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ABSTRACT

This study examined the effects of a gender specific questionnaire on college students' attitudinal responses about rape survivors. The Attitudes About Rape Survivors Scale was used in two versions, female specific and male specific, to measure one-hundred and eighty-three college students' attitudinal responses about rape survivors. The 2x2 factorial research design contained two main effects, gender and gender specific language, and one interaction, gender by gender specific language. The two-way ANOVA test of the main effects and interaction yielded significant results for gender, $F (1, 179) = 28.50$, $p < .001$, and gender specific language, $F (1, 179) = 11.08$, $p < .001$. No significant results were found for the interaction of gender by gender specific language, $F (1, 179) = .046$, $p < .831$. Additional findings regarding directional implications for the main effects, male target rape survivor, and structure of the items within the Attitudes About Rape Survivors Scale were also found. All findings were discussed with regard to implications for future research.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of recorded time rape has existed in practically every known society, from ancient Biblical times to modern day Western civilizations (Brownmiller, 1975). Rape, in addition to its existence throughout history, has been perpetuated through many means. Raping and pillaging has been a common activity by soldiers during many wars. Riots and revolutions, of either a religious or social nature, have often included acts of violence and rape. In addition, institutions such as slavery, war prison camps and criminal penitentiaries have many times used rape as a control measure. Finally, culture specific messages often times yield rape supportive myths, that have perpetuated its existence (Brownmiller, 1975).

As a result of rape's historical perpetuation, it is still very much alive in society today. The prevalence of rape, in American society is staggering. According to the latest survey conducted by the Senate Judiciary Committee, every week 2,000 women are raped (Senate Judiciary Committee, 1993). In 1992 it was found by the National Victim Center, that 20,000 men are raped every year (National Victim Center, 1992a). Additionally, even when
rape is constricted to "Forcible Rape", only physically forced sexual penetration, the reports still yield 1.3 rapes per minute, totalling 683,000 per year (National Victim Center, 1992).

This staggering existence of rape, in American society, precludes a population of survivors of the crime. These survivors, in addition to the trauma they endure as a result of victimization, must also endure the perceptions that people form about them. These perceptual ideas, that are formed about rape survivors, often times result in attitudes that are held about the survivor and their rape experience.

An attitude is a way of thinking or feeling about a certain situation, object, person or idea (Allport, 1935; Burczyk & Standing, 1989; Bridges, 1991; Bridges & McGrail, 1989; Gerdes, Dammann & Heilig, 1988; Larsen & Long, 1988; Myers, 1993; Sundberg, Barbaree, & Marshall, 1991). However, attitudes formed about rape survivors, are more often than not detrimental to the survivor. These negative attitudes can result in blame attributed to the survivor for their rape (Bridges & McGrail, 1989; Sundberg et al., 1991), or perpetuation of rape supportive beliefs, which purport deservingness on the part of the survivor (Lottes, 1991).

Therefore, within the research arena, it has been deemed necessary to assess attitudes about rape survivors and try to ascertain a means of counterbalancing them
(Brownmiller, 1975; Koss & Harvey, 1991; Ward, 1988; Warshaw 1987). This study is concerned with the former premise, assessing attitudes about rape survivors. Assessment of these attitudes is necessary to lead to understanding of how to counterbalance their effect.

However, in assessment of attitudes, generally questionnaires are employed (Dockery & Bedeian, 1989; LaPiere, 1934; Schuman & Johnson, 1976). Questionnaires can be problematic. They can contain language which may bias results (Dockery & Bedeian, 1989; LaPiere, 1934). One specific form of language, that can bias results obtained from a questionnaire, is sexist language (Buck, 1990; Greene & Rubin, 1991; Kasof, 1993). Attitude assessment, within the rape research arena, is often times laden with sexist questionnaires which exclude the male gender (Muehlenhard, Powch, Phelps, & Giusti, 1992).

In assessing attitudes that deal with the subject of rape, implementation of a non-sexist approach may prove to be effective and enlightening (Buck, 1990; Gastil, 1990; Harrigan & Lucic, 1988; Kasof, 1993). As one researcher, Charlene Muehlenhard, stated,

It is crucial that researchers examine the assumptions and biases underlying the terms that they use, as well as the ways in which these terms constrain their results and conclusions. This is particularly crucial in fields that use popular terms...The study of sexual assault is such a field (Muehlenhard

The non-sexist element would allow one to control for constrainment of results and conclusions due to gender exclusion.

However, when approaching non-sexist research, generic pronouns have been the most common language usage (Buck, 1990; Gastil, 1990; Greene & Rubin, 1991; Harrigan & Lucic, 1988; Muehlenhard et al., 1992). These approaches have been criticized in a two fold manner. First of all, gender generic terminology is thought to ignore the intricate differences that exist between men and women’s sexual experiences (Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988; Muehlenhard et al., 1992). Secondly, the most common usage of gender inclusive terminology is "he/she" (Buck, 1990; Gastil, 1990; Greene & Rubin, 1991; Kasof, 1993). This is thought to elicit more images of male than female (Cole, 1983; Gastil, 1990).

Therefore, in considering non-sexist research, one should take into account the aforementioned criticisms of previous attempts, which employed gender generics and gender inclusions. Through such a consideration, a gender specific approach might be more appropriate. This would entail the usage of gender specific language aligned with the population of interest. Thus, the pronoun "he" would be used in wording questionnaires for a male population and
"she" would be used in wording of questionnaires for a female population.

This gender specific approach for non-sexist research can be legitimized for assessment of attitudes about rape survivors. The usage of specific pronouns allows for the population, whether male or female, to identify with the rape survivor. This identification with the rape survivor, according to the defensive attribution theory, is the key to less blame being attributed to the rape survivor (Gilmartin-Zena, 1983; Shaver, 1970). Thus, by implementing the gender specific approach, one may retain a more accurate assessment of attitudes about rape survivors. An assessment which is not confounded by sexist or gender exclusionary language.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to obtain college students' attitudinal responses about rape survivors and ascertain if these responses are at all affected by a gender specific questionnaire. It was hoped the results of this study would yield valuable information for assessing attitudes about rape and its survivors. It has been purported that the use of gender exclusionary language within research can yield sexist tainted results (Buck, 1990; Galivan, 1991; Gastil, 1990; Greene & Rubin, 1991; Hale, Nevels, Lott & Titus; Harrigan & Lucic, 1988; Kasof,
1993). In this study the element of language was manipulated to ascertain the actual effect gender specific language might have upon attitudinal responses about rape survivors. Therefore, this study attempted to control for the gender exclusive nature of rape research in order to obtain a more accurate assessment of attitudes about rape survivors.

