

With the Compliments of Springer Publishing Company, LLC

Violence and Victims

SPRINGER  PUBLISHING COMPANY

www.springerpub.com/vv

The Role of Race and Respectability in Attributions of Responsibility for Acquaintance Rape

Erin C. Dupuis, PhD

Jason A. Clay

Loyola University New Orleans

Previous researchers have explored the role of race and respectability, independently, on attributions of responsibility; however, the interaction between race and respectability has not been analyzed in situations of acquaintance rape. Participants ($N = 241$) read a vignette detailing a case of acquaintance rape that manipulated the race of both the victim and the perpetrator and the respectability of the victim. Regression and ANOVA analyses indicated that victim race and respectability interacted in such a way that when Black victims were respectable, they were held less responsible than respectable White victims; however, less respected Black victims were held more responsible than less respected White victims. Manipulating perpetrator race revealed surprising results; the White perpetrator was found guilty more often than the Black perpetrator (although this appeared to be related to victim race).

Keywords: responsibility; acquaintance rape; victim blaming; respectability

One common misperception of rape is that it occurs between strangers (Estrich, 1987); however, acquaintance rape occurs more frequently than stranger rape and results in more arrests and criminal trials. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2008), 65% of all rapes/sexual assaults in the United States occur between nonstrangers, with 46% occurring between individuals who know each other well (not including relatives) and 13.5% occurring between casual acquaintances. Unfortunately, because rape myths indicate that rapes occur between strangers, victims of acquaintance rape are usually held more responsible than victims of stranger rape (Bridges & McGrail, 1989; Calhoun, Selby, & Warring, 1976; Donnerstein & Berkowitz, 1981; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Janoff-Bulman, Timko, & Carli, 1985; Muehlenhard & Hollabaugh, 1988; Sinclair & Bourne, 1998), leading to further victimization by the legal system (Campbell et al., 1999).

Approximately 122,000 cases of acquaintance rape (i.e., the offender is well known or casually acquainted) were reported to the police in 2008 (Bureau of Justice Statistics). Consequently, it is not surprising that researchers have deemed it important to study attributions of responsibility using the “rape perception framework” (Krahe, 1991; Pollard, 1992). The framework investigates the various victim, perpetrator, and situational factors that lead to victim blaming. Two factors leading to victim blaming include the race of the

victim and perpetrator (Feild, 1979; George & Martinez, 2002; Hymes, Leinart, Rowe, & Rogers, 1993; Ugwuegbu, 1979; Varelas & Foley, 1998; Willis, 1992) and the respectability of the victim including prior sexual history and dating history (Cann, Calhoun, & Selby, 1979; Cohn, Dupuis, & Brown, 2009; Heaven, Connors, & Pretorius, 1998; Kanekar & Kolsawalla, 1977; Luginbuhl & Mullin, 1981; Spencer, 1987). The purpose of this article is to explore the interaction between race and respectability; that is, if respectability is manipulated, will it be used to justify racial disparities in attributions of responsibility, guilt, and sentencing?

VICTIM BLAMING AND RESPECTABILITY

Rape is an underreported crime for many reasons, including the victim's apprehension that she will not be believed by law enforcement or by the public (see Alicke & Yurak, 1995). Common rape myths include that women "ask" to be raped, fantasize about rape, lie about rape, or deserve to be raped if they dress provocatively or drink too much alcohol (Burt, 1980; Kanekar, Kolsawalla, & D'Souza, 1981; Stormo, Lang, & Stritzke, 1997). The typical rape victim is often thought of as a prostitute or seductress, a woman who dresses and behaves in a sexual manner (Mazelan, 1980; Spencer, 1987).

Jones and Aronson (1973) showed that defensive attributions may be used to blame victims of rape when the victim has seemingly not deserved her fate (such as respectable married women or virgins); however, replications of their methodology has sometimes resulted in contrasting findings (Heaven et al., 1998; Kahn et al., 1977; Kanekar & Kolsawalla, 1977). A large body of research has instead shown that less respectable women are blamed to a greater degree than more respectable women (Acock & Ireland, 1983; Cohn et al., 2009; Feldman-Summers & Lindner, 1976; Kanekar et al., 1981). It is likely that less respectable victims are believed to be more likely to offer "token resistance" (i.e., saying no, but meaning yes; see Muehlenhard & Hollabaugh, 1988) than more respectable victims.

