video to be analyzed accordingly, without influence from the other independent variables.

Scale reliability. To examine the internal consistency of the "victim blameworthiness" scale, the overall reliability of the scale was examined, as well as the reliability of each of the four scales pertaining specifically to each independent variable. The overall scale had a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.862, demonstrating high internal consistency. The Cronbach's Alpha for "victim blameworthiness" for "clear violation of law" is 0.851, 0.700 for "victim blameworthiness" for "ambiguous violation of law," 0.659 for "victim blameworthiness" for "clear non-violation of law," and 0.752 for "victim blameworthiness" for "ambiguous non-violation of law." Therefore, in having a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.7 or greater, all of the scales

accept for the one pertaining to "ambiguous violation of law[58]," are considered to be highly reliable.

Perpetrator Blameworthiness

This section examines the questions pertaining to the variable "perpetrator blameworthiness." The questions, all measured via 11-point Likert scales, examined the respondents' perceptions on how well the perpetrators knew their victim, how much the perpetrators provoked the situation, how much control and responsibility the perpetrators had of the situation, and how much desire the perpetrators had for intercourse. The higher each of these scores, the more the perpetrators knew their victim, the more the perpetrators provoked the situation, the more control and responsibility the perpetrators had of the situation, and the more desire the perpetrators had for intercourse. The scores for the variable "perpetrator blameworthiness," as discussed in the *Factor Analysis* section below, ranges from zero to 30. The higher the score, the more blame respondents placed on the perpetrators.

Descriptive statistics IV 1 – Clear violation of law. Overall, blameworthiness average scores relating to the perpetrators were relatively high. The scores ranged from 3.22 (SD = 2.938) for how much the perpetrators knew the victim, to 9.46 (SD = 1.351) for the perpetrators' desire for intercourse. The other blame categories, as demonstrated in Table 29, fell above 9.00. The average for "perpetrator blameworthiness," was 28.53 (SD = 3.252). With a maximum score potential of 30, the "perpetrator blameworthiness" score demonstrates a very high overall average.

[58] Even though the Cronbach's Alpha for the "victim blameworthiness" scale falls under 0.7, it is still close to it, demonstrating moderate reliability.

Table 29

Clear Violation "Perpetrator Blameworthiness" Means

Variable	$\bar{X}$	*SD*	*Mode*	*Min.*	*Max.*
Perpetrators' Desire for Intercourse	9.46	1.351	10	1	10
Perpetrators Knew Victim	3.22	2.938	0	0	10
Perpetrators' Control of Situation	9.63	1.711	10	2	10
Perpetrators' Provocation of Situation	9.44	1.173	10	5	10
Perpetrator Blameworthiness	28.53	3.252	30	10	30

While the respondents who identified this incident as a non-rape, blamed the victim exceedingly more than those who identified the incident as rape, in terms of "perpetrator blameworthiness," the average levels of blame between the two groups were similar, with respondents whom identified the incident as a non-rape, finding the perpetrator at less fault with certain aspects, as demonstrated in Table 30. Respondents who identified the incident as a rape, compared to respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape, on average scored lower in relation to how well the perpetrators knew the victim; 3.14 (SD = 2.970), 5.00 (1.000), respectively, and how much control the victim had of the situation; 9.62 (SD = 1.203), 9.75 (SD = 0.500), respectively. However, respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape on average scored lower than respondents who identified the incident as a rape in terms of the perpetrators' desire for intercourse; 9.25 (SD = 1.500), 9.47 (SD = 1.353), respectively, and how much the perpetrators provoked the situation; 9.00 (SD = 2.000), 9.47 (SD = 1.131), respectively. In terms of overall "blameworthiness," respondents who identified the incident as a rape, on average blamed the perpetrator slightly more than respondents who did not identify the incident as a rape; 28.56 (SD = 3.238), 28.00 (SD = 4.000), respectively.

Table 30

Clear Violation "Perpetrator Blameworthiness" Means Comparison

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?	
Variable	$\bar{X}$ *and SD*	No	Yes
Perpetrators' Desire for Intercourse	$\bar{X}$	9.25	9.47
	SD	1.500	1.353
Perpetrators Knew Victim	$\bar{X}$	5.00	3.14
	SD	1.000	2.970
Perpetrators' Control of Situation	$\bar{X}$	9.75	9.62
	SD	0.500	1.203
Perpetrators' Provocation of Situation	$\bar{X}$	9.00	9.47
	SD	2.000	1.131
Perpetrator Blameworthiness	$\bar{X}$	28.00	28.56
	SD	4.000	3.238

Note. Scores range from 0-10, except for "Perpetrator Blameworthiness" which ranges from 0-30.

Descriptive statistics IV 2 – Ambiguous violation of law. Overall, the average scores for the blame factors were relatively high. All were above 9.0 except for how well the perpetrators knew the victim which had an average score of 2.2. (SD = 2.420), as demonstrated in Table 31. The average score for "perpetrator blameworthiness" was relatively high at 27.48 (SD = 3.532) with a range of 14 – 30.

Table 31

Ambiguous Violation "Perpetrator Blameworthiness" Means

Variable	$\bar{X}$	*SD*	*Mode*	*Min.*	*Max.*
Perpetrators' Desire for Intercourse	9.21	1.563	10	3	10
Perpetrators Knew Victim	2.23	2.420	0	0	10
Perpetrators' Control of Situation	9.17	2.066	10	0	10
Perpetrators' Provocation of Situation	9.10	1.437	10	5	10
Perpetrator Blameworthiness	27.48	3.532	30	14	30

As demonstrated in Table 32, respondents who accurately depicted the incident as a rape had a higher average score of "perpetrator blameworthiness" and respondents who inaccurately depicted the incident as a non-rape; 27.05 (SD = 6.126), 22.88 (SD = 3.399), respectively. However, even though they had lower overall score, respondents who identified the incident as a rape had higher average scores on perpetrators' desire for intercourse, 9.47 (SD = 1.292), the perpetrators' level of control of the situation, 9.25 (SD = 2.094), and how much the perpetrators provoked the situation, 9.27 (SD – 1.262), compared to the respondents who did not identify the incident as a rape; 6.88 (SD = 1.959), 8.50 (SD = 1.773), and 7.50 (2.000), respectively. The only aspect respondents who identified the incident as rape, scored lower on, on average, than the respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape, was how well the perpetrators knew the victim; 2.08 (SD = 2.396), 3.62 (SD = 2.326), respectively.

Table 32

Ambiguous Violation "Perpetrator Blameworthiness" Means Comparison

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?	
Variable	$\bar{X}$ *and SD*	No	Yes
Perpetrators' Desire for Intercourse	$\bar{X}$	6.88	9.47
	SD	1.959	1.292
Perpetrators Knew Victim	$\bar{X}$	3.62	2.08
	SD	2.326	2.396
Perpetrators' Control of Situation	$\bar{X}$	8.50	9.25
	SD	1.773	2.094
Perpetrators' Provocation of Situation	$\bar{X}$	7.50	9.27
	SD	2.000	1.261
Perpetrator Blameworthiness	$\bar{X}$	22.88	27.05
	SD	3.399	6.126

Note. Scores range from 0-10, except for "Perpetrator Blameworthiness" which ranges from 0-30.

Descriptive statistics IV 3 – Clear non-violation of law. In examining the perpetrator blame factors, the averages ranged from 2.62 (SD = 2.700) for how well the perpetrators knew the victim, to 9.51 (SD = 1.067) for how much desire the perpetrators had for intercourse, as demonstrated in Table 33. The overall average score for "perpetrator blameworthiness" is 27.21 (SD = 3.271), with a range of 17 – 30. Compared to the previous two videos, the "perpetrator blameworthiness" range is smaller.

Table 33

Clear Non-Violation "Perpetrator Blameworthiness" Means

Variable	$\bar{X}$	*SD*	*Mode*	*Min.*	*Max.*
Perpetrators' Desire for Intercourse	9.51	1.067	10	4	10
Perpetrators Knew Victim	2.62	2.700	0	0	10
Perpetrators' Control of Situation	8.99	1.326	10	5	10
Perpetrators' Provocation of Situation	8.82	1.723	10	0	10
Perpetrator Blameworthiness	27.21	3.271	30	17	30

Respondents who accurately identified this incident as a non-rape, scored lower on every aspect, include overall "perpetrator blameworthiness," except for how much desire the perpetrators had for intercourse, as demonstrated in Table 34, compared to the respondents who inaccurately identified this incident as a rape. In relation to the overall average score of "perpetrator blameworthiness," respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape had an average score of 27.08 (SD = 3.154), while respondents who identified the incident as a rape had a slightly higher average score of 27.75 (3.768). Average scores for the perpetrators' desire for intercourse, how well the perpetrators knew the victim, how much control the perpetrators had of the situation, and how much the perpetrators provoked the situation for respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape are as follows: 9.61 (SD= 0.847), 2,60 (SD = 2.774), 8.89 (SD – 1.544), and 8.71 (SD = 1.827), respectively, compared to the averages for respondents who identified the incident as a rape; 9.13 (SD = 1.668), 2.69 (SD = 2.469), 9.38 (SD = 1.258), and 9.25 (1.183), respectively.

Table 34

Clear Non-Violation "Perpetrator Blameworthiness" Means Comparison

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?	
Variable	$\bar{X}$ *and SD*	No	Yes
Perpetrators' Desire for Intercourse	$\bar{X}$	9.61	9.13
	SD	0.847	1.668
Perpetrators Knew Victim	$\bar{X}$	2.60	2.69
	SD	2.774	2.469
Perpetrators' Control of Situation	$\bar{X}$	8.89	9.38
	SD	1.544	1.258
Perpetrators' Provocation of Situation	$\bar{X}$	8.71	9.25
	SD	1.827	1.183
Perpetrator Blameworthiness	$\bar{X}$	27.08	27.75
	SD	3.154	3.768

Note. Scores range from 0-10, except for "Perpetrator Blameworthiness" which ranges from 0-30.

Descriptive statistics IV 4 – Ambiguous non-violation of law. The average scores for the perpetrator blame factors were about the same as the average scores for Video 3. As demonstrated in Table 35, the scores ranged from 2.34 (SD = 2.614) for how well the perpetrators knew the victim, to 9.36 (SD = 1.678) for how much the perpetrators desired intercourse, with the other scores falling above 9.0. The overall average for "perpetrator blameworthiness" is high at 27.91(SD = 3.667), with a range of 10 – 30, and a mode of the highest score possible, 30.

Table 35

Ambiguous Non-Violation "Perpetrator Blameworthiness" Means

Variable	$\bar{X}$	*SD*	*Mode*	*Min.*	*Max.*
Perpetrators' Desire for Intercourse	9.36	1.678	10	0	10
Perpetrators Knew Victim	2.34	2.614	10	5	10
Perpetrators' Control of Situation	9.35	1.148	10	5	10
Perpetrators' Provocation of Situation	9.20	1.453	10	3	10
Perpetrator Blameworthiness	27.91	3.667	30	10	30

As demonstrated in Table 36, respondents who accurately identified the incident as a non-rape had average higher scores in terms of the perpetrators' desire for intercourse, 9.68 (SD = 0.723), and how well the perpetrators knew the victim, 2.39 (SD = 2.362), and lower average scores on the perpetrators' control of the situation, 9.29 (SD = 1.013), and how much the perpetrators provoked the situation, 8.93 (SD = 1.654), than respondents who inaccurately identified the incident as a rape; 9.19 (SD = 2.000), 2.31 (SD = 2.762), 9.38 (SD = 1.223), and 9.35 (SD = 1.327), respectively. In terms of the overall average scores of "perpetrator blameworthiness," respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape had a slight lower average score, 27.89 (SD = 2.299), than respondents who identified the incident as a rape, 27.92 (SD = 4.247).

Table 36

Ambiguous Non-Violation "Perpetrator Blameworthiness" Means Comparison

		Do you consider this incident to be rape?	
Variable	$\bar{X}$ *and SD*	No	Yes
Perpetrators' Desire for Intercourse	$\bar{X}$	9.68	9.19
	SD	0.723	2.000
Perpetrators Knew Victim	$\bar{X}$	2.39	2.31
	SD	2.362	2.762
Perpetrators' Control of Situation	$\bar{X}$	9.29	9.38
	SD	1.013	1.223
Perpetrators' Provocation Situation	$\bar{X}$	8.93	9.35
	SD	1.654	1.327
Perpetrator Blameworthiness	$\bar{X}$	27.89	27.92
	SD	2.299	4.247

Note. Scores range from 0-10, except for "Perpetrator Blameworthiness" which ranges from 0-30.

Factor analysis. Similar to above, a factor analysis was conducted to determine the extent to which the questions measuring the variable "perpetrator blameworthiness" were correlated. While there were originally five questions measuring this variable, the one pertaining to perpetrator responsibility was left off the survey, so it is not included in the analysis. Upon analyzing the four questions pertaining to "perpetrator blameworthiness," for each of the four independent variables, together, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure was 0.629, demonstrating moderate accuracy. The initial Eigenvalues demonstrated that five of the 16 components accounted for 69.593% of the total explained variance. While this in relation with the Scree Plot suggests that the components with an Eigenvalue over 1.00 should be retained, doing so would get rid of the questions pertaining to "perpetrator blameworthiness" for the second, third, and

fourth independent variables. Due to the presence of multiple factors, the varimax rotation utilizing the maximum likelihood estimation was examined. None of the factors had a value below 0.524. However, due to the low Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure, the fact that the overall Cronbach's Alpha was below 0.7 (0.637), and that the question pertaining to how well the perpetrators knew the victim had a weak correlation in all four independent variables, it was removed, and the analysis was conducted again.

In removing the question pertaining to how well the perpetrators knew the victim, and analyzing the questions pertaining to the perpetrators' level of control, the perpetrators' desire for sex, and the level of provocation the perpetrators had of the situation, only, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure increased to 0.694. The Eigenvalues demonstrated that three of the 12 components comprised 62.196% of the total variance but removing all but these three questions would prevent an analysis of the second, third, and fourth variable. With the Cronbach's Alpha increasing to above 0.7 (0.794), these questions were selected for the scale.

To create the "perpetrator blameworthiness" scale, a variable was created for each of the four independent variables, as was done for the "victim blameworthiness" scale. Creating a "perpetrator blameworthiness" scale for each independent variable, from the overall "perpetrator blameworthiness" scale, allowed for the questions pertaining to each specific video to be analyzed accordingly, without influence from the other independent variables.

Scale reliability. To examine the internal consistency of the "perpetrator blameworthiness" scale, the overall reliability was examined, as well as the reliability of each of the four scales pertaining specifically to each independent variable. The overall scale had a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.794, demonstrating a high internal consistency. The Cronbach's Alpha for "perpetrator blameworthiness" for "clear violation of law" is 0.849, 0.445 for "perpetrator

blameworthiness" for "ambiguous violation of law," 0.593 for "perpetrator blameworthiness" for "clear non-violation of law," and 0.803 for "perpetrator blameworthiness" for "ambiguous non-violation of law." Therefore, the overall scale, and the scales for "clear violation of law," and "ambiguous non-violation of law" are considered to be highly reliable, with the scales for "ambiguous violation of law," and "clear non-violation of law," having moderately reliable scales.

Bivariate Statistics

This section provides paired sample *t*-tests for the scaled variables of "victim blameworthiness," and "perpetrator blameworthiness," to determine if there is a significant difference between them for each of the four simulations. Due to the dependent variable being categorical, *t*-tests and *chi-squared* analyses are provided, where appropriate, to demonstrate any significant differences between the variables for each of the simulations.