Hypotheses

Hypotheses that were formulated for study are as follows:

Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis proposed by the researcher pertains to gender.

Ho1: M1=M2

The mean scores of the female subjects and the male subjects are equal.

Ha1: M1≠M2

The mean scores of the female subjects and the male subjects are not equal.

Where:

M1=mean score of the female subjects
M2=mean score of the male subjects

Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis proposed by the researcher pertains to gender specific language.

Ho2: M1=M2

The mean scores of the subjects in the
female specific condition and the subjects in the male specific condition are equal.

Ha2: $M_1 - M_2$

The mean scores of the subjects in the female specific condition and the subjects in the male specific condition are not equal.

Where:
$M_1$ = mean score of the female specific condition subjects
$M_2$ = mean score of the male specific condition subjects

Hypothesis Three

The third hypothesis proposed by the researcher pertains to the interaction of gender by gender specific language.

$Ho_3$: There is no gender X gender specific language interaction.

$Ha_3$: There is a gender X gender specific language interaction.

**This hypothesis is not stated symbolically since there are four possibilities of finding significance and $Ha_3$ is only looking for any one of them in order to reject $Ho_3$.**

Definition of Terms

Specific terminology, as used in this study, will be reviewed here in order to further clarify the objectives and goals of the research.

ARVS-Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale. The original instrument compiled by Colleen Ward (Ward, 1988).

It is used in this study as the language
ARSS-Attitudes About Rape Survivors Scale. This is the gender specific modified version of the original ARVS. It is used in two forms within this study.

ARSS1-Attitudes About Rape Survivors Scale, version one. This version contains female specific language.

ARSS2-Attitudes About Rape Survivors Scale, version two. This version contains male specific language.

Attitude- This psychological concept is quite elastic, encompassing more than one meaning. An attitude can be of both a mental and a motor set (Allport, 1935; Dockery & Bedeian, 1989; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). An attitude is defined by Allport to be a "neuropsychic state of readiness for mental and physical activity" (Allport, 1935, p. 790). More recently, it has been further delineated that an attitude has a tripartite distinction. It includes affective, cognitive and behavioral components (Breckler, 1984). Therefore, this researcher operationally defines an attitude, for this study, to be the cognitive, written response that each subject expresses with regard to each statement item on the ARSS questionnaires.
Close Ended Response- A response given by a subject that is already structured through the format of the assessment instrument (Shavelson, 1988). For this study a close ended response is the Lickert scale category given in response to ARSS items. The categories are, disagree strongly (DS), disagree mildly (DM), neutral (N), agree mildly (AM), agree strongly (AS).

Defensive Attribution Theory- This theory suggests that a person will attribute less blame to a victim if anticipation of being in a similar situation is established (Gilmartin-Zena, 1983; Myers, 1993; Shaver, 1970). The key to this theory is that a person can identify with the victim (survivor) and their circumstance. This is the rationale used for the gender specific conditions.

Gender- This term refers to either the male or female sex within this study. It is the operational definition for the male and female conditions. Therefore, gender, in this study, is synonymous with an individual's sex.

Gender Exclusive Language- Language which refers to men and women with unequal likelihood (i.e., he, his she, her) (Greene & Rubin, 1991). This
language can be used in a mixed gender population or in a specific gender population. Either way, the target person can be excluded with this language usage.

**Gender Inclusive Language** - Language which refers to men and women with equal likelihood (i.e., he/she) (Greene & Rubin, 1991). This can be used in mixed gender populations as "he/she" or used in specific gender populations as "he" for male populations and "she" is used for female populations. Thus, the target person, whether a male or female, is included with this language usage.

**Gender Specific Language** - Language which refers to men and women with unequal likelihood, but is used for the appropriate population. Thus, "he" is used with a male population and "she" is used with a female population. This can also be termed female specific or male specific language. This is the operational definition for the two gender specific versions of the ARSS questionnaire.

**Generic Language** - Language which does not, in any manner, refer to or name a specific sex or gender (i.e., person, humanity) (Gastil, 1990).

**Non-Sexist Language** - Language which does not contain
pronouns that denote a specific sex or gender (i.e., man, woman). This language rather contains either neutral/generic or gender inclusive substitutes (i.e., person, or he/she) (Buck, 1990; Gastil, 1990; Greene & Rubin, 1991; Harrigan & Lucic, 1988; Kasof, 1993).

Open Ended Response - A response given by a subject that is not already structured through the format of the assessment instrument (Shavelson, 1988). For this study a open ended response is any written response, provided by a subject, in addition to, but in conjunction with, their Lickert scale category.

Rape - Rape is legally defined as "nonconsensual sexual penetration obtained by physical force or by threat of bodily harm..." (Koss & Harvey, 1991, pp. 2-5). Penetration refers to penile penetration, oral and anal penetration, and penetration obtained by fingers and objects (Bourque, 1989; Koss & Harvey, 1991; Muehlenhard et al., 1992). Nonconsensual is delineated in terms of unconscious state of mind, verbal or nonverbal coercion, mental illness, mental retardation, and intoxication (Koss & Harvey, 1991; Muehlenhard et al., 1992). The
The aforementioned definition of rape, with all its components, is the operational definition that this researcher chooses to use.

**Rape Survivor** - A person who has experienced a rape. Often times it is used as an empowering element to victims (Koss & Harvey, 1991). This terminology is used instead of rape victim throughout the study, unless direct reference is made to the original ARVS title.

**Rape Victim** - A person who has experienced a rape. This terminology is used for the ARVS to maintain consistency with the scale’s title.

**Sexist Language** - Language which contains pronouns that denote a specific sex or gender (Buck, 1990; Gastil, 1990; Greene & Rubin, 1991; Harrigan & Lucic, 1988; Kasof, 1993). This language contains gender exclusionary terms without adjusting terminology in regard to target population (i.e., always using "he" no matter if population is male or female or mixed).

**Target Rape Survivor** - The rape survivor which is referred to in the ARSS questionnaire. The ARSS1 target rape survivor is a female. The ARSS2 target rape survivor is a male.

**Assumptions**
The following are the assumptions upon which this study was based:

1. Subjects will respond honestly to the questionnaires.
2. Subjects will understand the statements within the questionnaires.
3. Subjects are literate.
4. The ARSS1 and the ARSS2 are comparable.
5. All subjects, in attendance at either the university courses or organizational meetings, were enrolled college students.
6. Survivor is a more empowering term than victim.
7. Expressed attitudes on questionnaires and behaviors are somewhat correlated.
8. Gender and sex are interchangeable terms.