Several studies have also shown that men are more likely to blame a rape victim than are women (Bridges & McGrail, 1989; Calhoun et al., 1976; Cohn et al., 2009; George & Martinez, 2002; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Howells et al., 1984), whereas other studies have reported that women attribute greater fault to a rape victim or have reported no gender differences at all (Acock & Ireland, 1983). The participant's perceived similarity to the rape victim may be a differentiating factor for gender differences in victim blaming; that is, a woman may attribute more, or less, blame to a "similar" female victim (Gerber, Cronin, & Steigman, 2004; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Kanekar et al., 1981).

RACE AND RACISM

Victim and perpetrator biological features also play a role in attributions of responsibility. For example, Kanekar et al. (1981) found that female participants believed that an unattractive woman was more likely to be raped than an attractive one. Kanekar and colleagues postulated that attractive women used defensive attributions to convince themselves that rape was more likely to happen to a woman who was unattractive. It would be likely that race would also be used as a biological feature indicating similarity. Furthermore, race is also an important variable in the formation of group identity and can lead to in-group bias.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (2008) indicate that approximately 75% of rapes/sexual assaults against White women are committed by White men and 75% of rapes/sexual assaults against Black women are committed by Black men. Intraracial rapes, therefore, occur more frequently than interracial rapes; however, a racial rape myth involves White women being raped by Black men (Brownmiller, 1975; Giacomassi & Dull, 1986; LaFree, 1980). This Black male/White female rape myth affects beliefs about culpability and responsibility. These racial biases can play out in the legal system. Ugwuegbu (1979) found that White participants were more likely to hold a Black defendant culpable if he raped a White woman than if a White defendant raped a Black woman. The “myth of the black rapist” also leads participants to attribute more responsibility to a Black perpetrator than to a White perpetrator (Varelas & Foley, 1998). However, Hymes and colleagues (1993) argued that Blacks are not necessarily placed at a disadvantage in the legal system. What appears to affect jurors is the “racial relationship between the victim and the defendant and what they thought this relationship implied about the victim’s willingness” (Hymes et al., 1993, p. 632). In their study, Hymes and colleagues varied the race of the defendant and the victim in an acquaintance rape case. They found that a Black defendant was more likely to be convicted if he raped a White victim and a White defendant was more likely to be convicted if he raped a Black victim. Thus, perpetrators of interracial rapes are more likely to be convicted (Hymes et al., 1993).

Results related to race and victim attributions of responsibility have varied. For example, Varelas and Foley (1998) found that White participants attributed more responsibility to a Black woman raped by a Black man than to a White woman raped by a Black man. On the other hand, Black participants were more likely to blame the Black woman if a White man had raped her. Other researchers have found victims raped by a perpetrator of the same race (i.e., White male/White female) are blamed more and/or attributed more responsibility than when the rape is intraracial (George & Martinez, 2002). These results may be caused by a bias against women who date outside of their race (George & Martinez, 2002; Willis, 1992). For example, Willis (1992) found that Black victims are seen as less truthful and more responsible than White victims; however, White victims are also seen as less truthful when they have been raped by an acquaintance who is Black than one who is White. George and Martinez (2002) further showed that racism was a significant predictor of men’s victim blaming; although, racism only affected women’s blaming if the victim was involved in an interracial rape.

Based on the mixed results of past research regarding race and respectability, this study was conducted to examine whether information given to participants regarding both race and respectability would play a role in attributions of responsibility. As previously discussed, researchers have examined race and they have examined respectability, but the two variables have not been examined in the same study. In this study, four hypotheses were analyzed. First, when victim respectability was high, Black victims would be held less responsible than White victims, but when victim respectability was low and could be used in place of race, Black victims would be held more responsible than White victims. Second, victims of interracial rapes would be held more responsible than victims of intraracial rapes. The third hypothesis related to the perpetrator; Black perpetrators would be held more responsible than White perpetrators.