Paired Sample *t*-Tests

Since the variables "victim blameworthiness" and "perpetrator blameworthiness" had differing values throughout each simulation, it is important to determine if there is a significant difference between them as the content of the simulation changes. "Victim blameworthiness" for each of the four videos were paired together and compared, as with "perpetrator blameworthiness." There are six pairs for "victim blameworthiness" and "perpetrator blameworthiness:" 1) Clear Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Violation of Law Video; 2) Clear Violation of Law Video – Clear Non-Violation of Law Video; 3) Clear Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Non-Violation of Law Video; 4) Ambiguous Violation of Law Video – Clear Non-Violation of Law Video; 5) Ambiguous Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Non-

Violation of Law Video; and 6) Clear Non-Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Non-Violation of Law Video.

As demonstrated in Table 37, there is a significant difference between all paired videos, except for Pair 1 (Clear Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Violation of Law Video), which has an insignificant difference between the videos. The *t*-test value for Pair 1 is $t_{(80)} = -1.382$ ($p = 0.171$), $t_{(79)} = -12.999$ ($p = 0.000$) for Pair 2, $t_{(79)} = -4.737$ ($p = 0.000$) for Pair 3, $t_{(79)} = -14.924$ ($p = 0.000$) for Pair 4, $t_{(79)} = -5.526$ ($p = 0.000$) for Pair 5, and $t_{(78)} = 10.441$ ($p = 0.000$) for Pair 6. This means that for the groups that are significantly different from one another, the "victim blameworthiness" values are significantly different between the groups, As the content of the video's changes, the difference between the values "victim blameworthiness" have significantly changed. This is true for all paired groups except for Pair 1 (Clear Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Violation of Law Video). There is no significant difference between the values of "victim blameworthiness" between these two videos.

Table 37

"Victim Blameworthiness" Paired Samples Test

Pair	*t-test*	*p-value*
Pair 1: Clear Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Violation of Law Video	-1.382	0.171
Pair 2: Clear Violation of Law Video – Clear Non-Violation of Law Video	-12.999	0.000
Pair 3: Clear Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Non-Violation of Law Video	-4.737	0.000
Pair 4: Ambiguous Violation of Law Video – Clear Non-Violation of Law Video	-14.924	0.000
Pair 5: Ambiguous Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Non-Violation of Law Video	-5.526	0.000
Pair 6: Clear Non-Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Non-Violation of Law Video	10.441	0.000

As demonstrated in Table 38, only Pair 1 (Clear Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Violation of Law Video) and Pair 2 (Clear Violation of Law Video – Clear Non-Violation of Law Video), have significant differences between the videos, while the other four pairs do not. Pair 1 has a *t*-test value of $t_{(80)} = 2.758$ ($p = 0.007$), $t_{(79)} = 3.359$ ($p = 0.001$) for Pair 2, $t_{(79)} = 1.233$ ($p = 0.221$) for Pair 3, $t_{(79)} = 0.521$ ($p = 0.604$) for pair 4, $t_{(79)} = -1.063$ ($p = 0.291$) for Pair 5, and $t_{(78)} = -1.452$ ($p = 0.151$) for Pair 6. This means that for the groups that are significantly different from one another, the "perpetrator blameworthiness" values are significantly different between the groups. As the content of the video's changes, the difference between the values of the variables have significantly changed. This is only true for Pair 1 (Clear Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Violation of Law Video), and Pair 2 (Clear Violation of Law Video – Clear

Non-Violation of Law Video). There is no significant difference between the values of "perpetrator blameworthiness" for the other four pairs of videos.

Table 38

"Perpetrator Blameworthiness" Paired Samples Test

Pair	*t-test*	*p-value*
Pair 1: Clear Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Violation of Law Video	2.758	0.007
Pair 2: Clear Violation of Law Video – Clear Non-Violation of Law Video	3.359	0.001
Pair 3: Clear Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Non-Violation of Law Video	1.233	0.221
Pair 4: Ambiguous Violation of Law Video – Clear Non-Violation of Law Video	0.521	0.604
Pair 5: Ambiguous Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Non-Violation of Law Video	-1.063	0.291
Pair 6: Clear Non-Violation of Law Video – Ambiguous Non-Violation of Law Video	-1.452	0.151

Video #1 – Clear Violation of Law

In using *t*-tests to determine if "victim blameworthiness" and "perpetrator blameworthiness" played a significant role in respondents' identification of the incident, it was found that there was no significant difference in "rape identification", in terms of these two variables. The *t*-test value for "victim blameworthiness" is $t_{(79)} = 1.043$ ($p = 0.300$), and $t_{(79)} = -0.333$ ($p = 0.800$) for "perpetrator blameworthiness." As demonstrated in Table 39, none of the conditional results variables or the control variables had a significant correlation with the dependent variable "rape identification." This means that there was no statistically significant difference between respondents who identifying the incident as a rape, and respondents who.

Table 39

Clear Violation Bivariate Statistics

Item	*t-test*	X^2	*p-value*
Force Identification		0.346	0.556
Threat Identification		0.623	0.430
Victim Conscious Identification		0.443	0.506
Drug/Alcohol Impairment		0.623	0.430
Victim Blameworthiness	1.043		0.300
Perpetrator Blameworthiness	-0.333		0.800
Gender		0.837	0.360
Race		0.250	0.617
Major		0.567	0.451
Athlete		0.281	0.596
Greek Life Member		0.337	0.562
Knowledge IUP Policy		7.689	0.021
Six O'clock Series		0.804	0.370
Haven Project		1.118	0.290
Take Back the Night		2.104	0.147
Green Light Campaign		0.219	0.640
Rainn Day		0.661	0.416
Turn the Red Zone Green		0.107	0.744
Bystander Step Up Training		0.398	0.528
Sexual Assault Awareness Month		0.593	0.441

identified the video as a non-rape, for the conditional results variables, the covariates, and the control variables

Video #2 – Ambiguous Violation of Law

The *t*-test value for "victim blameworthiness" is $t_{(79)} = 2.865$ ($p = 0.005$), while $t_{(79)} = -4.287$ ($p = 0.000$) is the value for "perpetrator blameworthiness," as demonstrated in Table 40. Due to having significant *p*-values, there is a significant difference in "victim blameworthiness" and "perpetrator blameworthiness" in relation to "rape identification." "Victim conscious identification" was the only conditional results variable that had a significant relationship with the dependent variable "ambiguous violation of law," with a *chi-squared* value of 11.288 ($p = 0.001$). In relation to the control variables, "knowledge IUP policy" was the only control variable with a significant relationship with "rape identification," with a *chi-squared* value of 4.846 ($p = 0.089$). This means that there was a statistically significant difference between respondents who identified this video as a rape and respondents who identified this video as a non-rape, in terms of the level of blame placed on the victim, the level of blame placed on the perpetrator, whether or not the victim was identified as being conscious or unconscious, and whether respondents reported having knowledge of the IUP sexual assault policy.

Table 40

Ambiguous Violation Bivariate Statistics

Item	*t-test*	X^2	*p-value*
Force Identification		2.564	0.109
Threat Identification		0.614	0.433
Victim Conscious Identification		11.288	0.001
Drug/Alcohol Impairment		0.614	0.433
Victim Blameworthiness	2.865		0.005
Perpetrator Blameworthiness	-4.287		0.000
Gender		1.767	0.184
Race		0.083	0.773
Major		1.398	0.237
Athlete		0.593	0.441
Greek Life Member		0.710	0.399
Knowledge IUP Policy		4.846	0.089
Six O'clock Series		0.083	0.773
Haven Project		0.386	0.535
Take Back the Night		0.277	0.598
Green Light Campaign		0.461	0.497
Rainn Day		1.395	0.238
Turn the Red Zone Green		0.225	0.635
Bystander Step Up Training		0.167	0.682
Sexual Assault Awareness Month		0.000	0.989

Video #3 – Clear Non-Violation of Law

"Victim blameworthiness," with a *t*-test value of $t_{(78)} = 7.301$ ($p = 0.000$), has a statistically significant difference for "rape identification," as demonstrated in Table 41, while "perpetrator blameworthiness," with a *t*-test value of $t_{(78)} = -0.733$ ($p = 0.466$), does not statistically differ between the groups. All four of the conditional results variables and two of the control variables have a statistically significant relationship with the dependent variable "rape identification." The *chi-squared* values are 35.000 ($p = 0.000$) for "force identification," 8.205 ($p = 0.004$) for "threat identification," 12.454 ($p = 0.000$) for "victim conscious identification," 3.750 ($p = 0.053$) for "drug/alcohol impairment," 2.917 ($p = 0.088$) for "gender," and 7.961 ($p = 0.005$) for the "sexual assault awareness event" Green Light Campaign. This means there were statistically significant differences between respondents who identifying this video as a rape and respondents who identified this video as a non-rape, based on the level of blame placed on the victim, whether force was used against the victim, whether the perpetrators threatened the victim, whether the victim was identified as conscious or unconscious, whether the victim's actions were impacted by drugs or alcohol, the gender of the respondent, and if the respondent had participated in the Green Light Campaign or not.

Table 41

Clear Non-Violation Bivariate Statistics

Item	*t-test*	X^2	*p-value*
Force Identification		35.000	0.000
Threat Identification		8.205	0.004
Victim Conscious Identification		12.454	0.000
Drug/Alcohol Impairment		3.750	0.053
Victim Blameworthiness	7.301		0.000
Perpetrator Blameworthiness	-0.733		0.466
Gender		2.917	0.088
Race		1.470	0.225
Major		1.338	0.247
Athlete		0.000	0.988
Greek Life Member		0.721	0.396
Knowledge IUP Policy		1.641	0.440
Six O'clock Series		1.569	0.210
Haven Project		0.168	0.682
Take Back the Night		1.154	0.283
Green Light Campaign		7.961	0.005
Rainn Day		2.134	0.144
Turn the Red Zone Green		1.154	0.283
Bystander Step Up Training		0.352	0.553
Sexual Assault Awareness Month		1.127	0.288

Video #4 – Ambiguous Non-Violation of Law

As demonstrated in Table 42, "victim blameworthiness" was found to be statistically different for "rape identification," with a *t*-test value of $t_{(78)} = 4.316$ ($p = 0.000$), while "perpetrator blameworthiness" was not found to be statistically significant between the groups with a *t*-test value of $t_{(78)} = -0.035$ ($p = 0.972$). All found of the conditional results variables and one of the control variables have a statistically significant relationship with the dependent variable "rape identification." The *chi-squared* values are 6.648 ($p = 0.010$) for "force identification," 3.239 ($p = 0.072$) for "threat identification," 15.793 ($p = 0.000$) for "victim conscious identification," 4.475 ($p = 0.034$) for "drug/alcohol impairment," and 11.397 ($p = 0.001$) for "gender." This means there is a statistically significant difference between respondents who identified this incident as a rape and respondents who identified this incident as a non-rape based on the level of blame placed on the victim, whether the perpetrators used force on or threatened the victim, whether the victim was identified as conscious or unconscious, or was under the influence of drugs or alcohol, and the gender of the respondent.

Table 42

Ambiguous Non-Violation Bivariate Statistics

Item	*t-test*	X^2	*p-value*
Force Identification		6.648	0.010
Threat Identification		3.239	0.072
Victim Conscious Identification		15.793	0.000
Drug/Alcohol Impairment		4.475	0.034
Victim Blameworthiness	4.316		0.000
Perpetrator Blameworthiness	-0.035		0.972
Gender		11.397	0.001
Race		0.017	0.896
Major		0.632	0.426
Athlete		0.477	0.490
Greek Life Member		0.642	0.423
Knowledge IUP Policy		0.377	0.828
Six O'clock Series		0.122	0.727
Haven Project		1.248	0.264
Take Back the Night		0.517	0.472
Green Light Campaign		0.416	0.519
Rainn Day		1.586	0.208
Turn the Red Zone Green		1.105	0.293
Bystander Step Up Training		0.139	0.709
Sexual Assault Awareness Month		1.130	0.288

Binary Logistic Regression

This section analyzes the logistic regression statistics of the independent variable "ambiguous non-violation of law" and dependent variable "rape identification." While the regression models for "clear violation of law," "ambiguous violation of law," and "clear non-violation of law" were significant, none of the variables within the models were significant, even at $p < 0.1$. This is due to the power of the sample, as discussed above. While the power is over 80%, it is barely over. This perhaps results in the limited effect size between respondents who classified the three simulations as rape and those who classified the simulations as a non-rape. Due to the limited effect size between the groups, as a result of the power of the sample, regression analyses could not be conducted for these three independent variables.

Video #4 – Ambiguous Non-Violation of Law

A binary logistic regression analysis was run on the independent variable "ambiguous non-violation of law" to determine the effect the conditional results variables ("force identification," "threat identification," "victim conscious identification," and "drug/alcohol impairment") and the covariate variables ("victim blameworthiness" and "perpetrator blameworthiness"), had on the dependent variable "rape identification." The binary logistic regression analysis resulted in a *chi-squared* value of 29.647 ($p = 0.000$). The Cox and Snell R Squared and Nagelkerke R Squared, which measure the model strength, are 0.313 and 0.430, respectively. This demonstrates that the model strength is moderate.

All of the VIF values are less than 1.264, which suggests that multicollinearity is not an issue for this model. The Durbin Watson statistic (2.326), which indicates a slightly negative autocorrelation due to being greater than 2.0, falls within the range of 1.5 – 2.5, demonstrating there are no autocorrelation concerns with this equation (Berry, 1993; Lewis-Beck, 1980;

Menard[1], 2002). The overall model was found to be statistically significant with a Wald statistic of 6.499 (p = 0.011), demonstrating a statistically significant relationship between the independent variable "ambiguous non-violation of law," and the dependent variable "rape identification."

Of the variables placed into the equation, only "victim conscious identification" and "victim blameworthiness" were found to have a significant impact on the regression model. As demonstrated in Table 43, "victim conscious identification" has a slope (b) value of 2.201. This means that moving from respondents who perceived the victim as unconscious to respondents who perceived the victim as conscious, there is a 2.201 decrease in the log-odds of perceiving the incident as a rape, holding all other independent variables constant. The Exp (B) value is 0.111. This means there is an 88.9% decrease in the odds of perceiving the simulation as a rape if the victim is perceived as being unconscious, holding all other independent variables constant. It is important to measure the Wald statistic because the closer the value is to zero, the less the likelihood is of the variable and the dependent variable having a statistically significant relationship (Arthurs, 2018). The Wald statistic of "victim conscious identification" is 7.245 (p = 0.007), therefore, the Wald test null hypothesis that the coefficient equals 0, is rejected. This means "victim conscious identification" has a statistically significant influence on "rape identification."

"Victim blameworthiness" has a slope (b) value of -0.085. This means that for every one-unit increase in "victim blameworthiness," there is a 0.085 decrease in the log-odds of perceiving the incident as a rape, holding all other independent variables constant. The Exp (B) value is 0.919, which means that for every one-unit value increase in "victim blameworthiness," there is an 8.1% decrease in the odds of perceiving the simulation as a rape, holding all other

independent variables constant. The Wald statistic for "victim blameworthiness" is 4.661 (p = 0.031); therefore, the null hypothesis associated with the Wald test, stating the coefficient equals 0, is rejected. This means "victim blameworthiness" has a statistically significant influence on "rape identification."