Limitations

The limitations of the study were:

1. Nonrandom sample was used. The subjects were all college students.
2. The ARSS2 version, male specific language, was not as highly normed and validated as the ARSS1 version, female specific language.
3. Culturally biased items were not controlled for in this study.
4. Gender and sex may not always be interchangeable terms.

5. The manipulation of language, was limited to the language within the original ARVS scale.

6. Gender specific language may overemphasize the inequalities that exist between men and women.

7. Attitudes assessed by a questionnaire are not always indicative of actual behavior.

Summary

Rape has existed throughout history. This historical perpetuation has precluded a population of survivors. These survivors, as a result, often times must endure negative attitudes that are held about them and their rape experience. Thus, it has been deemed necessary to assess these attitudes to ascertain a way of counterbalance. This study focuses upon the premise of assessment of attitudes about rape survivors, while examining the effect of a gender specific questionnaire on these attitudes about rape survivors.

The following chapters will provide a review of the pertinent literature, an overview of the methodology employed in the study, the results and analysis of the study, and finally a discussion of the implications of the
study and the possibilities for further research.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In this chapter a review of the literature relevant to this study is described in four major parts. The first section reviews rape with regard to its historical existence and modern day prevalence rates. The second section looks at the population of rape survivors in conjunction with the attitudes that are formed about them. The third section considers the current means of assessment for attitudes about rape survivors. Finally, the fourth section involves a discussion of non-sexist research within the context of language usage and defensive attribution theory.

Rape

Historical Existence

The existence of rape has been recorded since the beginning of time. Susan Brownmiller wrote a book entitled Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape, 1975, which capsulizes this historical perspective of rape. Her study of the history of rape's existence will be reviewed in this section.

Brownmiller begins her discussion of rape's history by tracing its existence through the written law. Brownmiller
states that "rape entered law through the back door, as a property crime..." (Brownmiller, 1975, p. 8). The ancient Babylonian and Mosaic law codified responsibility for the criminal act of rape upon the survivor not the rapist. The exception to this codification was if the survivor was already betrothed. In this instance the rapist was stoned to death (Brownmiller, 1975).

In early English law, before 1066, the penalty for rape was death and dismemberment. This penalty only applied, though, if the raped was a "highborn, propertied virgin who lived under the protection of a powerful lord" (Brownmiller, 1975, p. 15). However, this law, as most others in history, provided an exemption for the rapist. The rapist could marry their victim and no penalty would be applied (Brownmiller, 1975).

King Henry II, during the 12th century, was the first to enact a law that allowed for rape trial by jury. The trial, however, still depended upon the "respectability" of the rape survivor. If certain criteria, such as virgin and not married, were not met by the survivor, the trial was acquitted (Brownmiller, 1975).

The most comprehensive statute in Brownmiller's historical consideration came from Edward I. At the close of the 13th century, Edward I extended the jurisdiction of rape to include forcible rape of those married as well as
virgins. In addition, redemption of the rapist through marriage to the raped was banned under this statute. However, this jurisdiction did not apply to rapes where the assailant was known. The statute applied to stranger rape of a married person, not marital rape of the person (Brownmiller, 1975).

By this historical trace of rape through the law, Brownmiller found that rape in addition to its narrow stranger definition and exemptive penalties, was perpetuated and even legitimized through many means. The first issue discussed by Brownmiller was the raping and pillaging that was often used as a tactic of warfare. Rape was used as a weapon of terror during World War I, a weapon of revenge in World War II and as a way to "relieve boredom for American GI's in the highlands of Vietnam" (Brownmiller, 1975, p. 24).

Rape has also been included in riots and revolutions, whether religious or social in nature. As early as the American Revolution of 1768, reports of rape were recorded (Brownmiller, 1975). In addition, religious efforts such as the Mormon persecutions and social issues such as white mob violence against blacks, have provided "moral justification, for the public good as a license to rape" (Brownmiller, 1975, p. 131).

Brownmiller, also found that rape has been employed
through institutions such as slavery, war prison camps and criminal penitentiaries as a control measure. "They (rapists) can operate within an institutionalized setting that works to their advantage...in an exercise of power..." (Brownmiller, 1975, p. 283). Thus, rape operates to maintain power within the institutionalized setting.

Finally, Brownmiller, suggests that one of the main perpetual momentums behind rape's historical existence is the myth of stranger rape of a virginous woman as the real and founded case of rape. This myth may preclude survivors, of any other nature from coming forward. This creates a historical climate conducive to rape (Brownmiller, 1975).

Thus far rape has been presented within a historical context. Its existence has been traced through written law. The historical perpetuation of rape has been linked with warfare tactics, riots and revolutions, institutions such as slavery, war prison camps and criminal penitentiaries. Additionally, the acceptance of rape supportive beliefs, over time, has created myths about rape that yield a historical climate conducive to rape (Brownmiller, 1975). This entire historical existence and perpetuation of rape, precludes its survival in modern society. The next discussion, within this major section, views the modern day existence of rape through current prevalence rates. Modern Rates of Rape Prevalence
As a result of rape's historical perpetuation, it is still very much existent in modern day society. However, modern prevalence rates are based upon all types of rape, not just stranger rape, as has been the case historically. The prevalence rates of rape are most often surveyed for through judicial agencies. The Senate Judiciary Committee and National Victim Center are two such agencies. Their recent studies will be reviewed in this section.

The Majority Staff of the Senate Judiciary Committee prepared a report in 1993 entitled *The Response to Rape: Detours on the Road to Equal Justice*. This study found that 2,000 women are raped every week, in the United States (Senate Judiciary Committee, 1993). Even when the committee excluded all unreported rape cases, the most conservative estimate was 102,555, following the FBI's Uniform Crime Report (Senate Judiciary Committee, 1993). This survey further estimated that if unreported rape cases are counted, the total could be as high as 12,000 rapes per week (Senate Judiciary Committee, 1993).

The National Victim Center prepared two reports in 1992 that dealt with the prevalence of rape. The first, entitled *Crime and Victimization: A Statistical Overview*, found that 20,000 men are raped every year. In addition, it was found that 1:8 women are raped in their lifetime. Thus, there are 12.1 million women survivors of rape in our society today.
(National Victim Center, 1992a).

The second survey, entitled \textit{Rape In America: A Report to the Nation}, found that even when rape is constricted to "forcible rape, an event that occurred without consent, that involved the use of force or threat of force, and involved sexual penetration of the vagina, mouth or rectum", the estimate is still 1.3 rapes per minute (National Victim Center, 1992, p. i). This creates a total of 683,000 rapes in a year, not inclusive of coercive rapes (National Victim Center, 1992).