Based on past research, in this study, we also controlled for the specific participant variables of racism and gender to show that victim race, perpetrator race, and respectability would emerge as significant predictors of victim and perpetrator responsibility.

METHOD

Participants

To gain a diverse community sample, participants ($N = 257$) were recruited using Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) and were compensated \$0.25 upon completion of the study (see Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011, for a review of MTurk procedures and viability). An analysis of race indicated that 65% of participants identified as White and 13% identified as Black. To simplify the results, only participants who indicated that their race was White or Black were included in the final analysis, thus the final $N = 241$. Of those participants, 58% were between the ages of 18 and 25 years, 20% were between the ages of 26 and 35 years, and 22% were older than 35 years. In terms of gender, 67% of the participants were women.

Materials

Vignettes. Participants were given one of the eight written vignettes that varied the race of the victim and the perpetrator and also varied the respectability of the victim. These vignettes were modeled on an actual case in the Louisiana Court of Appeals. The first page of the packet was designed to look like a criminal case docket, but the case number indicated to the researcher which vignette was being given (i.e., NO. 2010-BB-0453 indicated that the vignette was for the Black perpetrator/Black victim with low respectability). The first paragraph of testimony gave identifying information for the victim and perpetrator (e.g., "The victim, Alyson Jordan [25, White female, black hair/brown eyes, 5' 6"], was walking along Galvez Street near Music Street").

The vignette gave brief victim testimony, witness testimony, and defendant testimony (three pages total). The victim described walking down a street, meeting the defendant along the way, and being dragged into a building and raped. It was revealed that the victim had previously, and only briefly, dated the defendant but had not seen him in a year. Officer testimony indicated that the officer had, in fact, seen a man coming out a building and leaving quickly before noticing the victim who looked disheveled and was crying. A witness for the defense claimed that she was with the defendant when he received a call from the victim and that, in her presence, the victim and defendant had met up and left together. Finally, the defendant's testimony gave the respectability of the victim. He stated that the victim had called him and had asked why he did not call her. The defendant admitted that the two of them had sex, but claimed it was consensual. He then either described the victim as a "party girl" whom he had seen pickup numerous men in bars or he stated that he was confused that she would accuse him given her "sweet nature" who really never dated much and never went to bars. Pilot study data ($N = 30$) indicated that college undergraduate students believed the vignettes were based on an actual rape case and manipulation checks ensured that participants had read the case before answering further questions.

Measures

The first measure participants completed was the responsibility questionnaire. The questions were based on past research by Cohn et al. (2009) and consisted of 22 questions regarding victim and perpetrator responsibility. All items were based on a 7-point Likert scale of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*); examples include, "Alyson overreacted

to the situation” and “Darnell planned it.” A rotated principal components factor analysis was conducted to force the items onto two factors. These factors were named “victim responsibility” (10 items, Cronbach’s $\alpha = .95$, $M = 25.87$, $SD = 14.22$) and “perpetrator responsibility” (7 items, Cronbach’s $\alpha = .85$, $M = 39.74$, $SD = 8.08$); three items were omitted because of eigenvalues lower than .50.

Participants were also asked if they would find the defendant guilty if the case went to trial ($-1 = \text{no}$, $1 = \text{yes}$) and, if they were to find the defendant guilty, what sentence they would impose ($1 = \text{none}$, $2 = \text{probation}$, $3 = \text{jail: less than one year}$; $4 = \text{jail: 1–5 years}$; $5 = \text{jail: 6–10 years}$; or $6 = \text{jail: more than 10 years}$).

Finally, participants completed the Symbolic Racism Scale (Henry & Sears, 2002). This scale includes eight items and it assesses racism directed toward Blacks (e.g., “Over the past few years, Blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve”). Seven of the items are assessed using a 4-point Likert scale and one item is assessed using a 3-point Likert scale. Scores on the racism scale ranged from 8 to 29 ($M = 17.36$, $SD = 4.18$) and the scale had okay reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .75$).

Procedure

The study was completed via the SurveyGizmo online survey site. Each vignette was set up as a separate survey and the MTurk “hit” listed all of the surveys (only by an identifying number for the researcher) and asked participants to copy and paste one of the links into a separate Internet window. MTurk restrictions, thus, disallowed participants from completing more than one survey.