Table 43

Logistic Regression Model 1

Variable	*B*	*SE*	*Wald*	*Exp(B)*
Constant	4.367	2.992	2.131	78.808
Force Identification	0.589	0.767	0.589	1.802
Threat Identification	1.058	1.184	0.798	2.880
Victim Conscious Identification	-2.201	0.818	7.245*	0.111
Drug/Alcohol Impairment	0.674	1.264	0.284	1.962
Victim Blameworthiness	-0.085	0.039	4.661*	0.919
Perpetrator Blameworthiness	-0.079	0.082	0.926	0.924

Note. *p < 0.05, Cox and Snell R squared = 0.313, Nagelkerke R squared = 0.430

Due to "gender" having a statistically significant impact on "rape identification" for the "ambiguous non-violation of law" video, a second regression analysis was run, incorporating this variable. This model has a *chi-squared* value of 35.359 (p = 0.000) and was still found to be statistically significant with a Wald statistic of 6.499 (p = 0.011). The Cox and Snell R squared value is 0.361, and the Nagelkerke R squared value is 0.496. This demonstrates a moderately strong model. When "gender" is added to the model, strength of the model slightly increases. All of the VIF values are less than 1.202, which suggests that multicollinearity is not an issue for this model. The Durbin Watson statistic (2.298), which indicates a slightly negative autocorrelation due to being greater than 2.0, falls within the range of 1.5 – 2.5, demonstrating there are no

autocorrelation concerns with this equation (Berry, 1993; Lewis-Beck, 1980; Menard[1], 2002). The overall model was found to be statistically significant with a Wald statistic of 6.499 (p = 0.011), demonstrating a statistically significant relationship between the independent variable "ambiguous non-violation of law," and the dependent variable "rape identification."

As demonstrated in Table 44, "victim conscious identification" has a slope (b) value of -2.354. This means that moving from respondents who perceived the victim as unconscious to respondents who perceived the victim as conscious, there is a 2.354 decrease in the log-odds of perceiving the incident as a rape, holding all other independent variables constant. The Exp (B) value is 0.095, which means there is a 90.5% decrease in the odds of perceiving the simulation as a rape if the victim is perceived as being unconscious, holding all other independent variables constant. "Victim conscious identification" has a Wald statistic of 7.265 (p = 0.007), thus, the Wald test null hypothesis that the coefficient equals 0, is rejected. This means "victim conscious identification" has a statistically significant influence on "rape identification."

"Victim blameworthiness" has a slope (b) value of -0.082. This means that for every one-unit increase in "victim blameworthiness," there is a 0.082 decrease in the log-odds of perceiving the incident as a rape, holding all other independent variables constant. The Exp (B) value is 0.921, which means that for every one-unit value increase in "victim blameworthiness," there is a 7.9% decrease in the odds of perceiving the simulation as a rape, holding all other independent variables constant. The Wald statistic for "victim blameworthiness" is 4.231 (p = 0.040). This means the null hypothesis associated with the Wald test that the coefficient equals 0, is rejected. Thus, "victim blameworthiness" has a statistically significant influence on "rape identification."

The slope (b) value for "gender" is 1.548. This means that moving from male respondents to female respondents, there is a 1.548 log-odds of perceiving the incident as a rape, holding all

other independent variables constant. “Gender” has an Exp (B) value of 4.703, which means that females have a 370.3% increase in the odds of perceiving the simulation as a rape, than males. The Wald statistic is 5.292 ($p = 0.021$), thus, the Wald test null hypothesis that the coefficient equals 0, is rejected. This means that gender has a statistically significant influence on “rape identification.”

Table 44

Logistic Regression Model 2

Variable	*B*	*SE*	*Wald*	*Exp(B)*
Constant	3.824	2.940	1.691	45.809
Force Identification	0.328	0.780	0.177	1.388
Threat Identification	0.575	1.213	0.224	1.776
Victim Conscious Identification	-2.354	0.874	7.265*	0.095
Drug/Alcohol Impairment	0.869	1.322	0.432	2.385
Victim Blameworthiness	-0.082	0.040	4.231*	0.921
Perpetrator Blameworthiness	-0.090	0.078	1.331	0.914
Gender	1.548	0.673	5.292*	4.703

Note. *$p < 0.05$, Cox and Snell R squared = 0.361, Nagelkerke R squared = 0.496

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This chapter provides a discussion of the results as they pertain to each of the independent variables and each of the hypotheses. Policy implications pertaining to the research are provided, along with a discussion of future research ideas. A discussion of the limitations of this study, including historical events which could have potentially altered the data are examined as well.

Can College Students Accurately Identify Rape?

The goal of the study was to identify if college students could accurately identify rape, based off visual simulations. This section discusses the accuracy of respondents' identifications for each of the four independent variables.

Video #1 – Clear Violation of Law

This video depicted a clear violation of law, meaning it demonstrated that a rape was clearly going to occur. In relation to the respondents who accurately identified this incident as a rape, 66 believed the offenders used force against the victim, while 11 did not, 9 believed the offenders threatened the victim; 68 did not, 51 believed the victim was conscious; 26 did not, and 68 believed the victim's actions were influenced by drugs or alcohol, while nine did not. Of the four respondents who did not identify this incident as a rape, one did not believe the offenders used force against the victim, three did not believe the offenders threatened the victim, two did not believe the victim was conscious, and one did not believe the victim's actions were influenced by drugs or alcohol.

Respondents stating this incident was not a rape yet responded 'no' to the victim being conscious or 'yes' to any of the other three conditional results variables, demonstrate a problem.

The conditional results variables represent the four elements of the legal definition of rape, as discussed previously. If one of the elements is present, a rape has occurred. Thus, if a respondent believed that force or threat was used against the victim, that the victim was under the influence of drugs or alcohol, or that the victim was unconscious, they should have identified the incident as a rape. Failing to do so demonstrates a disconnect between a respondent's knowledge and the legal elements of a rape. However, only four of the individuals demonstrated this lack of a connection, with majority of the respondents identifying the incident as a rape if they believed the victim was unconscious or if any of the other three conditional results variables were present.

Another potential problem is respondents who identified the incident as a rape, but did not identify the victim as being unconscious, the presence of force, threat, or victim impairment due to the use of drugs or alcohol. Of the 77 individuals who identified this incident as a rape, only one failed to identify any of the four conditional results variables. This means that this one respondent identified a rape occurred but did not identify any elements that constitute a rape. This demonstrates the problem of lacking the identification of the elements of a rape that are present within this video.

Video #2 – Ambiguous Violation of Law

This video depicted an ambiguous violation of law, meaning it demonstrated that a rape was going to occur, but it was not a clear-cut violation. Of the 81 respondents, all but eight (9.9%) accurately identified this incident as a rape; 73 respondents (90.1%) accurately identified this incident as a rape. Compared to the clear violation of law, four less individual were able to accurately identify the incident. This suggests that when the incident is less clear, students may be less likely to accurately identify what occurs. In relation to the respondents who accurately identified this incident as a rape, 40 believed the offenders used force against the victim, while

33 did not, only four believed the offenders threated the victim, only one believed the victim was conscious, and all but four believed the victim's actions were influenced by drugs or alcohol. Of the eight respondents who did not identify this incident as a rape, six did not believe force was used against the victim, seven did not believe the victim was threatened by the offenders, six did not believe the victim was conscious, and all but one believed the victim's actions were influenced by drugs or alcohol.

As stated above, respondents who identified this incident as not a rape, yet believed the offenders used force or threated the victim, believed the victim was unconscious or under the influence of drugs or alcohol, yet still identified this incident as a non-rape, demonstrates a disconnect between the respondent's knowledge and the legal elements of a rape. For this video however, none of the 73 respondents who identified this incident as a rape failed to identify any of the conditional results variables. This means that these respondents identified at least one of the conditional results variables.

Video #3 – Clear Non-Violation of Law

This video depicted a clear non-violation of law, meaning it portrayed an incident in which a rape was clearly not going to occur. Of the 80 respondents, 64 (79.0%) accurately identified this incident as a non-rape, with 16 (19.8%) inaccurately identifying this incident as a rape. In relation to the group of respondents who accurately identified this incident as a non-rape, one believed the offenders used force against the victim, none believed the offenders threatened the victim, all but two believed the victim was conscious, and 45 believed the victim was under the influence of drugs or alcohol. Of the respondents who inaccurately identified this incident as a rape, ten believed the offenders used force against the victim, two believed the offenders threated the victim, seven believed the victim was unconscious, and all but one believed the

victim was under the influence of drugs or alcohol. Of the respondents who inaccurately identified this incident as a rape, none of them identified any conditional results variables.

With respondents who accurately identified the incident as a non-rape, believing the offenders used force or threated the victim, that the victim was unconscious, or under the influence of drugs or alcohol, demonstrates an issue. Of the respondents who identified this incident as a non-rape, 21 identified one conditional results variable, 41 identified two of the variables, and one identified three of the variables. Due to identifying at least one of the conditional results variables, these respondents have identified the incident as a rape, since these elements make up the legal definition of rape. Another issue is that the conditional results variables were not present in this simulation, but respondents, both those who did and did not accurately identify the incident, found at least one of the elements present. This demonstrates that either respondents are perceiving the situation inaccurately, or they are erring on the side of caution, especially with the societal climate surrounding sexual assault at this current time.

Video #4 – Ambiguous Non-Violation of Law

This video depicted an ambiguous non-violation of law, meaning it portrayed an incident in which a rape did not occur, but it was not clear-cut. Of the 80 respondents, roughly one-third accurately identified the incident as a non-rape. Twenty-eight of the respondents (34.6%) accurately identified the incident as a non-rape, while 52 respondents (64.2%) inaccurately identified the incident as a rape. Of the group of respondents who accurately identified the incident as a non-rape, 18 believed the offenders used force against the victim, one believed the offenders threatened the victim, two did not believe the victim was conscious, and all but five believed the victim was under the influence of drugs or alcohol. In relation to the group of respondents who inaccurately identified the incident as a rape, all but six believed the offenders

used force against the victim, nine believed the offenders threatened to harm the victim, 27 believed the victim was unconscious, and all but two believed the victim was under the influence of drugs or alcohol. Of the respondents who inaccurately identified this incident as a rape, none of them identified any conditional results variables.

As with the videos depicting violations of law, when the incident went from a clear non-violation to an ambiguous non-violation, less individuals were able to accurately identify the incident. As with the clear non-violation of law video, respondents who accurately identified the incident as a non-rape, yet believed that force or threat was used, that the victim was unconscious, or under the influence of drugs or alcohol, demonstrates an issue. One the respondents who identified this incident as a non-rape, six identified one conditional results variable, 16 identified two, and two identified three. Due to identifying at least one of the conditional results variables, these respondents should have identified the incident as a rape. Not doing so demonstrates a difference between knowledge and the legal definition of the law. Another issues, as with the clear non-violation video, is that the conditional results variables were not present in this simulation. Even with these variables not being present, several respondents, both of who did and did not accurately identify the incident, still found at least one of these variables present.

Male Victims Versus Female Victims

Previous literature has demonstrated that college students are less likely to depict an incident as rape when the victim is a male (Burgess, 1980; Ford, Liwag-McLamb, & Foley, 1998; Schneider, Ee, & Aronson, 1994; Vandiver & Dupalo, 2013; White & Kurpius, 2002). While such research is limited, this study examined this relationship by having a male as the victim in all four of the scenarios. The fact that respondents identified incidents as rape, whether

they were correct in their identifications or not, refutes previous research on this topic. While a relationship between rape identification between male and female victims was not examined in this study, the fact that respondents still identified the incidents as rape, even with the victim being a male, suggests that students are likely to identify an incident as a rape even if the victim is male. In fact, for the "clear violation" (77 vs. 4), "ambiguous violation" (73 vs. 8), and "ambiguous non-violation" (52 vs. 28). simulations, a significant number of respondents identified the incidents as rape compared to those that identified the incidents as non-rape, respectively. If students were unlikely to identify an incident as rape due to the victim being male, it could be suggested that these numbers would be significantly reduced. Therefore, this study does not support the previous research.

Hypotheses

This section examines each of the study's hypotheses, separately to determine if the hypotheses accepted or rejected. As a reminder, the following hypotheses were examined:

H_1: Females are more likely to identify the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation and the ambiguous violation of law simulation as depicting rape than males.

H_2: White students are less likely to identify the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation and the ambiguous violation of law simulation as depicting rape than students of other races.

H_3: Students who participated in an event promoting sexual assault awareness are more likely to correctly identify simulations as to whether they depict rape or not than students who have not participated in a sexual assault event.

H_4: Students who know of or have read Indiana University of Pennsylvania's sexual assault policy are more likely to correctly identify simulations as to whether they depict

rape or not than students who do not know of Indiana University of Pennsylvania's sexual assault policy.

H_5: Students are less likely to depict a rape occurred the more they place blameworthiness of the act within the simulation on the victim.

H_6: Students are more likely to depict a rape occurred the less they place blameworthiness of the act within the simulation on the offender.

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one states that females are more likely to identify the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation as a rape, and the ambiguous violation of law simulation as a rape, compared to males. This means that it was hypothesized that females are more likely to identify rape in ambiguous situations then males. The sample consists of 24 males and 57 females. Of the 24 males, 20 identified the ambiguous violation of law as a rape, while four did not, with 53 of the females identifying the incident as a rape, and four not. Due to 16.6% of males and 7.0% females identifying this incident as a non-rape, which demonstrates equal numbers, it cannot be stated if females are more likely to identify the ambiguous violation of law as a rape, compared to males.

In relation to the ambiguous non-violation of the law, nine of the 24 males identified the incident as a rape, and 43 of the 52 females[59] identified the incident as a rape. This means that 37.5% of the males identified this incident as rape, while 82.7% of females identified this incident as rape. Overall, females were more likely to identify the ambiguous non-violation of law as a rape than males.

[59] One respondent did not answer questions on this simulation, making the sample size 80 instead of 81.

Although the response rate for the ambiguous violation of law demonstrates that females were more likely to identify the incident as a rape than males, gender was not found to be significantly correlated with "rape identification." However, gender was found to be significantly correlated with "rape identification" for the ambiguous non-violation of law. This supports the hypothesis that females are more likely to identify the ambiguous non-violation as rape than males. In regard to previous research, although such research has not examined whether college students can accurately identify rape, as stated above, previous research has examined the level of blame placed on the victim, with females placing less blame on the victim (Bell, Kuriloff, & Lottes, 1994; Brekke & Borgida, 1988; Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001; Deitz, Litman, & Bentley, 1984; Edmonts & Cahoon, 1986; Gerdes, Dammann, & Heilig, 1988; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Johnson & Jackson, 1988; Johnson, Jackson, & Smith, 1989; Kanekar & Nazareth, 1988; Kleinke & Meyer, 1990; Schneider et al., 2009; Sheldon-Keller et al., 1994). As previously discussed, based on the blame-perception assumption that students are less likely to perceive an incident as rape the more they place blame on the victim, it can be assumed that since females place less blame on victims, they are more likely to believe a rape has occurred. Based on this assumption, it is assumed that females are more likely to believe a rape has occurred than males. This assumption is supported by this study.

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two states that White students are less likely to identify the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation as a rape, and the ambiguous violation of law simulation as a rape, compared to students of other races. This means that it was hypothesized that White students are less likely to identify rape in ambiguous situations then students of other races. The sample consists of 68 White respondents and 13 non-White respondents. Of the 68 White respondents,

61 identified the ambiguous violation of law as a rape, while seven did not, with 12 of the non-White students identifying the incident as a rape, and one not. This means that 89.7% of the White respondents identified the ambiguous violation as a rape, while 92.3% of the non-White students identified the ambiguous violation as a rape. Due to the difference between the groups being less than three percentage points, and lacking statistical significance, it cannot be stated that White students were less likely to identify this incident as a rape than students of other races.

In relation to the ambiguous non-violation of the law, 44 of the White students identified this incident as a rape, and eight of the non-White students identified this incident as a rape. This means that 64.7% of the White students identified the incident as a rape, while 66.7% of the students of other races identified the incident as a rape. As with the ambiguous violation of the law simulation, there is minimal difference between White students and non-White students for the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation, with the differences lacking statistical significance and only constituting two percentage points.