However, in considering this literature one must keep in mind that only one estimate was obtained which included males (National Victim Center, 1992a). Also the defining criteria for rape was often limited to forcible rape, without considering coercive rape. Therefore, the actual prevalence rates for rape, when all inclusive of gender and type of rape, may be considerably higher than was found.

The aforementioned prevalence rates, in American society, preclude a population of survivors. These rape survivors will be considered in the next major section. The specific context of consideration will be the attitudes that are formed about rape survivors.

\textbf{Survivors of Rape}

Both the historical and modern prevalence of rape precludes a population of survivors. These survivors of
rape endure certain perceptions that are formed about them. These perceptual ideas, most often times, transfer into negative attitudes held about the rape survivor and their experience. Considerable research has been done with regard to attitudes about rape and its survivors. The most relevant research to this particular study will be considered within this major section.

Original ARVS Studies

The first research to be considered is the original studies that were conducted with the Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale (ARVS). These studies were conducted by Colleen Ward, in conjunction with researchers in 14 different countries (Ward, 1988). The purpose of the ARVS research was to establish an instrument which measured attitudes specifically about rape survivors as opposed to rape in general. The premise for this endeavor was based upon:

The popular literature on rape victimology (e.g., Brownmiller, ...) which has consistently highlighted the significance of rape myths and the negative impact of these misconceptions... (Ward, 1988, p. 127).

The first study, conducted by Ward, was the original construction and validation of the ARVS as an assessment instrument for attitudes about rape survivors. The ARVS was
based upon themes extracted from popular rape literature. The themes were, victim blame, credibility, responsibility, denigration, trivialization, and deservingness (Ward, 1988). This study resulted in a 25 item questionnaire which assessed, specifically, only attitudes about rape survivors.

The next three studies were concerned with further validating the ARVS. These studies had two insightful findings. The first was that negative attitudes about rape survivors were significantly correlated with other scales which measured attitudes related to conservative sexuality and acceptance of interpersonal violence. The findings were, $r = -0.61$, $p < 0.0005$ for conservative sexuality beliefs and negative attitudes about rape survivors, and $r = 0.26$, $p < 0.0005$ for acceptance of interpersonal violence and negative attitudes about rape survivors (Ward, 1988).

The second finding was that negative attitudes about rape survivors were consistently and often significantly higher for males than females (Ward, 1988). The findings were $t (409) = 10.13$, $p < 0.0001$ that men held more negative attitudes toward rape survivors (Ward, 1988).

The subsequent 10 studies were concerned with cross-culturally validating the ARVS instrument (Ward, 1988). One particular study, conducted by Lee and Cheung, found that cross-culturally, negative attitudes were significantly correlated with traditional sex beliefs. The findings were
This study further found that men expressed a significantly higher negative attitudinal response toward rape survivors than women. The findings were $t(200) = 2.58$, $p < .05$, one tailed test (Lee & Cheung, 1991).

From the ARVS research a consistent profile developed with regard to negative attitudes about rape survivors. Negative attitudes were most often related to conservative sexuality beliefs, and acceptance of violence. Negative attitudes were also more highly accepted by males than females (Lee & Cheung, 1991; Ward, 1988).

Other research, beyond the ARVS studies, has been done with regard to attitudes about rape survivors. However, as was alluded to earlier within the discussion of the ARVS studies, the research has been dominated by studies which analyze attitudes about rape in general (Ward, 1988). Therefore, the remaining literature to be reviewed will be divided into two portions. The first will be research done with regard to attitudes about rape in general but supplies implications or indirect findings for attitudes about survivors. The second portion will contain research directly looking at attitudes about rape survivors.

**Indirect Findings**

Negative attitudes toward rape in general have been found to most often correlate with sexuality beliefs and
gender (Abbey, Cozzarelli, McLaughlin & Harnish, 1987; Bell, Kuriloff, Lottes, Nathanson, Judge & Fogelson-Turet, 1992; Blumberg & Lester, 1991; Fischer, 1986 Larsen & Long, 1988; Lottes, 1991; Stacy, Prisbell & Tollefsrud, 1992). The specific correlation delineates that as one holds more traditional sexual beliefs and is of the male gender, they tend to hold more negative attitudes about rape.

One particular study, by Lottes, viewed the specific issue of sexuality beliefs and rape (Lottes, 1991). This study operationally defined negative attitudes about rape as "Victim-callous" (Lottes, 1991). It was found that in two separate samples "...acceptance of victim-callous attitudes was associated with traditional sex role beliefs"(Lottes, 1991, pp. 48-50). The findings were in sample one, r= -.59, p<.01 and in sample two, r= -.60, p<.01 (Lottes, 1991).

This study by Lottes additionally found that males expressed more acceptance of victim-callous attitudes (Lottes, 1991,). This is to say men expressed a more negative response to a rape survivor. The findings were "men reported significantly (p<.01, t-tests) more acceptance of victim-callous attitudes than women for all seven attitudes" (Lottes, 1991, p. 47).

A study conducted by Blumberg and Lester looked at attitudes toward rape and their relation to rape myths. They operationally defined rape myths as traditional sex
beliefs. This study found that negative attitudes about rape were significantly correlated with belief in rape myths. The findings were $r = .82, p < .0005$ (Blumberg & Lester, 1991).

Additionally, males were found to have a higher acceptance of these rape myths and attributed more amount of blame to the rape survivor. High school males were found to have the significantly highest acceptance of rape myths, $t (46) = 1.62, p < .06$ and the most amount of blame attributed to the rape survivor, $t (46) = 1.99, p < .05$. College males were found to have the second highest acceptance of rape myths and attribution of blame to the rape survivor (Blumberg & Lester, 1991).

Therefore, research with regard to attitudes about rape in general has applicability to attitudes specifically about survivors. Research has shown that as one holds negative attitudes about rape they tend to be more victim-callous toward a rape survivor (Lottes, 1991). In addition, belief or acceptance of rape myths often result in more blame attributed to the rape survivor (Blumberg & Lester, 1991).

Thus, the research purports that a negative view of rape most often yields a negative attitude about the rape survivor.

Direct Findings
Research with regard to attitudes specifically about rape survivors purports that negative attitudes are most often expressed in terms of survivor blame and responsibility. These negative attitudes are most often found to be accepted by males than females (Bridges, 1991; Bridges & McGrail, 1989; Burczyk & Standing, 1989; Deitz, Littman & Bentley, 1984; Ferguson, Duthie & Graf, 1987; Gerdes, et al., 1988; Pollard, 1992; Ryckman, Kaczor, Thorton, 1992; Sundberg, et al., 1991).