Only MTurk users from the United States, 18 years and older, were allowed to participate. Individuals were paid \$0.25 for successful completion of the study (see Buhrmester, 2010, for information regarding using MTurk in research). The first page of the survey included all of the consent information with a basic description of the study’s purpose. Participants indicated consent by clicking “next” and being directed to the vignette page. For anonymity purposes, the final page of the survey included a blank text field that asked the participants to enter a unique 5-digit number; this number was then also entered on the MTurk completion page. The researcher matched the unique identifiers and participants were paid if the identifiers matched (no participants “cheated”—all participants who entered a 5-digit number on MTurk had completed the survey entirely). Upon hitting “submit,” participants were brought to a separate debriefing page and were again provided with the researcher’s contact information.

RESULTS

Correlation analyses (see Table 1) were conducted between the independent variables (IVs; victim race, perpetrator race, and victim respectability), the dependent variables (DVs; victim responsibility, perpetrator responsibility, perpetrator guilt, and perpetrator sentencing), and the participant variables (age, race, gender, and racism scores). Several of the variables of interest (i.e., victim race, perpetrator race, participant gender and race, perpetrator guilt, and victim respectability) were dichotomous variables, thus, phi coefficients were analyzed for these variables when they were correlated with each other. Point biserial correlations were conducted between the dichotomous and continuous variables.

TABLE 1. Intercorrelations of IVs, DVs, and Participant Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Victim Responsibility										
2. Perpetrator Responsibility	-.80*									
3. Guilt	-.47*	.65*								
4. Sentencing	-.30*	.31*	.28*							
5. Victim Race	.04	-.05	-.07	-.03						
6. Perpetrator Race	-.06	.05	.16*	-.12	-.00					
7. Respectability	.15*	-.08	-.07	-.03	-.02	-.02				
8. Participant Age	-.00	.13	.00	-.01	-.19*	-.01	-.04			
9. Participant Race	.02	-.09	.00	.12	-.10	-.07	-.08	-.12		
10. Participant Gender	-.22*	.06	-.09	-.11	-.04	-.01	-.16*	-.12	-.04	
11. Racism	.22*	-.11	.02	-.05	-.03	-.09	-.07	.05	-.13*	-.18*

Note. IVs = independent variables; DVs = dependent variables.

* $p < .05$.

Victim Responsibility

Significant correlations emerged between the victim responsibility DV and victim respectability, participant gender, and racism. To further analyze these results, a hierarchical regression was conducted entering participant gender and racism on the first step and victim respectability on the second step. Zero-order, part, and partial correlations of each predictor with victim responsibility were requested. Results are summarized in Table 2. The overall regression was statistically significant, $R = .31$, $R^2 = .10$, adjusted $R^2 = .08$, $F(3, 220) = 7.80$, $p < .001$. To assess the contributions of the individual predictors, the t ratios for the individual regression slopes were examined for each variable in the step when it first entered the analysis. In Step 1, racism was statistically significant, $t(221) = 2.76$, $p = .006$, $sr^2_{unique} = .03$. Gender was also statistically significant, $t(221) = -2.68$, $p = .008$, $sr^2_{unique} = .03$. The nature of the slopes was as expected; participants scoring higher in racism and men held the victim more responsible. It should be noted, however, that the unique prediction of variance for both predictors was small. Respectability significantly increased the R^2 when it was entered on Step 2, $t(220) = 2.09$, $p = .04$, $sr^2_{unique} = .02$. The slope for respectability was as predicted. Victims lower in respectability (2 = low) were held more responsible than victims higher in respectability (1 = high).