With the response rate for the ambiguous violation of law and the ambiguous non-violation of law lacking variance and statistical significance between Whites and non-Whites, and race lacking a significant correlation with "rape identification" for either of the simulations, this hypothesis cannot be supported. Due to this, the assumption that White students are less likely to identify an incident as rape than students of other races, as based on previous literature (Lee et al., 2005; Romero-Sanchez, Megías, & Krahé, 2012; Yamawaki & Tschanz, 2005), cannot be supported. The reasoning behind the lack of support for previous research is that previous research focused solely on the Japanese and American college students (Lee et al., 2005; Yamawaki & Tschanz, 2005) and Spanish and Ameican college students (Romero-Sanchez, Megías, & Krahé, 2012). The racial composition of this current study consisted of

White (69), Black (4), Asian (3), Hispanic (2), and Other (3). Therefore, the representation of Hispanic respondents is not large enough to compare to previous research, which it is unknown what the specific decent of the Asian respondents are. Furthermore, for the purposes of this study, respondents were grouped into two racial categories: Whites and non-Whites, thereby grouping individuals who identified as non-White into one category for analysis.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three states that students who participated in an event promoting sexual assault awareness are more likely to correctly identify the simulations that students who have not participated in a sexual assault event. To examine this hypothesis, attendance of each of the events provided must be examined. In relation to the "clear violation of law" simulation, none of the respondents who inaccurately identified the incident as a non-rape participated in an event of any kind. This means that none of the students who attended any of the events promoting sexual assault awareness, incorrectly identified the simulation; 100.0% of the respondents who attended any of the events accurately identified the simulation. Of the 77 respondents who correctly identified this simulation as a rape, a total of 13 attended the Six O'clock Series, 17 attended the Haven Project, 27 attended Take Back the Night, four attended the Green Light Campaign, 11 attended Rainn Day, two attended Turn the Red Zone Green, seven attended a Bystander Step Up Training, and 10 participated in Sexual Assault Awareness Month. Of the four respondents who inaccurately identified this simulation as a non-rape, none attended any of the events promoting sexual assault awareness. Therefore, respondents who attended an event promoting sexual assault awareness, correctly identified the simulation.

Although 100% of the respondents who attended an event promoting sexual assault awareness accurately identified the simulation as a rape, and varying percentages of respondents

who did not attend an event inaccurately identifying the rape, it cannot be stated that respondents who attended an event promoting sexual assault awareness were more likely to accurately identify the "clear violation of law" simulation as a rape than respondents who did not attend such an event. Such a conclusion cannot be made because the number of individuals who reported attending any events was low, and individuals who reported not attending such events were still able to accurately identify this simulation as a rape.

In relation to the "ambiguous violation of law" simulation, not all the respondents who attended an event accurately identified the simulation as a rape. The percentages who accurately identified the rape varies based on the type of event they attended. Of the 73 respondents who correctly identified the simulation as a rape, 12 attended the Six O'clock Series, 16 attended the Haven Project, 25 attended Take Back the Night, four attended the Green Light Campaign, 11 attended Rainn Day, two attended Turn the Red Zone Green, six attended a Bystander Step Up Training, and nine participated in Sexual Assault Awareness Month. Of the eight individuals who inaccurately identified this incident as a non-rape, one attended the Six O'clock Series, one attended the Haven Project, two attended Take Back the Night, none attended the Green Light Campaign, Rainn Day, or Turn the Red Zone Green, one attended a Bystander Step Up Training, and one participated in Sexual Assault Awareness Month. For this simulation, not all respondents who attended an event promoting sexual assault awareness accurately identified the "ambiguous violation of law" simulation as a rape.

For the "clear non-violation of law" simulation, not all the respondents who attended an event accurately identified the simulation as non-rape. The percentages who accurately identified the non-rape varies based on the type of event they attended. Respondents who attended an event were less likely to accurately identify the simulation than respondents who did not attend an

event. Of the 64 respondents who accurately identified this simulation as a non-rape, eight attended the Six O'clock Series, 13 attended the Haven Project, 19 attended Take Back the Night, one attended the Green Light Campaign, seven attended Rainn Day, one attended Turn the Red Zone Green, five attended a Bystander Step Up Training, and six participated in Sexual Assault Awareness Month. In relation to the 16 respondents who inaccurately identified this simulation as a rape, four attended the Six O'clock Series, four attended the Haven Project, seven attended Take Back the Night, three attended the Green Light Campaign, four attended Rainn Day, one attended Turn the Red Zone Green, two attended a Bystander Step Up Training, and three participated in Sexual Assault Awareness Month. This suggests that respondents who attended an event promoting sexual assault awareness were slightly more likely to accurately identify the "clear non-violation of law" simulation. However, the percentage of respondents who attended an event promoting sexual assault awareness and inaccurately identified the simulation as a rape (62.5%) is higher than the percentage of respondents who attended an event promoting sexual assault awareness and accurately identified the simulation as a non-rape (40.6%). This suggests that respondents who attended the events were less likely to accurately identify the "clear non-violation of law" simulation as a non-rape. This could be attributed to the knowledge acquired while attending the events, resulting in these individuals to be more liberal in their identification of rape, thereby classifying the simulation as rape instead of non-rape to err on the side of caution.

Lastly, for the "ambiguous non-violation of law simulation," very few respondents who attended an event accurately identified the incident as a non-rape. As a result, individuals who did not attend an event were more likely to accurately identify the simulation as a non-rape than respondents who attended an event, for all events except for the Green Light Campaign and the

Bystander Step Up Training. Of the 28 respondents who accurately identified this simulation as a non-rape, four attended the Six O'clock Series, four attended the Haven Project, eight attended Take Back the Night, two attended the Green Light Campaign, two attended Rainn Day, none attended Turn the Red Zone Green, two attended a Bystander Step Up Training, and two participated in Sexual Assault Awareness Month. Of the 52 respondents who inaccurately identified this simulation as a rape, nine attended the Six O'clock Series, 13 attended the Haven Project, 19 attended Take Back the Night, two attended the Green Light Campaign, nine attended Rainn Day, two attended Turn the Red Zone Green, five attended a Bystander Step Up Training, and eight participated in Sexual Assault Awareness Month. It is likely that individuals who participated in these events compared to the other events were more likely to accurately identify the simulation because of the amount of training that goes into such participation; these events incorporate training while the other events are participation based without a training requirement[60].

Although the frequencies demonstrate that respondents who attended an event promoting sexual assault awareness tended to more accurately identify the clear and ambiguous violation of law simulations, and less accurately identify the clear and ambiguous non-violation of law simulations, there is no statistical significance to support this. In addition, upon examining the relationship between "rape identification" and attending each of the events, for "clear violation of law" and "ambiguous violation of law," there was no statistically significant relationship

[60] For the Green Light Campaign, students who participate wear a green button on their clothing. This green button demonstrates that individual's commitment to making the IUP campus safer. When asked about the button, students are able to inform others that the green button was created to "Talk about healthy relationships and consent…Create and maintain a campus environment that is supportive of victims and survivors of violence…Show that IUP students can and will create a safer campus community free of violence" (The Green Light Campaign, 2019, para. 5). The Bystander Step Up Training involves "help[ing] students learn how to safely **step in** and offer help or **step out** a for an individual in need" (Bystanders Step Up!, 2019, para. 3). Through this training, students learn how to notice and interpret potential problem events, assume personal responsibility, learn how to help and how to offer help (Bystanders Step Up!, 2019).

between attending any of the events and "rape identification." This means that attending an event does not have a significant relationship on the likelihood of a respondent accurately identifying the clear and ambiguous violations of the law simulations. Attending the Green Light Campaign was the only event that had a statistically significant relationship with "rape identification" for the "clear non-violation of law" simulation. This means that respondents who attended the Green Light Campaign are statistically more likely to accurately identify the "clear non-violation of law" simulation as a non-rape that respondents who did not attend the event. As with the "clear violation of law" and "ambiguous violation of law" simulations, there were no events that had a statistically significant relationship with "rape identification" for the "ambiguous non-violation of law" simulation. This means that individuals who did not attend the event are not statistically more likely to accurately identify the "ambiguous non-violation of law" as a non-rape that respondents who did attend an event prompting sexual assault. Due to the lack of statistical significance, this hypothesis cannot be supported.

Hypothesis Four

Hypothesis four states that students who know of, or have read, Indiana University of Pennsylvania's sexual assault policy are more likely to correctly identify the simulations that students who do not know of the policy. For "clear violation of law," "ambiguous violation of law," and "clear non-violation of law," Students who know of, or have read the policy were more likely to accurately identify the simulations that students who did not know of the policy; 98.4% and 85.7%, respectively, for "clear violation of law," 93.7% and 71.4%, respectively, for "ambiguous violation of law," and 100.0% and 30.0%, respectively, for "clear non-violation of law." It is important to note that for each of these simulations, eight out of the ten respondents who were unsure if they had knowledge of the policy, accurately identified all three of these

simulations. In relation to the "ambiguous non-violation of law" simulation, respondents who had knowledge of or read the policy were less likely to accurately identify the simulation as a non-rape (33.3%), compared to respondents who did not have such knowledge and accurately identified the simulation as a non-rape (42.8%). Forty percent of the respondents who were unsure if they had such policy knowledge, accurately identified simulation as a non-rape.

"Knowledge of IUP Policy" was found to be statistically significantly related to "rape identification" for the "clear violation of law" and the "ambiguous violation of law" simulations, but not for the "clear non-violation of law" and "ambiguous non-violation of law" simulations. This means that respondents who have read or have knowledge of the IUP sexual assault policy are statistically more likely to accurately identify clear and ambiguous violations as rape but are not statistically more likely to accurately identify clear non-violations as non-rape, than respondents who have no such knowledge. Similarly, respondents who do not have policy knowledge are not statistically more likely to accurately identify an ambiguous non-rape simulation as that of a non-rape than individuals with such knowledge. Due to this, the hypothesis can only be partially supported.

Hypothesis Five

Hypothesis five states that the more respondents blame the victim for what occurred, the more likely they are to depict the simulation as a rape. For each of the four simulations, respondents who identified the incident as a rape placed less blame on the victim than respondents who identified the incident as a non-rape. Respondents who identified the "clear violation of law" simulation as a rape had an average "victim blameworthiness" score of 6.21 compared to respondents who identified the simulation as a non-rape (10.75). The average scores for "victim blameworthiness" for the "ambiguous violation of law" simulation was 7.05 for

respondents who identified the simulation as rape, and 13.88 for respondents who identified the simulation as a non-rape, while respondents who identified the "clear non-violation of law" simulation as a rape had an average "victim blameworthiness" score of 11.44, compared to 25.66 for respondents who identified the simulation as a non-rape. Respondents who identified the "ambiguous non-violation of law" as a rape had an average "victim blameworthiness" score of 9.15, while respondents who identified the situation as a non-rape had an average score of 17.18. This demonstrates that the more respondents blame the victim for what occurred, the less likely they are to depict the situation as a rape.

Although the average scores for "victim blameworthiness" depict that individuals with higher scores are more likely to perceive the simulation as a rape, the statistics do not support such a conclusion for all the simulations. "Victim blameworthiness" and "rape identification" were found to have a statistically significant relationship for the "ambiguous violation of law," "clear non-violation of law," and "ambiguous non-violation of law" simulations, but not the "clear violation of law" simulation. This means that respondents who place more blame on the victim are significantly less likely than respondents who place less blame on the victim, to identify the simulations as rapes for the "ambiguous violation of law," "clear non-violation of law," and "ambiguous non-violation of law" simulations. Due to this, the hypothesis can only be partially supported.

Furthermore, this research adds to the literature and supports the assumption that increased victim blame decreases the likelihood of perceiving a rape, by demonstrating that a statistically significant relationship exists between the level of blame assigned to the victim and the likelihood the individual will consider the incident to be that of a rape. Currently, as discussed above, literature only examines how various factors influence the level of blame and

responsibility students assign to victims and perpetrators (Abbey et al., 1987; Abrams et al., 2003; Acock & Ireland, 1983; Bell, Kuriloff, & Lottes, 1994; Ben-David & Schneider, 2005; Brekke & Borgida, 1988; Bridges, 1991; Bridges & McGrail, 1989; Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001; Deitz, Litman, & Bentley, 1984; Edmonts & Cahoon, 1986; Ford, Liwag-McLamb, & Foley, 1998; Frese, Moya, & Megías, 2004; Gerber, Cronin, & Steigman, 2004; Gerdes, Dammann, & Heilig, 1998; Gölge et al., 2013; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Hammock & Richardson, 1997; Johnson & Jackson, 1998; Johnson, Jackson, & Smith, 1989; Kanekar & Nazareth, 1988; Kleinke & Meyer, 1990; Koss et al., 1998; Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohlin, & Binderip, 2000; Newcomb et al., 2008; Rebeiz & Hard, 2010; Schneider, Ee, & Aronson, 1994; Schneider et al., 2009; Sheldon-Keller et al., 1994; Simonson & Subich, 1999; Sleath & Bull, 2010; Vandiver & Dupalo, 2013; Viki, Abrams, & Masser, 2004; Whatley, 2005; White & Kurpius, 2002; White & Yamawaki, 2009; Workman & Freeburg, 1999; Yamawaki, 2007; Yarmey, 1985). This study, however, examines this missing piece, with data suggesting that the more blame that is placed on the victim, the less likely the incident will be identified as a rape, thereby supporting the blame-perception assumption that students are less likely to perceive an incident as a rape the more they place blame on the victim.

Hypothesis Six

Hypothesis six states that the more respondents blame the perpetrator for what occurred, the more likely they are to identify the simulation as a rape. For each of the simulations except for the "ambiguous violation of law" simulation, the average scores for "perpetrator blameworthiness" between respondents who identified the simulations as rape and those who identified them as non-rape, were exceedingly close. Respondents who identified the "ambiguous violation of law" simulation as a rape had a relatively higher average score for

"perpetrator blameworthiness" than respondents who identified the simulation as a non-rape. The average scores for "perpetrator blameworthiness" between respondents who identified the simulations as rape and respondents who identified the simulations as non-rape are as follows: 28.56 and 28.00, respectively, for the "clear violation of law" simulation; 27.05 and 22.88, respectively, for the "ambiguous violation of law" simulation; 27.75 and 27.08, respectively, for the "clear violation of law" simulation; and 27.92 and 27.89, respectively, for the "ambiguous non-violation of law" simulation. This demonstrates that respondents who identified the simulations as rape are slightly more likely to blame the perpetrator than respondents who did not identify the simulations as rape.

The relationship between "perpetrator blameworthiness" and "rape identification" was found to be statistically significant for the "ambiguous violation of law" simulation only. This means that the more blame individuals place on the perpetrator, the less statistically likely they will be to perceive the incident as a rape, for situations that ambiguously violate the law. With only one of the simulations having statistical significance, this hypothesis can only be partially supported. However, this research adds to previous literature (Bell, Kuriloff, & Lottes, 1994; Davies, Pollard, & Archer, 2001; Deitz, Litman, & Bentley, 1984; Edmonts & Cahoon, 1986; Gerdes, Dammann, & Heilig, 1988; Gruber & Harrower, 2009; Johnson & Jackson, 1988; Johnson, Jackson, & Smith, 1989; Kanekar & Nazareth, 1988; Kleinke & Meyer, 1990). Previous literature tends to demonstrate that overall, more blame is placed on the victim for the incident than the perpetrator. However, this study demonstrates that respondents place much more blame overall on the perpetrator compared to the victim for each of the four incidents, thereby refuting previous literature. This research also does not support the assumption that increased perpetrator blame increases the likelihood of perceiving a rape, by demonstrating that a

statistically significant relationship exists between the level of blame assigned to the perpetrator and the likelihood that an individual will not consider the incident to be that of a rape.