A study conducted by Gerdes, Dammann and Heilig examined perceptions of rape survivors' responsibility for their rape (Gerdes et al., 1988). Attributions of responsibility were based upon behaviors elicited by the survivor. Thus, negative attitudes about rape survivors were defined as attributions of responsibility placed upon the survivor due to certain behaviors (Gerdes et al., 1988).

It was found that negative attitudes of responsibility for the survivor were most expressed when behaviors such as "walking alone at night" or "going home with the perpetrator" were described, $F(1, 48) = 3.45, p<.07$ (Gerdes et al., 1988, p. 146). In addition, male subjects attributed more responsibility to the survivor than female subjects, $F(1, 48) = 4.81, p<.04$ (Gerdes et al., 1988).

Another study, conducted by Burczyk and Standing, analyzed attitudes about rape survivors in terms of sex of
survivor, sex of rater, and survivor status (Burzcyk & Standing, 1989). This study found that survivors were attributed with an internal locus of causality as compared to non-survivors, $F (1, 136) = 14.59, p < .01$ (Burzcyk & Standing, 1989). Thus, survivors were attributed with internal locus of responsibility for their rape; "...greater internal attribution for rape victims (survivors) supports the stereotypic view that the victim (survivor) is to blame" (Burzcyk & Standing, 1989, p. 8).

This study further found that males attributed more blame and responsibility to the survivor overall, than did females, $F (1, 136) = 11.98, p < .01$ (Burzcyk & Standing, 1989). However, males still attributed less blame to a female survivor than a male survivor. Thus, these researchers purported that belief in stereotypic sex roles may have been a motivation for more blame attributed to the male rape survivor (Burzcyk & Standing, 1989).

Therefore, whether indirectly or directly assessed, attitudes about rape survivors seem to contain some consistent components. Elements such as attribution of responsibility, blame and deservingness are found to be most common components of negative attitudes about rape survivors. Additionally, these elements all tend to be expressed more by males than females. The next major section will consider the means of assessment that was
employed for these attitudes about rape survivors.

Assessment of Attitudes About Rape Survivors

Assessment of attitudes about rape survivors generally employs questionnaires. However, questionnaires can be problematic. They can contain language which may bias results (Dockery & Bedian, 1989; LaPiere, 1934). One specific form of language, that can bias results obtained from a questionnaire, is sexist or gender exclusionary language (Buck, 1990; Greene & Rubin, 1991; Kasof, 1993). Attitude assessment, within the rape research arena, is often times laden with gender exclusive language questionnaires (Muehlenhard et al., 1992).

Therefore, this major section will first consider the means of assessment, questionnaires, and second will consider the sexist language bias within these questionnaires.

Means of Assessment-Questionnaires

The majority of the rape attitude research employed for this study contained questionnaires as the assessment tool (Abbey, et al., 1987; Bell et al., 1992; Blumberg & Lester, 1991; Bridges, 1991; Deitz et al., 1984; Fischer, 1986; Larsen & Long, 1988; Lee & Cheung, 1991; Lottes, 1991; Stacy et al., 1992; Ward, 1988). The questionnaire format usually provides a list of both positive and negative statements about rape survivors. The respondents are then instructed to respond to each of these statements, in degrees of agreement.
or acceptance of the statement. The most common response format is some type of a Lickert scale.

Some examples of item statements within a questionnaire will now be provided. Examples of positive statements will be provided first. "Women do not provoke rape by their appearance or behavior" (Ward, 1988, p. 134). "A woman should not blame herself for rape" (Ward, 1988, p. 135). Negative statements included, "A woman who goes out alone at night puts herself in a position to be raped" (Ward, 1988, p. 134). "Sexually experienced women are not really damaged by rape" (Ward, 1988, p. 135).

The assessment of attitudes about rape survivors has been illustrated through its use of the questionnaire tool. The next portion of this major section will review the sexist language bias present in these questionnaires.

**Sexist Bias**

Specific studies have been done with regard to sexist bias within research (Buck, 1990; Cole, 1981; Cole, 1983 Denmark, Russo, Frieze & Sechzer, 1988; Gallivan, 1991; Gastil, 1990; Greene & Rubin, 1991; Harrigan & Lucic, 1988; Kasof, 1993; Kurtzman, 1990; McHugh, Koeske & Frieze, 1986; Moulton, Robinson & Elias, 1978; Muehlenhard et al., 1992). From this research, guidelines have been established for non-sexist research (Denmark et al., 1988; McHugh et al., 1986).

Some examples of these guidelines are as follows. "When
formulating questions...formulate the question so that findings can be generalized to a heterogeneous sample..." (Denmark et al., 1988, p. 582). This guideline was directed at gender stereotypes which bias question formulation.

Another guideline is with regard to research methods and gender bias. "Both sexes should be studied before conclusions are drawn..." (Denmark et al., 1988, p. 583). This guideline was drawn because if unanticipated gender differences emerge within research, researchers will tend to drop those who do not conform to their analysis (Denmark et al., 1988).

In addition to these aforementioned guidelines, research has addressed the specific sex bias existence in language usage (Buck, 1990; Hale, et al., 1989; Gastil, 1990; Greene & Rubin, 1991; Harrigan & Lucic, 1988; Kasof, 1993; Kurtzman, 1990; Muehlenhard et al., 1992). These studies have ascertained that the biggest issue within research is the "gender-biased nature of language usage" (Harrigan & Lucic, 1988, p. 129). In consequence, this biased language usage most often creates constrainments to the findings of the research. The results are not applicable to the gender which is excluded from the research questions (Denmark et al., 1988; Muehlenhard et al., 1992). This gender based bias of language usage has been scrutinized with regard to its existence within rape
research. In one particular study, conducted by Muehlenhard, Powch, Phelps and Giusti, the concern was with how rape is defined. One of the main findings was that rape definitions currently contain gender biased terms. "Sexual coercion between two women or two men (is) excluded...and it would not include a woman forcing a man to have intercourse..." (Muehlenhard et al., 1992, p. 29).

However, the area where the sex bias within rape research has received the most attention is male rape research. Male rape research has found that language usage within traditional rape studies has excluded males from a survivor status (Calderwood, 1987; Frazier, 1993; Goyer & Eddleman, 1984, Groth & Burgess, 1980; Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988; Smith, Pine & Hawly, 1988; Struckman-Johnson, 1988). This exclusion, by language usage, of males, has been purported to lead to inaccurate prevalence rates for male rape (Frazier, 1993; Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988; Struckman-Johnson, 1988).