To determine if there were any interactions between victim responsibility (the DV), victim race (Black, White), perpetrator race (Black, White), and victim respectability (High, Low), an ANOVA was conducted. See Table 3 for cell means. As predicted,

TABLE 2. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Victim Responsibility From Racism, Participant Gender, and Victim Respectability

Predictor	<i>B</i>	β	<i>sr</i> ²	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2
Step 1				.08	.07
Racism	0.45	.18*			
Gender	-3.71	-.18*			
Step 2				.10	.08
Respectability	2.72	.14*			

* $p < .05$.

there was a significant victim race by respectability interaction: $F_{A \times B}(1, 220) = 4.49$, $p = .035$. However, the corresponding effect size estimate, $\eta_{2\text{partial}} = .02$, indicated a weak effect. Planned comparisons indicated that the difference between means for the White victim based on respectability was not significant ($p = .97$); however, the difference between means for the Black victim based on respectability was significant ($p = .002$); thus, respectability did not change participants' attributions for the White victim, but did change attributions for the Black victim. When the Black victim was respectable, she was held less responsible ($M = 18.65$) than when she was not respectable ($M = 24.29$). Comparisons also revealed that the main difference between respectability based on the race of the victim was found in the high respectability condition; thus, participants differentiated between victims with a high respectability ($p = .02$), but not between victims with low respectability ($p = .35$). Black respectable victims were held less responsible ($M = 18.65$) than White respectable victims ($M = 22.84$).

There was also a significant interaction between victim race, perpetrator race, and respectability: $F_{A \times B \times C}(1, 220) = 4.22$, $p = .041$. However, the corresponding effect size estimate, $\eta_{2\text{partial}} = .02$, indicated a weak effect. Planned comparisons indicated that

TABLE 3. Means for Victim Responsibility Interaction Effects

	Low Respectability	High Respectability
White V	22.95 (1.28)	22.84 (1.38)
Black V	24.29 (1.22)	18.65 (1.34)
White V/White P	24.21 (1.85)	22.96 (2.09)
White V/Black P	21.68 (1.76)	22.72 (1.82)
Black V/Black P	27.86 (1.63)	18.00 (1.92)
Black V/White P	20.72 (1.82)	19.30 (1.88)

Note. Standard error is presented in parentheses. V = victim; P = perpetrator.

this effect was only significant if the victim and the perpetrator were both Black. When the victim was Black and the perpetrator was Black, the respectable victim was held less responsible ($M = 18.00$) than when she was not respectable ($M = 27.86$). This differentiation was not made for the relationship between White victim and perpetrators. When the victim was White and the perpetrator was White, the respectable victim was held less responsible ($M = 22.96$) than when she was not respectable ($M = 24.21$), but this difference was not significant.

Perpetrator Responsibility

No significant correlations emerged between the perpetrator responsibility DV and the other variables, thus it was not further analyzed. A significant correlation did emerge between the guilt DV and perpetrator race. An independent samples t test was conducted. The mean guilt ratings differed significantly, $t(237) = -2.56, p = .01$. Black perpetrators ($M = 0.05, SD = 1.00$) were less likely to be found guilty than White perpetrators ($M = 0.37, SD = 0.93$). The effect size, as indexed by η^2 , was .03. In other words, 67 of the Black perpetrators were found guilty whereas 76 of the White perpetrators were found guilty.

DISCUSSION

Previous research examining respectability and race has been mixed. Some researchers have reported that high respectability leads to greater victim blaming based on similarity to the participant (Jones & Aronson, 1973). Other researchers have reported that low respectability leads to greater victim blaming (Acock & Ireland, 1983; Cohn et al., 2009; Feldman-Summers & Lindner, 1976; Kanekar et al., 1981). Furthermore, some researchers have found that victims of interracial rapes are blamed more than victims of intraracial rapes (George & Martinez, 2002), whereas some researchers have reported opposite findings (Varelas & Foley, 1998). In this research, we further examined respectability and race; however, this research addressed gaps in the literature by manipulating both respectability and race to examine whether one has greater influence on participants' attributions than the other.

First, we hypothesized that Black victims would be held less responsible than White victims when respectability was high, but would be held more responsible than White victims when respectability was low. This hypothesis was supported, even when racism and gender were controlled for. Black victims were held less responsible than White victims, but only when respectability was high. When respectability was low, Black victims were held more responsible than White victims. We believe that participants did not want to appear racially biased by showing that they believed the Black victim was responsible when she had high respectability; however, when she had low respectability, participants were given an "out," a way of explaining why they held her responsible for her rape. We also hypothesized that victims of interracial rapes would be held more responsible than victims of intraracial rapes. This hypothesis was not supported. Perpetrator race did not emerge as a significant independent predictor of victim responsibility; however, an interaction between perpetrator race, victim race, and respectability did indicate that—when the respectable Black victim was held less responsible when raped by a Black perpetrator than a nonrespected Black victim raped by a Black perpetrator (i.e., Black victims of intraracial rapes were held more responsible, but only if their respectability was low).