Hypotheses Support

As discussed, this study greatly expands research on sexual assault by incorporating a male victim and female perpetrators, examining how blameworthiness influences rape identification, and examining whether college students can accurately identify what rape is. Overall, when respondents were asked to identify if a simulation portrayed a rape, they tended to err on the side of caution and indicate a rape had occurred, even if one did not. Females were more likely to identify the ambiguous simulations as rape compared to males, while there was not statistical difference between Whites and non-Whites. Respondents who participated in an event promoting sexual assault awareness were no more likely than respondents who did not participate in such events to correctly identify the simulations, while participation in the Green Light Campaign and Bystander Step Up Training, demonstrate a more accurate ability to correctly identify the simulations. While respondents who placed more blame on the perpetrator and less blame on the victim were more likely to identify the simulation as a rape, the relationship between these variables did not have statistical significance for all of the simulations, thereby demonstrating only partial support for these hypotheses.

Personal Versus Legal Definitions

While this study demonstrates that for clear and ambiguous violations of law, college students are able to correctly identify that a rape occurred, it also demonstrates that they have the biggest issues accurately identifying a rape not occurring in ambiguous non-violation of law situations. While this demonstrates that college students are unable to accurately identify such situations, it does not mean that they do not understand what rape means. Instead, it is possible

that college students identified the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation as a rape, because that is what the college lifestyle believes a rape is. Essentially, this study calls into question personal definitions of rape versus the legal definitions of rape.

With the current societal focus on preventing and addressing rape and sexual assault, especially on college campuses, students could have developed personal definitions of what they believe classifies a rape, that not only differ, but as suggested by this study, are more critical than the legal definition of rape. While the law clearly defines the elements of rape in a black and white manner, college students perceiving the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation as a rape, suggests that college students perceive the actions falling within the "grey" areas as being more negative and unacceptable than the law. Could it be that students are perceiving certain sexual actions as being more serious, or illegal, compared to what has been addressed in the law, or do they really not understand the legal elements of rape? Are they more aware of the issues in certain sexual actions that the law has not caught up with yet due to our ever-changing society?

Impact on College Campuses

With college students incorrectly identifying the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation as rape, along with students incorrectly identifying, or not identifying the four key elements that constitute a rape occurred, colleges should be more vigilant in explaining the elements of rape to students. While the sexual assault policies provided to students define what rape is, colleges should also provide examples, and clearly explain the elements of rape, so students are fully aware of what actions constitute a rape.

In addition, with the Green Light Campaign and the Bystander Step Up programs influencing students' perceptions of rape, so that they are better able to accurately classify what is and is not a rape, such programs should be offered more often on college campuses. As

discussed previously, there is a training aspect of these two programs that are not present in the other sexual assault awareness programs on campus. Therefore, one could state that the training provided on sexual assault allows students to better comprehend what constitutes a rape. Due to this, students should be provided with not only more of these programs, but other sexual assault awareness programs should incorporate some form of sexual assault-based training, to increase students' knowledge of rape and sexual assault. Colleges would benefit from providing not only sexual assault trainings to students, but incorporating these trainings into more programs, because students would be better able to accurately understand what constitutes rape, and thereby be less likely to engage in such illegal actions.

Along with providing more training on rape and sexual assault, such training should focus specifically on the ambiguous "grey" situations. As demonstrated in the study, it is the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation that the students had the hardest time identifying. If the trainings provide examples of "grey" situations instead of the typical clear-cut violations of rape, students would be able to obtain a better understanding of what exactly constitutes rape and sexual assault. Doing so would allow students to better understand what actions are and are not acceptable, thereby clearing up confusion on the ambiguous situations, and increasing students' ability to accurately know and identify what situations constitute rape and sexual assault.

Policy Implications

Even with a lack of statistical support, this research could still impact current policy. If anything, the research demonstrates: 1) a need to accurately depict the legal elements of rape and sexual assault so that students are not reporting incidents that do not constitute a crime; 2) the effectiveness of the Green Light Campaign and the Bystander Step Up Training need to be

examined; and 3) the ambiguous incidents should be discussed in sexual assault trainings more so than the black and white incidents.

It appears students are erring on the side of caution when identifying rape simulations, by identifying non-rape simulations as that of rape. This in part, as discussed above, could be due to the current societal climate surrounding sexual assault. Students may believe it is better to identify an incident as a rape, than to ignore the potential sex crime that occurs. While this is a safe way to go about it, it brings about the issues of potentially reporting acts that were not in fact sex crimes. By reporting acts that were not sex crimes, the consequences of doing so fall on the suspected perpetrator. Even without demonstrating a legitimate sex crime occurred, society still labels the individual as a rapist, even if they did not engage in a sex act. The societal climate today does not view potential sexual predators as "innocent until proven guilty," but rather guilty by accusation. If anything, policy should address this issue by educating students on the legal elements that make of rape and other sexual assaults.

As demonstrated above, while there was a lack in statistical support, respondents who participated in the Green Light Campaign or the Bystander Step Up Training, were more likely to correctly identify the simulations than respondents who participated in other sexual assault awareness events. In examining the events, the Green Light Campaign and the Bystander Step Up Training consist of a training portion for those participating, whereas the other events are simply open to the public for participation, without any training necessary. It is possible that it is this training component that enhances a respondent's ability to accurately identify rape and non-rape simulations. As a result, the effectiveness of these programs should be examined to gain an understanding of how efficient the programs work, and what could be done to improve them in terms of expanding participation.

In addition, with the training aspects of the Green Light Campaign and the Bystander Step Up Training, being unique to these sexual assault awareness events, it can be suggested that the training aspect increases students' ability to accurately identify, and thus understand, what rape is. Due to this, more training should be provided to students, and the other sexual assault events should look into including a training aspect to the event as well. Doing so would provide students more information on rape and sexual assault, and increase their knowledge of what actions fall within the realm of rape and sexual assault.

Limitations

There are three potential limitations of this study. The first potential limitation is the sample size, which influences the second limitation of the lack of variation in the dependent variable for three of the independent variables. The third potential limitation is three historical events: 1) the "me too" Movement; 2) the Justice Kavanaugh Supreme Court nomination; and 3) the sexual assault allegations that were brought against a priest in the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania Catholic Diocese. Each of these potential limitations are discussed.

Sample Size

As discussed earlier, a smaller sample size of 81 was obtained, compared to the intended 300. Research has suggested that a minimum of 20 events per predictor variable (EPV) is needed (Austin & Steyerberg, 2016; Bujang, Sa'at, Tg Abu Bakar Sidik, & Lim, 2018; Harrell, Lee, & Mark, 1996; Vittinghoff & McCullloch, 2007) in order to avoid Type II error. However, research has suggested that only 10 data points are needed per independent variable (Bujang et al., 2018; Concato, Peduzzi, Holford, & Feinstein, 1995; Peduzzi, Concato, Kemper, Holford, & Feinstein, 1996; Vittinghoff & McCulloch, 2007). When running regression analyses for this study, the four main independent variables were run as their own model. As a result, there were a total of

seven to eight predictor variables within each model, thereby suggesting that a minimum of only 70 to 80 EPVs were needed to run the analyses. However, one must be cautious in running such analyses with a small sample size because the small sample size increases the likelihood of obtaining Type II error (Cooper & Garson, 2016).

While the obtained sample size of 81 is a much smaller size than intended, the power analysis indicated the sample had a power of 80.3%. However, even with a high power, the question of just how representative the sample was of the IUP main campus community of roughly 15,000 students, comes into question. While the power demonstrates that the sample size was efficient for this study, the lack of effect size between differing groups, could be attributed to the sample size instead of being an accurate representation of the population. Even though the sample has a strong power, the small size of it should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results. Due to the small sample size, the results may not be representative of the entire population, thereby calling the generalizability of this study into question.

Lack of Minority Representativeness

Due to the small percentage of minority respondents, it was difficult to compare the groups separately. Specifically, past research, has examined specifically Asian students (Lee et al., 2005; Yamawaki & Tschanz, 2005) and Hispanic students' (Romero-Sanchez, Megías, & Krahé, 2012) perceptions compared to American perceptions. However, with 69 of the respondents being White, compared to three Asian respondents and two Hispanic respondents, such comparisons were unable to be made at a significant level.

Lack of Dependent Variable Variance

A lack of variance in the dependent variable between respondents who identified the incidents as rape and respondents who identified the incidents as non-rape for the independent

variables “clear violation of law,” “ambiguous violation of law,” and “clear non-violation of law,” could be a direct consequence of the small sample size of this study. A lack of variance in the dependent variable for these three independent variables made it impossible to run regression models for these variables, due to the lack of effect size among the dependent variable. As a result, regression analysis could only be run for the independent variable “ambiguous non-violation of law.”

Sexual Assault Versus Rape

A potential limitation of this study is that it examines a specific sexual act, rape, instead of looking at sexual assault as a whole. This could be a potential issue in terms of students’ perceptions of the incident. It is possible that students stated simulation four (ambiguous non-violation of law) was a rape, because they viewed it as contained a sexual assault. Without knowing what students perceive rape to be, it is plausible that if they believed a sexual assault occurred in the simulation, they may have identified it as a rape, instead of ignoring what occurred altogether.

Historical Events

Throughout the duration of this study, there were several events that occurred which could have influenced respondents’ responses throughout the data collection process. These events include the “me too” Movement. Justice Brett Kavanaugh’s Supreme Court nomination, and the sexual abuse allegations that have occurred not only through the Catholic Church, but more recently throughout Pennsylavnia. This section will discuss the historical events themselves, as well as how they each could potentially have influenced respondents’ classifications of rape.

The "me too" movement. The "me too" Movement was first created in 2006 by Tarana Burke, as a way to assist sexual assault survivors, especially "Black women and girls, and other young women of color from low wealth communities," with healing (metoo, 2018, para. 1). The movement itself did not become popular and widespread until Alyssa Milano pushed the campaign on October 15, 2017, by using the hashtag #MeToo on Twitter (D'Zurilla, 2017), as a means to increase the conversation about the Harvey Weinstein sexual assault allegations ("More than 12M," 2017). Within 48 hours, the hashtag was tweeted on Twitter almost one million times ("More than 12M," 2017), and had spread across 85 countries within the week (Park, 2017). Even Facebook was active with the tweet, with over "12 million posts, comments, and reactions in less than 24 hours, by 4.7 million users around the world," with 45% of all Facebook users having friends who had posted "me too" ("More than 12M," 2017, para, 6). Since then, the "me too" movement has become a popular staple across not only the social media platform, but across political and societal platforms as well.

The spread of the "me too" movement allowed for the awareness of how widespread sexual assault is. In doing so, the public attitude has shifted in a manner that demands actions be taken for any potential sexual allegation, thereby resulting in a society that at times, has over-emphasized the manner in an inaccurate, negative way, whereby every sexual act is deemed as a rape. As a result, society might err on the side of caution when it comes to sexual acts, especially ones that could potential depict rape, because the societal awareness of sexual assault has exponentially increased over the past year. This in turn could explain the results of the study in terms of how respondents classified the simulations, with it appearing as though majority of respondents are erring on the side of caution, identifying rape even in the non-rape simulations, as discussed below.

Justice Kavanaugh nomination. Brett Kavanaugh, a federal district court judge, was nominated by President Trump for U.S. Supreme Court Justice on July 9, 2018. Come September 2018, three women had accused Kavanaugh of sexual assault (Hauser, 2018), where he was deemed as a rapist not only throughout news outlets, but society as well (Adams, 2018; Essig, 2018; Filipovic, 2018; Gainor, 2018; Kellman, 2018; Levine, 2018; Mangan & Breuninger, 2018; Scanlan, 2018). This case demonstrates a societal and political climate in which all sexual actions were deemed as rape. Even though Kavanaugh was accused of three different sexual actions, one of which was later reported as being fabricated (Dinan, 2018), and none of which fit the legal definition of rape in any manner, he was deemed as a rapist for his actions. The data collection for this study, which took place from September 6, 2018 through September 24, 2018, ran right through the highly publicized questioning of Kavanaugh by the U.S. Congress, which depicted a rapist, who was accused of crimes that did not actually qualify as that of rape. Due to this, the respondents' ideals of what rape is could not only be influenced by the media's inappropriate usage of wording, but it the event could have resulted in respondents erring on the side of causing when determining whether the simulations indicated that of rape.

Catholic Diocese of Pennsylvania sexual abuse allegations. Over the past year, allegations of priests abusing altar servers has been released to the public, along with the names of the priests accused. On August 14, 2018, a grand jury examining 301 Pennsylvania priests accused of child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church (Sheehan, 2018), released the names of 99 of which were within the Diocese of Pittsburgh (Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, 2018). Following the release of this list, within a week, the Pittsburgh Diocese had received roughly 50 additional new abuse claims (Flores, Conlon, & Willingham, 2018). With this, the media has not only covered the events leading up to the grand jury, but also the events that have occurred as a result

of new allegations being brought to light. At the end of August 2018, three priests from the Pittsburgh Diocese were placed on leave following sexual abuse allegations (3 Priests Accused, 2018). The Catholic Diocese of Pittsburgh has even placed a list of accused clergies on their website, while stating the names of the clergy who appealed to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court (Catholic Dioceses of Pittsburgh, 2018). With new accusations arising, and clergy appealing to the higher courts, the media has continued coverage on the events. These events hit many students close to home, especially those not only from the Pittsburgh and surrounding areas, but those of the Catholic faith. Due to this, their identifications of the incidents could have been influenced by this event.

Future Research

There is an abundance of future research that should be conducted pertaining to this topic. First, this research should be conducted again, at colleges in other states. This will allow an examination of how perceptions of rape not only differ by state, but how such perceptions are perhaps influenced by the states laws as well, since states have different laws pertaining to rape. Second, an examination on how participation in the Green Light Campaign or the Bystander Step Up Training influences the likelihood of respondents' accurately identifying rape and non-rape scenarios should be addressed, since these programs have shown promise in this area compared to others offered at IUP.

Third, this research provided simulations that portrayed a male victim and two female perpetrators. Future research should incorporate other such combinations; one male victim and one female perpetrator, one female victim and one male perpetrator, one female victim and one female perpetrator, and one male victim and one male perpetrator. Also, increasing the number of perpetrators, as done in this study, should be examined as well. By changing the gender roles

between the victim and the perpetrator, along with the number of perpetrators, would allow for research to examine whether the gender of the victim and/or perpetrator, and the number of perpetrators, influences how college students identify rape-based simulations.

It is important to change up the gender compositions in order to gain an understanding of how perceptions of rape change based on whether the simulations depict heterosexual acts or homosexual acts. This in turn will allow for an examination of how rape is viewed within the homosexual community. In addition, examining how viewpoints shift when a victim is male compared to female, or the perpetrator is male compared to female, is key in understanding how rape is perceived depending on the sex of the individuals involved. As demonstrated by previous research (Groth & Burgess, 1980; Vandiver & Dupalo; 2013), students tend to find difficulty in believing that men can be raped, so examining such differences between the genders of not only the victims, but the perpetrators as well, allows for a comprehensive understanding of how gender influences perceptions of rape.

Lastly, this research should be conducted via different simulations. It would be unique to compare the perceptions of visual simulations to participatory simulations and analogue simulations. In doing so, the impact that each type of simulation, whether you are participating in the simulations, watching the simulation, or listening to the simulation, has on an individual's perceptions of the event is key. Not only could the impact of the extent to which an individual engages with the incident be examined, but such research could be related to witness testimony in terms of the witnesses' impact on the jury based on whether they heard the crime, viewed the crime, or participated in the crime.

Conclusion

In order to determine if college students could accurately identify rape, an e-mail survey was sent out to a random sample of 2,000 Indiana University of Pennsylvania students during the fall 2018 semester. Study participants were shown four simulations, one depicting a clear violation of law, one depicting an ambiguous violation of law, one depicting a clear non-violation of law, and one depicting an ambiguous non-violation of law. Perceptions on each of the simulations were acquired, along with whether respondents believed each incident was a rape or not.