Therefore, in dealing with the assessment of attitudes about rape survivors, it has been suggested that a non-sexist, male gender inclusive approach be attempted (Buck, 1990; Frazier, 1993; Gastil, 1990; Harrigan & Lucic, 1988; Kasof, 1993; Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988; Muehlenahrd et al., 1992). For as Charlene Muehlenhard stated,
It is crucial that researchers examine the assumptions and biases underlying the terms that they use, as well as the ways in which these terms constrain their results and conclusions. This is particularly crucial in fields that use popular terms...The study of sexual assault is such a field (Muehlenahrd et al., 1992, p. 24). A non-sexist element could allow one to control for constraintment of results due to sexist terminology.

The implementation of a non-sexist, more gender inclusive approach toward attitudes about rape survivors will be considered in the next major section.

Non-Sexist Research

Generic and Gender Inclusive Pronouns

The implementation of non-sexist research has most often employed generic pronouns and gender inclusive pronouns (Buck, 1990; cole, 1983; Gastil, 1990; Greene & Rubin, 1991; Hale et al., 1989; Harrigan & Lucic, 1988; Kasof, 1993; Kurtzman, 1990; Muehlenhard et al., 1992; Moulton et al., 1978). These pronoun usages will be considered within this first portion of the non-sexist section.

Gender generic pronouns are defined as language, which does not, in any manner, refer to or name a specific sex or gender. Examples of these would be "person" or "they" (Gastil, 1990; Cole, 1984; Harrigan & Lucic, 1988). Gender inclusive pronouns are defined as language which refers to
men and women with equal likelihood. Examples of these would be "he/she" or "hers/his" (Greene & Rubin, 1991). Both of these types of pronouns have been recommended to replace sexist terms within research.

However, these pronoun usages have been criticized. First of all, gender generic pronouns, "person" or "they", have been considered to ignore the intricate differences that exist between men and women (Cole, 1983; Gastil, 1990; Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988; Muehlenhard et al., 1992). Muehlenhard recommends that investigation by the researcher should include "different meanings and consequences that experiences have for women and men" (Muehlenhard et al., 1992, p.37). The generic approach does not capture these intricacies (Cole, 1983; Muehlenhard et al. 1992).

Secondly, the gender inclusive approach has been criticized for the usage of "he/she" type language. This approach is thought to elicit more images of male than female (Gastil, 1990 & Muehlenhard et al., 1992). One study, by Gastil, found that males and females comprehend "he/she" in much the same manner as "he" used alone (Gastil, 1990). Thus, gender inclusive language has been found to create a gender exclusive situation.

The gender generic and gender inclusive approaches have been shown to be problematic in some instances. The aforementioned criticisms need to be considered when
embarking upon non-sexist research. Through such a consideration, the position that may be applicable is a gender specific approach. This gender specific approach will be viewed in the following portion of the non-sexist section.

**Gender Specific Approach**

Gender specific language could be equated with gender exclusive language. Both types of language usage refer to men and women with unequal likelihood. However, a gender exclusive situation results when the language employed does not include the gender of the target population (Greene & Rubin, 1991). This most often results in a sexist situation.

On the other hand, a gender specific situation would result when the language employed would be specific to the appropriate gender population. Thus, "he" would be used with a male population and "she" would be used with a female population. The language usage would then be male or female specific, depending upon the respondent. The sexist element of gender exclusion could then be avoided (Muehlenhard et al., 1992).

**Defensive Attribution Theory**

This modification of a non-sexist approach, gender specific, can be legitimized through a theory known as defensive attribution. Defensive attribution purports that
a person will attribute less blame if anticipation of being in a similar situation is established (Gilmartin-Zena, 1983; Myers, 1993; Shaver, 1970). The key factor to this theory is establishment of identification (Gilmartin-Zena, 1983).

Defensive attribution was studied by Gilmartin-Zena in relation to rape survivor blame (Gilmartin-Zena, 1983). This study found that when an "ideal female victim (survivor)" was presented to subjects some females attributed 0% blame to the survivor but the male population all attributed some sort of blame to the survivor. This finding was interpreted as "support evidenced for the defensive attribution model" (Gilmartin-Zena, 1983, p. 367).

The male subjects within the Gilmartin-Zena study were purported to not be able to identify with the "ideal female victim (survivor)" (Gilmartin-Zena, 1983, p. 367). However, if a gender specific approach were to be employed a male survivor would be presented to the male subjects. This could allow for identification that was not available with the depicted female survivor. This identification, according to the defensive attribution theory, is the key to less blame being attributed to the rape survivor (Gilmartin-Zena, 1983 & Shaver, 1970). Therefore, by implementing the gender specific approach, one may retain a more accurate assessment of attitudes about rape survivors. An assessment which is not confounded by sexist or gender exclusionary
Summary

The literature review was discussed in four major sections. The first section looked at rape's historical existence and modern prevalence rates. The second section reviewed the survivors of rape and the attitudes that are formed about them. The third section considered the means of assessment of attitudes about rape survivors. The fourth section discussed non-sexist research within the context of language usage and defensive attribution theory.

The next chapter will provide a review of the methodology employed within this study. The sample selection, procedural data collection, research design, instrumentation and statistical data analysis will all be presented.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to assess the effects of a gender specific questionnaire on college students' attitudinal responses about rape survivors. This specific chapter discusses the sample selection, procedural data collection, research design, instrumentation and statistical data analysis.

Sample Selection

The sampling procedure used for this study was of a nonprobability nature. Subjects were a nonrandom, self-selected sample from a population of students at a southwest university.

The students were recruited through a systematically organized process, that allowed for voluntary and anonymous participation. Ten to fifteen minute explanatory presentations were given, by the researcher, in either classes or club/organizational meetings at the university. To maintain consistency, a specific outline was followed at each of the presentations. (Appendix A) Upon conclusion of the presentations, students were requested, by the researcher, to voluntarily answer the anonymous rape
attitude questionnaire. Those who chose to answer the questionnaire became the self-selected subject sample.

This systematic recruitment of subjects also consisted of a criterion analysis. The criteria that were used are as follows:

1. Subjects were required to be enrolled students at this particular south west university. 2. Subjects were required to be at least 18 years of age.