The hypothesis that Black perpetrators would be held more responsible than White perpetrators was not supported. Perpetrator responsibility did not emerge as a significant variable; however, participants were more likely to find White perpetrators guilty than Black perpetrators. This effect trended toward more participants deciding the White perpetrator was guilty when he had raped a Black victim ($M = 0.55$, $SE = 0.13$) than when he had raped a White victim ($M = 0.17$, $SE = 0.13$; i.e., more decisions of “guilty” in interracial rapes, but only when the perpetrator was White).

This study was not without its limitations. First, the vignettes may have provided the participants with more information than intended. The case was based on an actual court of appeals docket and included information about the victim’s cell phone being taken by the defendant. Although this only accounted for less than one line in the vignette, some participants wrote about this information in the open-ended manipulation check (used to verify if participants had read the vignette) and asked why the telephone records were not included as testimony. Such extra evidentiary information may have negatively biased the participants toward the victim and may have caused them to doubt her story.

Furthermore, many of the effect sizes calculated in this study were weak. For example, the variables used to predict victim responsibility only accounted for about 8% of the variance in the model. It is possible that, although the results are statistically significant, these variables are not important in real world decisions.

Overall, this research fills in some of the gaps of past research related to attributions of responsibility for an acquaintance rape. Both race and respectability were manipulated and participants were asked about their perceptions of the victim and perpetrator’s responsibility. The study also used a more diverse sample and explored participant variables such as racism and gender to further extend past research (although the Black sample was fairly small and should be further examined in future research). Perhaps, the most important contribution of this research is the comparison of responsibility when race is manipulated compared to when respectability is manipulated. It appears that victim respectability interacts with victim race in the determination of her responsibility for an acquaintance rape.

REFERENCES

- 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*(2), 179–193. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00289622>
- Alicke, M. D., & Yurak, T. J. (1995). Perpetrator personality and judgments of acquaintance rape. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25*, 1900–1921.
- Bridges, J. S., & McGrail, C. A. (1989). Attributions of responsibility for date and stranger rape. *Sex Roles, 21*, 273–286.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: Men, women, and rape*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Buhrmester, M. (2010). *Amazon Mechanical Turk guide for social scientists*. Retrieved from <http://homepage.psy.utexas.edu/homepage/students/buhrmester/MTurk%20Guide.htm>
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon’s Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 6*(3), 3–5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1745691610393980>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2008). *Crime Victimization in the United States, Statistical Tables*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*, 217–230.