Through the use of frequency statistics, bivariate statistics, and binary regression analyses, support was found for hypothesis one (*females are more likely to identify the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation and the ambiguous violation of law simulation as depicting rape than males*), while no support was found for hypotheses two (*White students are less likely to identify the ambiguous non-violation of law simulation and the ambiguous violation of law simulation as depicting rape than students of other races*) and three (*students who participated in an event promoting sexual assault awareness are more likely to correctly identify simulations as to whether they depict rape or not than students who have not participated in a sexual assault event*). Partial support was found for hypotheses four (*students who know of or have read Indiana University of Pennsylvania's sexual assault policy are more likely to correctly identify simulations as to whether they depict rape or not than students who do not know of Indiana University of Pennsylvania's sexual assault policy*), five (*students are more likely to depict a rape occurred the less they place blameworthiness of the act within the simulation on the victim*), and six (*students are less likely to depict a rape occurred the more they place blameworthiness of the act within the simulation on the offender*).

As discussed previously, data pertaining to rape tends to focus on male perpetrators and female offenders and examines factors that influence respondents' perceptions of the event. Until now, research has neglected to identify whether respondents can accurately identify what a rape is, before asking their perceptions on the incident at hand. This study adds to the literature by employing a study containing a male victim and two female perpetrators. This study also examines not only what influences respondents' perceptions of each of the incidents, but whether respondents can accurately identify what rape is. Overall, it was found that college students tend to err on the side of caution by not only identifying rape incidents as rape, but non-rape incidents as rape as well.

References

Abbey, A., Cozzarelli, C., McLaughlin, K., & Harnish, R. J. (1987). The effects of clothing and dyad sex composition on perceptions of sexual intent: Do women and men evaluate these cues differently? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 17*(2), 108-126. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1987.tb00304.x

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

Acock, A. C., & Ireland, N. K. (1983). Attribution of blame in rape cases: The impact of norm violation, gender, and sex-role attitude. *Sex Roles, 9*(1/2), 179-193.

Adams, B. (2018, September 24). Michael Avenatti calls Kavanaugh a high school rapist, Kavanaugh says he was a virgin, media pounces. *Washington Examiner*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/avenatti-calls-kavanaugh-a-rapist-kavanaugh-says-hes-a-virgin-media-pounces.

Akhtar-Danesh, N., Baxter, P., Valaitis, R. K., Stanyon, W., & Sproul, S. (2009). Nurse faculty perceptions of simulation use in nursing education. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 31*(3), 312-329. doi:10.1177/0193945908328264

Alison, L., van del Heuvel, C., Warning, S., Power, N., Long, S., O'Hara, T., & Crego, J. (2013). Immersive simulated learning environments for researching critical incidents: A knowledge synthesis of the literature and experiences of studying high-risk strategic decision making. *Journal of Cognitive Engineering and Decision Making, 7*(3), 255-272. doi:10.1177/1555343412468113

Armstrong, E. A., Hamilton, L., & Sweeney, B. (2006). Sexual assault on campus: A multilevel, integrative approach to party rape. *Social Problems, 53*(4), 483-499.

Arthurs, S. M. (2018). *Alcohol in academic: Assessing underage binge drinking personalities and policies*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Full Text. (10824336)

Austin, P.C., & Steyerberg, E. W. (2017). Events per variable (EVP) and the relative performance of different strategies for estimating the out-of-sample validity of logistic regression models. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research, 26*(2), 796-808. https://doi.org/10.1177/0962280214558972

Bachen, C. M., Hernández-Ramos, P. F., & Raphael, C. (2012). Simulation REAL LIVES: Promoting global empathy and interest in learning through simulation games. *Simulation & Gaming, 43*(4), 437-460. doi:10.1177/1046878111432108

Bell, S. T., Kuriloff, P. J., & Lottes, I. (1994). Understanding attributions of blame in stranger rape and date rape situations: An examination of gender, race, identification, and students social perceptions of rape victims. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24*(19), 1719-1734.

Ben-David, S., & Schneider, O. (2005). Rape perceptions, gender role attitudes, and victim perpetrator acquaintance. *Sex Roles, 53*(5/6), 385-399. doi:10.1007/s11199-005-6761-4

Bermont, G., McGuire, M. McKinley, W., & Salo, C. (1974). The logic of simulation in jury research. *Criminal Justice and Behavior 1*(3). 224-233.

Bernat, J. A., Wilson, A. E., & Calhoun, K. S. (1999). Sexual coercion history, calloused sexual beliefs and judgments of sexual coercion in a date rape analogue. *Violence and Victims, 4*(2), 147-160.

Berry, W. D. (1993). *Understanding regression assumptions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Berzofsky, M., Krebs, C., Langton, L., & Planty, M. (2013). *Female victims of sexual violence, 1994-2010* [NCJ 240655]. Retrieved from U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics: http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=4927.

Berzofsky, M., Krebs, C., Langton, L., & Smiley-McDonald, H. (2012). *Victimizations not reported to the police, 2016-2010* [NCJ 238536]. Retrieved from U.S. Department of Justice, office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics: http://www,bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=4962.

Bieneck, S., & Krahé, B. (2011). Blaming the victim and exonerating the perpetrator in cases of rape and robbery: Is there a double standard? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*, 1785-1797. doi:10.1177/0886260510372945

Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. L., Merrick, M. T., … Stevens, M. R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey: 2010 summary report*. Retrieved from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control: http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/pdf/NISVS_Report2010.

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

Boeringer, S. B. (1996). Influences of fraternity membership, athletics, and male living arrangements on sexual aggression. *Violence Against Women, 2*(2), 134-147.

Boeringer, S. B. (1999). Associations of rape-supportive attitudes with fraternal and athletic participation. *Violence Against Women, 5*(1), 81-90. doi:10.1177/10778019922181167

Boeringer, S. B., Shehan, C. L., & Akers, R. L. (1991). Social contexts and social learning in sexual coercion and aggression: Assessing the contribution of fraternity membership. *Family Relations, 40*(1), 58-64. doi:10.2307/585659

Bohm, R. M. (1990). Death penalty opinions: A classroom experience and public commitment. *Sociological Inquiry, 60*(3), 285-297.

Boswell, A., & Spade, J. Z. (1996). Fraternities and collegiate rape culture: Why are some fraternities more dangerous places for women? *Gender and Society, 10*(2), 133-145.

Brekke, B., & Borgida, E. (1988). Expert psychological testimony in rape trials: A social cognitive analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*(3), 372-386.

Bridges, J. S. (1991). Perceptions of date and stranger rape: A difference in sex role expectations and rape-supportive beliefs. *Sex Roles, 24*(5), 291-307.

Bridges, J. S., & McGrail, C. A. (1989). Attributions of responsibility for date and stranger rape. *Sex Roles, 21*(3), 273-286.

Bujang, M. A., Sa'at, N., Th Abu Baker Sidik, T. M. I., & Lim, C. J. (2018). Sample size guidelines for logistic regression from observational studies with large population: Emphasis on the accuracy between statistics and parameters based on real life clinical data. *Malaysian Journal of Medical Science, 25*(4), 122-130. https://doi.org/10.21315/mjms2018.25.4.12

Bulman, R. J., & Wortman, C. B. (1977). Attribution of blame and coping in the "real world": Severe accident victims react to their lot. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*, 351-363.

Burgess, M. R., & Burpo, S. (2012). The effect of music videos on college students' perceptions of rape. *College Student Journal, 46*(4), 748-763.

Bystanders Step Up! (2019). Retrieved from https://www.iup.edu/haven/information/bystanders-step-up!/.

Canan, S. N., Jozkowski, K. N., & Crawford, B. L. (2016). Sexual assault supportive attitudes: Rape myth acceptance and token resistance in Greek and non-Greek college students from two university samples in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 1-29. doi:10.1177/0886260516636064

Carey, K. B., Durney, S. E., Shepardson, R. L., & Carey, M. (2015). Incapacitated and forcible rape of college women: Prevalence across the first year. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 56*(6), 678-680. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2015.02.018

Carlan, P. E., & Byxbe, F. R. (2000). The promise of humanistic policing: Is higher education living up to societal expectations? *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 24*(2), 235-246.

Carmines, E. G., & Zeller, R. A. (1979). *Reliability and validity assessment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Catholic Diocese of Pittsburgh. (2018). *Clergy against whom allegations have been made*. Retrieved from https://diopitt.org/clergy-allegations.

Champion, D. J., & Hartley, R. D. (2010). *Statistics for criminal justice and criminology* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Cohen, D., Darzi, A., & Vlaev, I. (2013). Behavioural simulations in health care policy: Current uses and future developments. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy, 18*(2), 98-106. doi:10.1177/1355819612473591

Concato, J., Peduzzi, P., Holford, T. R., & Feinstein, A. R. (1995). Importance of events per independent variable in proportional hazards analysis I. Background, goals, and general strategy. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 48*(12), 1495-1501. https://doi.org/10.1016/0895-4356(95)00510-2

Conly, S. (2004). Seduction, rape, and coercion. *Ethics 115*(1), 96-121.

Cooper, J. A., & Garson, G, D. (2016). *Power analysis.* Asheboro, NC: Statistical Associates Publishers.

Curl, E. D., Smith, S., Chisholm, L., Hamilton, J., & McGee, L. A. (2007). Multidimensional approaches to extending nurse faculty resources without testing faculty's patience. *Journal of Nursing Education, 46,* 193-195.

Curry, T. J. (1991). Fraternal bonding in the locker room: A pro-feminist analysis of talk about competition and women. *Sociology of Sports Journal, 8,* 119-135.

Davies, M., Pollard, P., & Archer, J. (2001). The influence of victim gender and sexual orientation on judgments of the victim in a depicted stranger rape. *Violence and Victims, 16*(6), 607-619.

Decker, J. F., & Baronia, P. G. (2011). "No" still means "yes": The failure of the "non-consent" reform movement in American rape and sexual assault law. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 101*(4), 1081-1169.

Deitz, S. R., Littman, M., & Bentley, B. J. (1984). Attribution of responsibility for rape: The influence of observer empathy, victim resistance, and victim attractiveness. *Sex Roles, 10*(3/4), 372-384.

Delisi, M., Kosloski, A., Sween, M., Hachmeister, E., Moore, M., & Drury, A. (2010). Murder by the numbers: Monetary costs imposed by a sample of homicide offenders. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology, 21,* 501-213. doi:10.1080/14789940903564388

Dewey, A., Musker, J., & Clements, R. (Producers), & Clements R., & Musker, J. (Directors). (1997). *Hercules* [Motion picture]. United States: Buena Vista Pictures Distribution.

DiFonzo, N., Hantula, D. A., & Bordia, P. (1998). Microworlds for experimental research: Having your (control and collection) cake, and realism too. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, *30*(2), 278-286.

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailed design method* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Dinan, S. (2018, November 3). Another Kavanaugh accuser admits to fabricating rape story. *The Washington Times*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2018/nov/3/another-kavanaugh-accuser-admits-fabricating-rape-/.

Division of Violence Prevention. (2012). *Sexual violence: Facts at a glance*. Retrieved from Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Division of Violence Prevention: http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/pdf/SV-DataSheet-a.pdf.

D'Zurilla, C. D. (2017, October 16). In saying #MeToo, Alyssa Milano pushes awareness campaign about sexual assault and harassment. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from http://www.latimes.com/entertainment/la-et-entertainment-news-updates-metoo-campaign-me-too-alyssa-milano-1508173882-htmlstory.html.

Doherty, K., & Anderson, I. (2004). Making sense of male rape: Constructions of gender, sexuality and experience of rape victims. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 14,* 85-103. doi:10.1002/casp.765

Dowler, K. (2006). Sex, lies, and videotape: The presentation of sex crime in local television news. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 34*(4), 383-392. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2006.05.004

Durán, M., Moya, M., Megías, J. L., & Viki, G. T. (2010). Social perception of rape victims in dating and married relationships: The role of perpetrator's benevolent sexism. *Sex Roles, 62*, 505-519. doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9676-7

Edmonds, E. M., & Cahoon, D. D. (1986). Attitudes concerning crimes related to clothing worn by female victims. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 24*(6), 444-446.

18 PA. CONS. STAT. § 3121(a)(1) (2016).

18 PA. CONS. STAT. § 3121 (a) (1-5) (2016).

Essig, L. (2018, September 24). Brett Kavanaugh and the creation of the rapist [blog]. Retrieved from http://msmagazine.com/blog/2018/09/24/brett-kavanaugh-creation-rapist/.

Fabrigar, L. R., & Wegener, D. T. (2012). *Exploratory factor analysis: Understanding statistics.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Farnworth, M., Longmire, D., & West, V. (1998). College students' views on criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 9*(1), 39-57. doi:10.1080/10511259800084171

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2014). *Frequently asked questions about the change in the UCR definition of rape.* Retrieved from https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/recent-program-updates/new-rape-definition-frequently-asked-questions.

Feild, H. S. (1979). Rape trials and jurors' decisions: A psycholegal analysis of the effects of victim, defendant, and case characteristics. *Law and Human Behavior, 3*(4), 261-284.

Feinstein, A. H., & Cannon, H. M. (2002). Constructs of simulation evaluation. *Simulation & Gaming, 33*(4), 425-440. doi:10.1177/1046878102238606

55 PA. ADC. § 4200.4 (2016).

Filipovic, J. (2018, September 18). Rapists have no place on the supreme court. Kavanaugh's accuser must be heard. *The Guardian.* Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/sep/18/we-cannot-have-a-rapist-on-the-us-supreme-court.

Finch, E., & Munro, V. E. (2008). Lifting the veil: The use of focus groups and trial simulations in legal research. *Journal of Law and Society, 35*(1), 30-51. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6478.2008.00423.x

Fisher, B., Cullen, F., & Turner, M. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women* [182369]. Retrieved from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service: http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/182369.pdf.

Fitzgerald, J., & Fitzgerald, J. (2014). *Statistics for criminal justice and criminology in practice and research: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Flores, R., Conlin, K, & Willingham, A. (2018, August 22). The Pittsburgh Diocese has received about 50 new abuse claims since the grand jury report came out. *CNN*. Retrieved from https://www.cnn.com/2018/08/22/us/pittsburgh-diocese-abuse-claims/index.html.

Ford, T. M., Liwag-McLamb, M. G., & Foley, L. A. (1998). Perceptions of rape based on sex and sexual orientation of victim. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 13*(2), 253-262.

Foubert, J. D., Brosi, M. W., & Bannon, R. S. (2011). Pornography viewing among fraternity men: Effects on bystander intervention, rape myth acceptance, and behavioral intent to commit sexual assault. *Sexual Addition & Compulsivity, 18*, 212-231. doi:10.1080/10720162.2011.625552

Fox, J. (1991). *Regression diagnostics*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Frese, B., Moya, M., & Megías, J. L. (2004). Social perception of rape: How rape myth acceptance modulates the influence of situational factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(2), 143-161.

Frankfort-Nachmias, C., & Leon-Guerrero, A. (2011). *Social statistics for a diverse society* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Friedman, L. M. (1977). *Law and society: An introduction*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Frintner, M. P., & Rubinson, L. (1993). Acquaintance rape: The influence of alcohol, fraternity membership, and sports team membership. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, 19*(4), 272-284. doi:10.1080/01614576.1993.11074089

Gnanadesikan, R. (1977). *Methods for statistical data analysis of multivariate observations*. New York: Wiley.

Gates, D. M., Fitzwater, E., & Telintelo, S. (2001). Using simulations and standardized patients in intervention research. *Clinical Nursing Research, 10*(4), 387-400.