This sampling process, recruitment strategy, and resulting subject pool were approved by the Human Subjects Committee. (Appendix B)

Data Collection

The sampling process and recruitment strategy employed in this study yielded a nonrandom sample that was voluntary, anonymous, and self-selected with regard to participation. The subjects, within this sample, were provided with a rape attitude questionnaire packet. The packet contained a consent explanation, counseling references, instructions on how to answer questionnaire, a demographic profile and the questionnaire itself. (Appendix C) Once provided with a packet, the subjects voluntarily answered the questionnaire. The researcher left the room while subjects answered the questionnaire and then returned to the class or club/organizational meeting to retrieve the data.
The basic research design employed for this study was a quasiexperimental, 2x2 factorial design. (Figure 1) Thus, two independent variables were employed, with each at two levels. Furthermore, both main effects and interactions were analyzed through a quantitative approach (Anastasi, 1988; LoBiondo-Wood & Haber, 1990; Shavelson, 1988).

**Variables**

The quasiexperimental design for this study contained both independent and dependent variables, but no control variable. The independent variables were two each at two levels. The first independent variable, chosen by the researcher, was based upon the individual differences between subjects, thus it was not manipulated. The variable chosen was an inherent subject variable, gender. The two levels were quantified through a nominal scale: 1. female and 2. male.

The second independent variable, chosen by the researcher, was a treatment variable manipulated in two conditions. The variable was gender specific language. The two levels were quantified through a nominal scale: 1. female specific language and 2. male specific language. The implementation of these two levels translated into two questionnaire conditions. The ARSS1 contained female specific language and the ARSS2 contained male specific language.
Figure 1

2x2 Factorial Research Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female Specific Language (1)</th>
<th>Male Specific Language (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female + Female Specific Language (1:1)</td>
<td>Female + Male Specific Language (1:2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male + Female Specific Language (2:1)</td>
<td>Male + Male Specific Language (2:2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where:
- Female = 1
- Female Specific Language = 1
- Male = 2
- Male Specific Language = 2
The dependent variable, within this 2x2 factorial design, was the attitudinal response score each subject obtained on either the ARSS1 or the ARSS2. The dependent variable was measured through a five point Lickert scale and quantified, for data analysis, through a ordinal scale.

Subject Assignment

The subject assignment, within this quasiexperimental study, paralleled the independent variable conditions. The subjects were assigned to either the: 1. female specific language condition (ARSS1) or 2. the male specific language condition (ARSS2). The subject assignment to these experimental conditions was a random process.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis proposed by the researcher pertains to the gender main effect.

H0: M1=M2

The mean scores of the female subjects and the male subjects are equal.

H1: M1≠M2

The mean scores of the female subjects and the male subjects are not equal.

Where:
M1=mean score of the female subjects
M2=mean score of the male subjects

Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis proposed by the researcher
pertains to the gender specific language main effect.

**Ho2:** $M_1 = M_2$

The mean scores of the subjects in the female specific condition and the subjects in the male specific condition are equal.

**Ha2:** $M_1 \neq M_2$

The mean scores of the subjects in the female specific condition and the subjects in the male specific condition are not equal.

Where:
- $M_1 =$ mean score of the female specific condition subjects
- $M_2 =$ mean score of the male specific condition subjects

**Hypothesis Three**

The third hypothesis proposed by the researcher pertains to the interaction of gender by gender specific language.

**Ho3:** There is no gender $\times$ gender specific language interaction.

**Ha3:** There is a gender $\times$ gender specific language interaction.

**This hypothesis was not stated symbolically since there are four possibilities of finding significance and Ha3 is only looking for any one of them in order to reject Ho3.**

**Instrumentation**

**Attitudes About Rape Survivors Scale**

One questionnaire instrument, Attitudes About Rape Survivors Scale (ARSS), with two versions, (ARSS1 and ARSS2), was employed in this study. In addition a demographic
profile, gender and age, was used to further identify subjects. The questionnaire used, the ARSS, was a modified version of the original Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale (ARVS). The only existing difference between the modified ARSS versions and the original ARVS was the usage of male specific language within the ARSS2 version. The ARSS1 version contained the same language usage, female specific, as the original ARVS.

The ARSS1 was the female specific version. Thus, it contained female specific language. The ARSS2 was the male specific version. Thus, it contained male specific language. These two versions of the ARSS were the tools for analysis within this study. The basis for these two versions of the ARSS was an empirically established instrument, the ARVS. (APPENDIX D) Therefore, the structure, scoring, method of administration, time needed to complete the questionnaire, development, reliability, validity, and limitations of the ARVS can apply to the ARSS used within this study.

Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale

The ARVS was designed primarily as an assessment tool for measuring the expression of attitudes about rape victims (survivors) (Lee & Cheung, 1991; Ward, 1988). Thus, the scale can give an overall measure of negative or positive attitudes expressed about a rape victim (survivor).
The ARVS is a pencil and paper test consisting of 25 items. The time needed to complete the questionnaire is 10-15 minutes. The method of administration is self-administration.

The 25 items are presented with Lickert response categories ranging from a 0-4 point scales. Respondents are asked to rate their degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement. Scores on the ARVS range from 0-100, with the higher scores indicating a more negative attitudinal expression about rape victims (survivors) (Lee & Cheung, 1991; Ward, 1988).

The two subscales within the ARVS are 1. positive attitude statements, and 2. negative attitude statements (Lee & Cheung, 1991; Ward, 1988). Items 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, and 25 are negative statements about rape victims (survivors). The negative items are scored on a scale of agree strongly (AS), to disagree strongly (DS), with a 0-4 point value respectively.

The positive items are: 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 19, and 22. For the positive subscale, the point values are reversed, agree strongly (AS), to disagree strongly, with a 4-0 point value respectively (Lee & Cheung, 1991; Ward, 1988).

**Development of Instrument**
The ARVS was designed with the objective to construct an instrument which measured attitudes toward rape victims (survivors) (Ward, 1988). The original version of the ARVS was based upon themes extracted from the current rape literature. These themes were; victim blame, credibility, responsibility, denigration, trivialization, and deservingness (Ward, 1988). The first ARVS contained 70 items, 34 of which were positively worded statements and 36 which were negatively worded statements (Ward, 1988).

Upon construction of this original ARVS, a study was conducted to analyze the instrument. The sample consisted of 411 undergraduates (Ward, 1988). Through preliminary analysis, 25 items were deleted based upon low item-total correlations, nine were deleted due to indirect relation to attitudes toward victims, and one item was dropped due to a cultural bias (Ward, 1988). Twenty-five items were then chosen from those remaining based upon; item content variation, mixture of positively and negatively worded statements, and deletion of items which produced extreme responses (Ward, 1988). The result was a 25 item scale, with eight positive statements and 17 negative statements (Ward, 1988).