- Calhoun, L. G., Selby, J. W., & Warring, L. J. (1976). Social perception of the victim's causal role in rape: An exploratory examination of four factors. *Human Relations, 29*, 517–526.
- Campbell, R., Sefl, T., Barnes, H. E., Ahrens, C. E., Wasco, S. M., & Zaragoza-Diesfeld, Y. (1999). Community services for rape survivors: Enhancing psychological well-being or increasing trauma? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67*, 847–858. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.67.6.847>
- Cann, A., Calhoun, L. G., & Selby, J. W. (1979). Attributing responsibility to the victim of rape: Influence of information regarding past sexual experience. *Human Relations, 32*, 57–67.
- Cohn, E. S., Dupuis, E. C., & Brown, T. M. (2009). In the eye of the beholder: Do behavior and character affect victim and perpetrator responsibility for acquaintance rape?. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(7), 1513–1535. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00493.x>
- Donnerstein, E., & Berkowitz, L. (1981). Violent reactions in aggressive erotic films as a factor in violence against women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41*(4), 710–724.
- Estrich, S. (1987). *Real rape: How the legal system victimizes women who say No*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- 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*, 261–284.
- Feldman-Summers, S., & Lindner, K. (1976). Perceptions of victims and defendants in criminal assault cases. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 3*(2), 135–150. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/009385487600300203>
- George, W. H., & Martinez, L. J. (2002). Victim blaming in rape: Effects of victim and perpetrator race, type of rape, and participant racism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*, 110–119.
- Gerber, G. L., Cronin, J. M., & Steigman, H. J. (2004). Attributions of blame in sexual assault to perpetrators and victims of both genders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34*, 2149–2165.
- Giacopassi, D. J., & Dull, R. T. (1986). Gender and racial differences in the acceptance of rape myths within a college population. *Sex Roles, 15*, 63–75.
- 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*, 63–81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13552600802641649>
- Heaven, P. L., Connors, J., & Pretorius, A. (1998). Victim characteristics and attribution of rape blame in Australia and South Africa. *Journal of Social Psychology, 138*, 131–133.
- Henry, P. J., & Sears, D. O. (2002). The symbolic racism 2000 scale. *Political Psychology, 23*, 253–283.
- Howells, K., Shaw, F., Greasley, M., Robertson, J., Gloster, D., & Metcalfe, N. (1984). Perceptions of rape in a British sample: Effects of relationship, victim status, sex, and attitudes to women. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 23*, 35–40.
- Hymes, R. W., Leinart, M., Rowe, S., & Rogers, W. (1993). Acquaintance rape: The effect of race of defendant and race of victim on White juror decisions. *Journal of Social Psychology, 133*, 627–634.
- Janoff-Bulman, R., Timko, C., & Carli, L. L. (1985). Cognitive biases in blaming the victim. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 21*, 161–177.
- Jones, C., & Aronson, E. (1973). Attribution of fault to a rape victim as a function of respectability of the victim. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 26*, 415–419.
- Kahn, A., Gilbert, L. A., Latta, R. M., Deutsch, C., Hagen, R. L., Hill, M., . . . Wilson, D. W. (1977). Attribution of fault to a rape victim as a function of respectability of the victim: A failure to replicate or extend. *Representative Research in Social Psychology, 8*, 98–107.
- Kanekar, S., & Kolsawalla, M. B. (1977). Responsibility in relation to respectability. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 102*, 183–188.
- Kanekar, S., Kolsawalla, M. B., & D'Souza, A. (1981). Attribution of responsibility to a victim of rape. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 20*, 165–170.

- Krahe, B. (1991). Social psychological issues in the study of rape. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 2, 279-309.
- LaFree, G. D. (1980). The effect of sexual stratification by race on official reactions to rape. *American Sociological Review*, 45, 842-854.
- Luginbuhl, J., & Mullin, C. (1981). Rape and responsibility: How and how much is the victim blamed? *Sex Roles*, 7, 547-559.
- Mazelan, P. M. (1980). Stereotypes and perceptions of the victims of rape. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 5, 121-132.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Hollabaugh, L. C. (1988). Do women sometimes say no when they mean yes? The prevalence and correlates of women's token resistance to sex. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 872-879.
- Pollard, P. (1992). Judgments about victims and attackers in depicted rapes: A review. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 307-326.
- Sinclair, H. C., & Bourne, L. E. (1998). Cycle of blame or just world: Effects of legal verdict on gender patterns in rape myth acceptance and victim empathy. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 575-588.
- Spencer, C. C. (1987). Sexual assault: The second victimization. In L. L. Crites & W. L. Hepperle (Eds.), *Women, the courts, and equality*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Stormo, K. J., Lang, A. R., & Stritzke, W. G. K. (1997). Attributions about acquaintance rape: The role of alcohol and individual differences. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 279-305.
- Ugwuebu, D.C.E. (1979). Racial and evidential factors in juror attribution of legal responsibility. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 15, 133-146.
- Varelas, N., & Foley, L. A. (1998). Blacks' and Whites' perceptions of interracial and intraracial date rape. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 138(3), 392-400.
- Willis, C. E. (1992). The effect of sex role stereotype, victim and defendant race, and prior relationship on rape culpability attributions. *Sex Roles*, 26, 213-226.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank Alexis Gaddis, Nicole Harris, and Brianna Powell for their assistance with data collection.

Correspondence regarding this article should be directed to Erin C. Dupuis, PhD, Loyola University New Orleans, Department of Psychological Sciences, New Orleans, LA 70118. E-mail: edupuis@loyno.edu