Gerber, G. L., Cronin, J. M., & Steigman, H. J. (2004). Attributions of blame in sexual assault to perpetrators and victims of both genders. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 34*(10), 2149-2165. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02694.x

Gerdes, E. P., Dammann, E. J., & Heilig, K. E. Perceptions of rape victims and assailants: Effects of physical attractiveness, acquaintance, and subject gender. *Sex Roles, 19*(3/4), 141-153.

Giovannelli, T. S., & Jackson, L. (2013). Sexual violence perceptions among Christian college students. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 16*(3), 254-272.

Glaser, R., & Chi, M. (1988). Overview. In M. Chi, R. Glaser, & M. J. Farr (Eds.), *The nature of expertise* (pp. xv-xxviii). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gölge, Z. B., Yavuz, M. F., Müderrisoglu, S., & Yavuz, M. S. (2013). Turkish university students' attitudes towards rape. *Sex Roles, 49*, 653-661.

Greenfeld, L. A. (1997). *An analysis of data on rape and sexual assault: Sex offenses and offenders* [NCJ 163931]. Retrieved from U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics: http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/soo.pdf.

Gross, A. N., & Burgess, A. W. (1980). Male rape: Offenders and victims. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 137*(7) 806-810.

Groth, A. N., & Burgess, A. W. (1980). Male rape: Offenders and victims. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 137*(7), 806-810.

Grubb, A. R., & Harrower, J. (2009). Understanding attribution of blame in cases of rape: An analysis of participant gender, type of rape and perceived similarity to the victim. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 15*(1), 63-81. doi:10.1080/13552600802641649

Hammock, G. S., & Richardson, D. R. (1997). Perceptions of rape: The influence of closeness of relationship, intoxication and sex of participant. *Violence and Victims, 12*(3), 237-246.

Harkins, L., & Dixon, L. (2010). Sexual offending in groups: An evaluation. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 15*(2), 87-99.

Hauser, C. (2018, September 26). The women who have accused Brett Kavanaugh. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2018/09/26/us/politics/brett-kavanaugh-accusers-women.html.

Havighurst, L. C., Fields, L. E., & Fields, C. L. (2003). *High versus low fidelity simulations: Does the type of format affect candidates' performance or perceptions?* Paper presented at the 27th Annual IPMAAC Conference on Personnel Assessment, "Exploring New Horizons in Assessment," Baltimore, M.D.

Humphrey, S. R., & Kahn, A. S. (2000). Fraternities, athletic teams, and rape: Importance of identification with a risky group. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*(12), 1313-1322. doi:10.1177/088626000015012005

Indiana University of Pennsylvania. (2014). *Sexual harassment and sexual violence policy*. Retrieved from http://www.iup.edu/socialequity/policies/sexual-harassment-and-sexual-violence/.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania. (2015). *IUP at a glance*. Retrieved from http://www.iup.edu/about/iup/.

IUP Office of Public Safety. (2015). *IUP annual security report and fire safety report: Crime and fire statistics representing calendar years 2012, 2013, 2014: Updated October 25, 2015*. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/SGavin/Downloads/2015%20ASR%20Updated%20December%202015.pdf.

Johnson, J. D., & Jackson, L. A., Jr. (1988). Assessing the effects of factors that might underlie the differential perception of acquaintance and stranger rape. *Sex Roles, 19*(1/2), 1182-1197.

Johnson, J. D., Jackson, L. A., Jr., & Smith, G. J. (1989). The role of ambiguity and gender in mediating the effects of salient cognitions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15*(1), 52-60. doi:10.1177/0146167289151005

Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2013). College students and sexual consent: Unique insights. *Journal of Sex Research, 50*(6), 517-523. doi:10.1080/00224499.2012.700739

Kalof, L. (1993). Rape-supportive attitudes and sexual victimization experiences of sorority and nonsorority women. *Sex Roles, 29*, 767-780.

Kanekar, S., & Nazareth, A. M. (1988). Attributed rape victim's fault as a function of her attractiveness, physical hurt, and emotional disturbance. *Social Behaviour, 3*(1), 37-40.

Kellman, L. (2018, September 26). Here's what the 4 affidavits supporting Kavanaugh accuser Chrinstine Blasey Ford say. *PBS*. Retrieved from https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/heres-what-the-4-affidavits-supporting-kavanaugh-accuser-christine-blasey-ford-say.

Klein, G. A., & Hoffman, R. R. (1993). Perceptual-cognitive aspects of expertise. In M. Rabinowitz (Ed.), *Cognitive science foundations of instruction* (pp. 203-226). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kleinke, C. L., & Meyer, C. (1990). Evaluation of rape victim by men and women with high and low belief in a just world. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 14*, 343-353.

Kopper, B. A. (1996). Gender, gender identity, rape myth acceptance, and time of initial resistance on the perception of acquaintance rape blame and avoidability. *Sex Roles, 34*, 81-93.

Koss, M. P., Dinero, T. E., Seibel, C. A., & Cox, S. L. (1988). Stranger and acquaintance rape: Are there differences in the victim's experience? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12*, 1-24.

Koss, M. P., & Gaines, J. (1993). The prediction of sexual aggression by alcohol use, athletic participation, and fraternity affiliation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 8*(1), 94-107. doi:10.1177/088626093008001007

Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C., Warner, T., Fisher, B., & Martin, S. (2007). *The campus sexual assault (CSA) study: Final report*. Retrieved from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service: http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/221153.pdf.

Lambert, E. G. (2004). Assessing the crime and punishment views of criminal justice majors: How different are they from other majors? *Criminal Justice Studies, 17*(3), 245-257. doi:10.1080/147860104200281097

Lane, J. S. (1997). Can you make a horse drink? The effects of a corrections course on attitudes toward criminal punishment. *Crime & Delinquency, 43*(2), 186-202. doi:10.1177/0011128797043002004

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Monson, C. M. (1998). Marital rape: Is the crime taken seriously without co-occurring physical abuse? *Journal of Family Violence, 13*, 433-443.

Langton, L., & Sinozich, S. (2014). *Rape and sexual assault among college-aged females, 1995 2013*. Retrieved from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics: http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=5176.

Lee, J., Pomeroy, E., Yoo, S., & Rheinboldt, K. T. (2005). Attitudes toward rape: A comparison between Asian and Caucasian college students. *Violence Against Women, 11*(2), 177-196. doi:10.1177/1077801204271663

Levin, J. (2018, September 25). 'Morning Joe' slams Kavanaugh coverage: 'This has not been the media's finest hour.' *The Wrap.* Retrieved from https://www.thewrap.com/morning-joe-slams-kavanaugh-coverage-not-medias-finest-hour/.

Lewis, J. A., & Carlan, P. E. (2009). The National Minimum Drinking Age law: Perceptions of its effectiveness to deter juvenile alcohol use. *Criminal Justice Studies, 22*(2), 167-179. doi:10.1080/14786010902975440

Lewis-Beck, M. S. (1980). *Applied regression: An introduction*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lipshitz, R., & Shaul, O. B. (1997). Schemata and mental models in recognition-primed decision making. In C. E. Zsambok & G. Klein (Eds.), *Naturalistic decision making* (pp. 60-72). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lynch, K. R., Wasarhaley, N. E., Golding, J. M., & Simcic, T. (2013. Who bought the drinks? Juror perceptions of intoxication in a rape trial. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*(16), 3205-3222. doi:10.1177/0886260513496900

Mackey, D. A., & Courtright, K. E. (2000). Assessing punitiveness among college students: A comparison of criminal justice majors with other majors. *The Justice Professional, 12*(4), 423-441. doi:10.1080/1478601X.2009.9959561

Malamuth, N. M., & Briere, J. (1986). Sexual violence in the media: Indirect effects on aggression against women. *Journal of Social Issues, 42*(3), 75-92.

Mancini, C., Pickett, J. T., Call, C., & Roche, S. P. (2016). Mandatory reporting (MR) in higher education: College students' perceptions of laws designed to reduce campus sexual assault. *Criminal Justice Review, 41*(2), 219-235. doi:10.1177/0734016816634787

Mangan, D., & Breuninger, K. (2019, September 26). New Kavanaugh accuser Julie Swetnick details parties where girls allegedly were drugged and raped. *CBNC*. Retrieved from https://www.cnbc.com/2018/09/26/michael-avenatti-identifies-kavanaugh-accuser-as-julie-swetnick.html.

Martin, P. Y. (2016). The rape prone culture of academic contexts: Fraternities and athletics. *Gender & Society, 30*(1), 30-43. doi:10.1177/0891243215612708

Mason, G. E., Roger, S., & Foley, L. A. (2004). The impact of past sexual experiences on attributions of responsibility for rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(10), 1157-1171. doi:10.1177/0886260504269094

Maurer, T., & Robinson, D. (2008). Effects of attire, alcohol, and gender on perceptions of date rape. *Sex Roles, 58*(5/6), 423-434.

Maxfield, M. G., & Babbie, E. R. (2011). *Research methods for criminal justice and criminology* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

McCarthy, B. R., & McCarthy, B. J. (1981). Criminal justice student views of the criminal justice system: The impact of education and self-selection and their implications for the human services. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 8*(3), 610-622.

McCray, K. L. (2015). Intercollegiate athletes and sexual violence: A review of literature and recommendation for further study. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse, 16*(4), 438-443. doi:10.1177/1524838014537907

McNamara, K., Vattano, F., & Viney, W. (1993). Verdict, sentencing, and certainty as a function of sex of juror and amount of evidence in a simulated rape trial. *Psychological Reports, 72*, 575-583.

Menard[1], S. (2002). *Applied logistical regression analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Menard[2], S. (2002). *Longitudinal research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Menning, C. L. (2009). Unsafe at any house? Attendees' perceptions of microlevel environmental traits and personal safety at fraternity and nonfraternity parties. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(10), 1714-1734. doi:10.1177/0886260509331515

Messner, M. A. (1992). *Power at play: Sports and the problem of masculinity*. Boston: Beacon Press.

metoo. (2018). *About: History & vison*. Retrieved from https://metoomvmt.org/about/.

Miller, A. J., Tewskbury, R., & Hensley, C. (2004). College students' perceptions of crime, prison and prisoners. *Criminal Justice Studies, 17*(3), 311-328. doi:10.1080/1478601042000281132

Miller, A. K., Amacker, A. M., & King, A. R. (2011). Sexual victimization history and perceived similarity to a sexual assault victim: A path model of perceiver variables predicting victim culpability attributions. *Sex Roles, 64*, 372-381. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9910-3

Miller, T. R., Cohen, M. A., & Wiersema, B. (1996). *Victim costs and consequences: A new look* [NCJ 155282]. Retrieved from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice: http://www.ndaa.org/pdf/the_voice_3_no_1_2009 .pdf.

Monson, C. M., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Binderup, T. (2000). Does "no" really mean "no" after you say "yes"? Attributions about date and marital rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*(11), 1156-1174. doi:10.1177/088626000015011003

More than 12M "Me Too" Facebook posts, comments, reactions in 24 hours. (2017, October 17). *CBS News*. Retrieved from https://www.cbsnews.com/news/metoo-more-than-12-million -facebook-posts-comments-reactions-24-hours/.

Muehlenhard, C. L., Friedman, D. R., & Thomas, C. M. (1985). Is date rape justifiable? The effects of dating activity, who initiated, who paid, and men's attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9*(3), 297-310.

Murphy, G. L., & Wright, J. C. (1984). Changes in conceptual structure with expertise: Differences between real-world experts and notices. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, & Cognition, 10*(1), 144-155.

National Sexual Violence Resource Center (NSVRC). (2015). *Statistics about sexual violence*. Retrieved from http://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/publications_nsvrc_factsheet_media-packet_statistics-about-sexual-violence_0.pdf.

Newcombe, P. A., van den Eynde, J., Hafner, D., & Jolly, L. (2008). Attributions of responsibility for rape: Differences across familiarity of situation, gender, and acceptance of rape myths. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*(7), 1736-1754. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00367.x

Oshiname, F. O., Ogunwale, A. O., & Ajuwon, A. J. (2013). Knowledge and perceptions of date rape among female undergraduates of a Nigerian university. *African Journal of Reproductive Health, 17*(3), 137-148.

Park, A. (2017, October 24). "MeToo reaches 85 countries with 1.7M tweets. *CBS News*. Retrieved from https://www.cbsnews.com/news/metoo-reaches-85-countries-with-1-7-million-tweets/.

Pasternoster, R., Brame, R., Mazerolle, P., & Piquero, A. (1998). Using the correct statistical test for the equality of regression coefficients. *Criminology, 36*(4), 859-866.

Payne, B. K., & Coogle, V. (1998). Examining attitudes about the death penalty. *Corrections Compendium, 23*(4), 1-5, 24-26.

Payne, B. K., & Gainey, R. R. (1999). Attitudes toward electronic monitoring among monitored offenders and criminal justice students. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 29*(3-4), 195-208. doi:10.1300/J076v29n03_12

Peduzzi, P., Concato, J, Kemper, E., Holford, T. R., & Feinstein, A. R. (1996). A simulation study of the number of events per variable in logistic regression analysis. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 49*(12), 1373-1379. https://doi.org/10.1016/50895-4356(96)00236-3

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. (2018, August 16). Abuse allegations against Pittsburgh priests named in grand jury report released. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.* Retrieved from http://www.post-gazette.com/news/faith-religion/2018/08/16/grand-jury-report-pa-Diocese-of-Pittsburgh-priests-accused-sexual-misconduct-sortable-list-names/stories/201808160149.

Plumm, K. M., Nelson, K. D., & Terrance, C. A. (2012). A crime by any other name: Effects of media reporting on perceptions of sex offenses. *Journal of Media Psychology, 17*(1), 1-29.

Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2012). *Nursing research: Generating and assessing evidence for nursing practice* (9th ed.). Philadelphia: Wolters Klower Health, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Punch, K. F. (2014). *Developing effective research proposals* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rape Abuse and Incest National Network (RAINN). (2017). *Sexual assault*. Retrieved from https ://www.rainn.org/articles/sexual-assault.

Rayburn, N. R., Mendoza, M., & davison, G. C. (2003). Bystanders' perceptions of perpetrators and victims of hate crime: An investigation using the person perception paradigm. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*(9), 1055-1074. doi:10.1177/0886260503254513

Rebeiz, M. J., & Harb, C. (2010). Perceptions of rape and attitudes toward women in a sample of Lebanese students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(4), 735-752. doi:10.1177/0886260509334410

Reimann, P., & Chi, M. T. H. (1989). Human expertise: Human and machine problem solving. In K. J. Gilhooly (Ed.), *Human and machine problem solving* (pp. 161-191). New York: Plenum.

Rennison, C. A. (2002). *Rape and sexual assault: Reporting to police and medical attention, 1992-2000* [NCJ 194530]. Retrieved from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics: http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/rsarp00.pdf.

Romero-Sanchez, M., Megias, J. L., & Krahe, B. (2012). The role of alcohol and victim sexual interest in Spanish students' perceptions of sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(11), 2230-2258.

Sahl, D., & Keene, J. R. (2012). The effects of age, authority, and gender on perceptions of statutory rape offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(18), 3701-3722. doi:10.1177/0886260512447523

Salkind, N. J. (2011). *Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Saltz, R. F. (2007). How do college students view alcohol prevention policies? *Journal of Substance Use, 12*(6), 447-460. doi:10.1080/14659890701262320

Sampson, R. (2003). *Acquaintance rape of college students*. Retrieved from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services: http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/html/cd_rom/inaction1/pubs/AcquaintanceRapeCollegeStudents.pdf.

Sanday, P. R. (1996). Rape-prone versus rape-free campus cultures. *Violence Against Women, 2*, 191-208. doi:10.1177/1077801296002002006

Sandys, M. (1995). Attitudinal change among students in a capital punishment class: It may be possible. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 20*(1), 37-55. doi:10.1007/BF02886117

Scanlan, Q. (2018, September 30). Graham suggests no need for FBI to take to Kavanaugh classmates on drinking: He's not a 'stumbling, bumbling, drunk.' *abc News*. Retrieved from https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/graham-suggests-fbi-talk-kavanaugh-classmates-drinking-hes/story?id=58173769.

Schneider, L. J., Ee, J. S., & Aronson, H. (1994). Effects of victim gender and physical vs. psychological trauma/injury on observers' perceptions of sexual assault and its aftereffects. *Sex Roles, 30*(11/12), 793-808.

Schneider, L. J., Mori, L. T., Lambert, P. L., & Wong, A. O. (2009). The role of gender and ethnicity in perceptions of rape and its aftereffects. *Sex Roles 60*, 410-421. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9545-9

Schuller, R. A., & Stewart, A. (2000). Police responses to sexual assault complaints: The role of perpetrator/complainant intoxication. *Law and Human Behavior, 24*(5), 535-551. doi:10.1023/A:1005519028528

Schult, D. G., & Schneider, L. J. (1991). The role of sexual provocativeness, rape history, and observer gender in perceptions of blame in sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6*, 94-101.

Schwartz, M. D., & Nogrady, C. A. (1996). Fraternity membership, rape myths, and sexual aggression on a college campus. *Violence Against Women, 2*, 148-162. doi:10.1177/1077801296002002003

Sentürk, D., & Müller, H. G. (2005). Covariate-adjusted regression. *Biometrika, 92*(1), 75-89.

Sheehan, A. (2018, August 14). 301 'predator priests' named in Pa. grand jury sex abuse report: 'They were raping little boys & girls.' *KDKA2 CBS Pittsburgh*. Retrieved from https://pittsburgh.cbslocal.com/2018/08/14/pennsylvania-diocese-sex-abuse-grand-jury-report-released/.

Sheldon-Keller, A., Llyod-McGarvey, E., West, M., & Canterbury, R. J. (1994). Attachment and assessment of blame in date rape scenarios. *Social Behavior and Personality, 224), 313-318.*

Simonson, K., & Subich, L. M. (1999). Rape perceptions as a function of gender-role traditionality and victim-perpetrator association. *Sex Roles, 40*(7/8), 617-634.

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

Sommer, S., Reynolds, J., & Kehn, A. (2015). Mock juror perceptions of rape victims: Impact of case characteristics and individual differences. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 1-20. doi:10.1177/0886260515581907

The Green Light Campaign. (2019). Retrieved from https://www.iup.edu/haven/awareness-campaigns/green-light-campaign/.

Thornberry, T. P., & Krohn, M. D. (2000). The self-report method for measuring delinquency and crime. *Criminal Justice, 4*, 33-83.

3 priests accused of sexual abuse placed on administrative leave. (2018, August 31). *KDKA 2 CBS Pittsburgh*. Retrieved from https://pittsburgh.cbslocal.com/2018/08/31/john-bauer-bernard-costello-hugh-lang-sexual-abuse-allegations/.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey* [NCJ 183781]. Retrieved from U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice: https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/183781.pdf.

Truman, J. L., & Langton, L. (2015). *Criminal victimization, 2014* [NCJ 248973]. Retrieved from U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics: http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cv14.pdf.

Tsoudis, O. (2000). Does majoring in criminal justice affect perceptions of criminal justice? *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 11*(2), 225-236. doi:10.1080/10511250000084881

United States Census Bureau (2010). *QuickFacts: Indiana Borough, Pennsylvania.* Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/4236816.

United States Census Bureau. (2015). *QuickFacts: Indiana Borough, Pennsylvania.* Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/4236816.

Urdan, T. C. (2010). *Statistics in plain English*, (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

U.S. Department of Justice. (2014). *2014 crime in the United States: Pennsylvania offenses known to law enforcement by city, 2014*. Retrieved from https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2014/crime-in-the-u.s.-2014/tables/table-8/table-8-by-state/Table_8_Offenses_Known_to_Law_Enforcement_by_Pennsylvania_by_City_2014.xls.

Vandiver, D. M., & Dupalo, J. R. (2013). Factors that affect college students' perceptions of rape: What is the role of gender and other situational factors? *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology, 57*(2), 592-612.

Varelas, N., & Foley, L. A. (1998). Blacks' and Whites' perceptions of interracial and intraracial date rape. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 138*(3), 382-400.

Viki, G. T., Abrams, D., & Masser, B. (2004). Evaluating stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent sexism in perpetrator blame and recommended sentence length. *Law and Human Behavior, 28*(3), 295-303. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy-iup.klnpa.org/10.1023/B:LAHU.0000029140.72880.69

Vittinghoff, E., & McCulloch, C. E. (2007). Relaxing the rule of ten events per variable in logistic and cox regression. *American Journal of Epidemiology, 165*(6), 710-718. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwk052

Walters, M. L., Chen, J., & Breiding, M J. (2013). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 findings on victimization by sexual orientation.* Retrieved from Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Division of Violence Prevention: http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/pdf/NISVS_SOfindings.pdf.

Ward, C. (1988). The attitudes towards rape victims scale: Construction, validation and cross-cultural applicability. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12*(2), 127-146. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1988.tb00932.x

Waring, S., Alison, L., Cunningham, S., & Whitfield, K. C. (2013). The impact of accountability on motivational goals and the quality of advice provided in crisis negotiations. *Psychology, Public Policy & Law, 19*(2), 137-150.

Whatley, M. A. (2005). The effect of participant sex, victim dress, and traditional attitudes on causal judgments for marital rape victims. *Journal of Family Violence, 20*(3), 191-200. doi:10.1007/s10896-005-3655-8

White, B. H., & Robinson Kurpius, S. E. (2002). Effects of victim sex and sexual orientation of perceptions of rape. *Sex Roles, 46*(5/6), 191-200.

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

Workman, J. E., & Freeburg, E. W. (1999). An examination of date rape, victim dress, and perceiver variables within the context of the attribution theory. *Sex Roles, 41*(3/4), 261-277.

Yamawaki, N. (2007). Rape perception and the function of ambivalent sexism and gender-role traditionality. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(4), 406-423.

Yamawaki, N., & Tschanz, B. T. (2005). Rape perception differences between Japanese and American college students: On the mediating influence of gender role traditionally. *Sex Roles, 52*(5/6), 379-392.

Yarmey, A. D. (1985). Older and younger adults' attributions of responsibility toward rape victims and rapists. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 17*(4), 327-338. doi:http://doi.org/proxy-iup/klnpa.org/10.1037/h0080045

Appendix A

Email to Students

My name is Samantha Gavin. I am a doctoral candidate for the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice. For my dissertation, I am conducting a research study examining students' perceptions of rape. As part of the study, you will view four (4) videos and fill out a survey following each video. Viewing the simulations and completing the surveys should take approximately 15-20 minutes

I am reaching out to you, asking you to participate in the study. In total, this process will take a maximum of 20 minutes to complete. All information will be kept anonymous, held within a password protected file, and destroyed after three years, as per federal regulations.

If you would like to participate in this study, please click the link below, carefully read the informed consent, acknowledge your voluntary participation in the study, and follow the directions.

If you have any questions or concerns, do not hesitate to ask. You may contact myself, or Dr. Erika Frenzel, my dissertation chair. This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724-357-7730).

Samantha M. Gavin
s.m.gavin@iup.edu

Dr. Erika Frenzel, Ph.D.
Department of Criminology
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Wilson Hall, Room 205
724-357-5933
e.frenzel@iup.edu

Appendix B

Passive Informed Consent

My name is Samantha Gavin. I am a doctoral candidate for the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice. For my dissertation, I am conducting a research study examining students' perceptions of rape. You are invited to participate in this research study as you are an Indiana University of Pennsylvania undergraduate student. The following information is provided in order to help you make an informed decision whether or not to participate. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask. You may contact myself, or Dr. Erika Frenzel, my dissertation chair. You are eligible to participate because you are currently enrolled as an undergraduate student at Indiana University of Pennsylvania main campus.

The purpose of this study is to determine how college students perceive rape through viewing videos. It will be determined how such perceptions are influenced not only by the videos themselves, but personal characteristics as well. Participation in this study will require approximately 15-20 minutes of your time. Participation or non-participation will not affect you in any legal or academic matters.

You will view four, brief (two minute) videos. ***Warning: these videos contain sexual content and may trigger an adverse reaction.*** After each video you will be provided with a survey. The surveys will consist of questions pertaining to the videos you observed as well as demographic information. The information you provide on these surveys will be anonymous and will not be shared with anyone.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to decide to not participate in this study or to withdraw at any time. If you choose to participate, you may withdraw at any time by exiting out of this session. Upon your request to withdraw, all information which you have provided will be destroyed. Once you have completed the surveys however, you cannot request to withdraw from the study. If you choose to participate, all information will remain anonymous. Your response will be considered only in combination with responses from other participants. All information collected will be held on the researcher's laptop, within a password protected file. The data will be held for three years, as per federal regulations, before being destroyed.

By clicking "yes I wish to volunteer in this study", you are voluntarily providing your consent to participate in this study. Therefore, those of you who do not wish to participate in this study, or are under the age of 18 years, may exit the study now. Upon completing or exiting out of the study, you will automatically be emailed contact information for local counseling services.

If you have any questions or concerns, do not hesitate to ask.

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724-357-7730).

Samantha M. Gavin
s.m.gavin@iup.edu

Dr. Erika Frenzel, Ph.D.
Department of Criminology
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Wilson Hall, Room 205
724-357-5933
e.frenzel@iup.edu

Appendix C

Survey Questionnaire

SIM1

For this section, based your answers on *the simulation you just watched*. Circle the number that most accurately depicts your opinion.

1: Do you consider this incident to be a rape?

YES NO

2: How much desire did Rebecca and Emily have for intercourse?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Desire) (Complete Desire)

3: John was dressed in a provocative manner.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)

4: John knew Rebecca and Emily.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)

5: Was John's actions influenced by the use of drugs or alcohol?

YES NO

6: How much did John provoke this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Not at all) (To a great extent)

7: How much control did John have of this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Control) (Complete Control)

8: How much responsibility did John have in this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Responsibility) (Complete Responsibility)

9: How much desire did John have for intercourse?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Desire)

10: Rebecca and Emily knew John.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)

11: How much control did Rebecca and Emily have of this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Control) (Complete Control)

12: How much responsibility did Rebecca and Emily have in this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Responsibility) (Complete Responsibility)

13: Did Rebecca and Emily use force to engage in sexual activity with (victim's name)?

YES NO

14: How much did Rebecca and Emily provoke this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Not at all) (To a great extent)

15: Did Rebecca and Emily threaten to harm John?

YES NO

16: Was John conscious during the incident?

YES NO

For this section, based your answers on *the simulation you just watched*. Circle the number that most accurately depicts your opinion.

1: Do you consider this incident to be a rape?

YES NO

2: How much desire did Rebecca and Emily have for intercourse?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Desire) (Complete Desire)

3: John was dressed in a provocative manner.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)

4: John knew Rebecca and Emily.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)

5: Was John's actions influenced by the use of drugs or alcohol?

YES NO

6: How much did John provoke this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Not at all) (To a great extent)

7: How much control did John have of this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Control) (Complete Control)

8: How much responsibility did John have in this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Responsibility) (Complete Responsibility)

9: How much desire did John have for intercourse?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Desire)

10: Rebecca and Emily knew John.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)

11: How much control did Rebecca and Emily have of this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Control) (Complete Control)

12: How much responsibility did Rebecca and Emily have in this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Responsibility) (Complete Responsibility)

13: Did Rebecca and Emily use force to engage in sexual activity with (victim's name)?

YES NO

14: How much did Rebecca and Emily provoke this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Not at all) (To a great extent)

15: Did Rebecca and Emily threaten to harm John?

YES NO

16: Was John conscious during the incident?

YES NO

For this section, based your answers on *the simulation you just watched*. Circle the number that most accurately depicts your opinion.

1: Do you consider this incident to be a rape?

YES NO

2: How much desire did Rebecca and Emily have for intercourse?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Desire) (Complete Desire)

3: John was dressed in a provocative manner.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)

4: John knew Rebecca and Emily.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)

5: Was John's actions influenced by the use of drugs or alcohol?

YES NO

6: How much did John provoke this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Not at all) (To a great extent)

7: How much control did John have of this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Control) (Complete Control)

8: How much responsibility did John have in this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Responsibility) (Complete Responsibility)

9: How much desire did John have for intercourse?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Desire)

10: Rebecca and Emily knew John.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)

11: How much control did Rebecca and Emily have of this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Control) (Complete Control)

12: How much responsibility did Rebecca and Emily have in this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Responsibility) (Complete Responsibility)

13: Did Rebecca and Emily use force to engage in sexual activity with (victim's name)?

YES NO

14: How much did Rebecca and Emily provoke this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Not at all) (To a great extent)

15: Did Rebecca and Emily threaten to harm John?

YES NO

16: Was John conscious during the incident?

YES NO

For this section, based your answers on *the simulation you just watched*. Circle the number that most accurately depicts your opinion.

1: Do you consider this incident to be a rape?

YES NO

2: How much desire did Rebecca and Emily have for intercourse?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Desire) (Complete Desire)

3: John was dressed in a provocative manner.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)

4: John knew Rebecca and Emily.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)

5: Was John's actions influenced by the use of drugs or alcohol?

YES NO

6: How much did John provoke this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Not at all) (To a great extent)

7: How much control did John have of this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Control) (Complete Control)

8: How much responsibility did John have in this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Responsibility) (Complete Responsibility)

9: How much desire did John have for intercourse?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Desire)

10: Rebecca and Emily knew John.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Strongly disagree) (Strongly agree)

11: How much control did Rebecca and Emily have of this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Control) (Complete Control)

12: How much responsibility did Rebecca and Emily have in this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(No Responsibility) (Complete Responsibility)

13: Did Rebecca and Emily use force to engage in sexual activity with (victim's name)?

YES NO

14: How much did Rebecca and Emily provoke this situation?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Not at all) (To a great extent)

15: Did Rebecca and Emily threaten to harm John?

YES NO

16: Was John conscious during the incident?

YES NO

For this section, check the box to the left of your answer choice.

For example:

☐ **Male**
☐ **Female**

When appropriate, write in your answers.

17: What is your gender?

☐ Male
☐ Female
☐ Other _____

18: What racial group do you *most* identify with?

☐ White
☐ Black
☐ Asian
☐ Hispanic
☐ Other _____

19: What is your major?

_____

20: Do you play on a sports team for IUP?

☐ Yes
☐ No

21: Are you a member of a Greek Social Fraternity or a Greek Social Sorority?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

22: Have you ever read or had the IUP policy pertaining to sexual assault explained to you?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unknown

23: Please mark all of the following events that you have gone to or participated in, that have related to sexual assault events.

- ☐ Six O'clock Series
- ☐ Haven Project
- ☐ Take Back the Night
- ☐ Green Light Campaign
- ☐ Rainn Day
- ☐ Turn the Red Zone Green
- ☐ Bystander Step Up Training
- ☐ Sexual Assault Awareness Month

Appendix D

Counseling Resources

The Counseling Center
Suites on Maple East, G31
901 Maple Street
Indiana, PA 15705
724-357-2621

Client Services: 8:00am – 4:30pm
Walk-In Hours:
Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday → 1:00pm – 3:00pm
Wednesday → 11:00am – Noon and 2:30pm – 3:30pm

Alice Paul House
PO Box 417
Indiana, PA 15701
724-349-4444

Crime Victim's Hotline
1-800-435-7249
24-hour hotline