**Reliability**

The ARVS appears to be a significantly reliable instrument. Norm testing to assess reliability was
performed internationally, on university campuses, in 14 different countries (Lee & Cheung, 1991; Ward, 1988). The Cronbach alpha = .83 for the entire scale (Ward, 1988). The test-retest approach also yielded adequate reliability. The Pearson product moment correlation was $r = .80$, $p < .0005$ for the entire scale (Ward, 1988).

The reliability for the ARVS was also assessed on a sample that was taken from the particular south west university of interest for this study. The Cronbach alpha = .86 for the entire scale, with regard to the south west university sample (Ward, 1988). Thus, the reliability of the ARVS appears to be quite substantiated for the population of interest for this particular study.

**Validity**

The ARVS appears to be a significantly valid instrument. Testing to assess validity was conducted internationally, on university campuses in 14 different countries (Lee & Cheung, 1991 & Ward, 1988). Construct validity was established through item by item comparison of male and female scores, which resulted in $t(409) = 10.13$, $p < .0001$ (Ward, 1988).

Additionally, construct validity was established through a 2x4 correlational analysis of variance, which resulted in $r = -.17$, $p < .05$ (Ward, 1988). Discriminant and convergent validity were established through inter-
correlations with other attitude scales, \( r = .89, p < .0005 \) (Ward, 1988). Lastly, construct validity was established with a sample taken from the south west university of interest to this study. The analysis revealed \( t (568) = 12.16, p < .0005 \) (Ward, 1988). Thus, the ARVS appears to be a valid instrument for use with the population of interest for this study.

**Limitations of the Instrument**

**Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale**

The major criticism of the ARVS is the difference in number of items in the subscales. The larger number of negative statements may bias the questionnaire (Lee & Cheung, 1991; Ward, 1988). Another criticism of the ARVS deals with the creation of the instrument. The validation and standardization of the ARVS was not scrutinized in a single culture for relevance before being adapted and modified for another culture. Thus, simultaneous analysis was done that may have overlooked both cultural similarities and differences (Ward, 1988).

**Attitudes About Rape Survivors Scale**

This modified version of the original ARVS has a specific limitation of its own. The ARSS2 version contained male specific language. This version, since it did not contain the same language usage as the original ARVS, cannot be considered a normed and validated instrument. Thus, its
empirical establishment cannot be linked to the ARVS reliability and validity findings.

Data Analysis

The questionnaire versions, ARSS1, female specific, and ARSS2, male specific, were coded and entered into the database. Each subject was coded as either 1. ARSS1 or 2. ARSS2. This procedure was followed by the entrance of coded information from demographic questions. Each subject was coded as either 1. female or 2. male. The final entrance into the data base was each individual item response. These were coded according to the scoring specifications of the positive and negative subscales within the ARSS.

Statistics

This coded data was then analyzed through both descriptive and inferential statistics. Demographics were outlined with the help of descriptive techniques. Subjects within each of the independent variable conditions of the study were also described through descriptive statistics. The specific hypotheses, of the study, were addressed through inferential statistics.

Descriptive

The descriptive statistical techniques that were employed for this study pertained to demographic data and description of experimental condition groups. The
demographic profile of subjects within this study, age and gender, was compiled through the use of means (M), percentages (%), and standard deviations (SD). The subjects within each experimental condition were described through the use of means (M), percentages (%), and standard deviations (SD).

**Inferential**

The inferential statistical technique that was employed for this study pertained to the specific hypotheses proposed by the researcher. The statistical procedure used for data analysis was an analysis of variance, a two-way ANOVA test. The two-way ANOVA test analyzed the main effects, gender and gender specific language and the interaction, gender by gender specific language, in order to locate the source of variance.

**Summary**

This chapter discussed the methodology employed in this study. The sample selection, procedural data collection, research design, instrumentation, and statistical data analysis were all presented. Chapter four will consist of a discussion pertaining to the results obtained from this study.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to assess the effects of a gender specific language questionnaire instrument on college students attitudinal responses about rape survivors. This specific chapter will present a demographic description of the sample, (N=183). Statistical results of the data analysis will then be presented. Finally, a discussion of additional findings will be provided. Tables, figures and graphs will be included throughout the chapter to facilitate analysis and discussion.

Demographic Description of the Sample

The subjects, which participated in this study, were all students at a south west university. The sample size was 183 subjects, (N=183). These 183 subjects were obtained through presentations given by the researcher. Specifically, subjects were recruited from four separate class meetings, two sorority meetings, and one dormitory government meeting.

The presentational recruitment process, since it was concentrated upon the south west university campus, did not yield a random selection of subjects. However, the assignment of subjects to either the female specific or male
specific language condition was random. All 183 subjects, at any of the presentations, had an equal chance of receiving either questionnaire version (ARSS1 = female specific, ARSS2 = male specific version).

The participation of the 183 subjects was both voluntary and anonymous. Thus, a participatory rate was not obtained. However, originally, 190 subjects returned answered questionnaires but seven could not be analyzed. Six subjects reported being under the age of 18 and therefore could not be included within the sample due to Human Subjects Committee guidelines. Additionally, one questionnaire was incompletely answered by the respondent and could not be accurately analyzed. These seven subjects could not be used for the purposes of this study. Thus, yielding a sample size of 183 subjects (N=183).

The resulting sample of 183 subjects was categorized in two ways, age and gender. The subjects ranged in age from 18 to 31 years. The mean age was 20.10 years, (M=20.10), with a standard deviation of 2.07, (SD=2.07). (Table 1) Of the 183 subjects, 50.30%, (N=92), were female and 49.70%, (N=91), were male. (Table 1) Therefore, the sample used in this study contained an equal distribution of females and males with a mean age of 20.10 years.

Data Analysis
Table 1

**Demographics of Sample: Age and Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>50.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>49.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Sample Size: N = 183
* = Mean Age

M = 20.10 yrs.
SD = 2.07
This study employed a 2x2 factorial research design. (Figure 1, chapter two, p. 52) The two independent variables were gender and gender specific language. The dependent variable was the attitudinal response score each subject obtained on either the ARSS1 or ARSS2. Thus, this study analyzed two main effects, gender and gender specific language and one interaction, gender by gender specific language. A total of three hypotheses were analyzed. The statistical procedure used for data analysis was an analysis of variance, a two-way ANOVA test.

Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis proposed by the researcher pertained to the gender main effect.

Ho1: M1=M2

The mean scores of the female subjects and the male subjects are equal.

Ha1: M1≠M2

The mean scores of the female subjects and the male subjects are not equal.

Where:
M1= mean score of the female subjects
M2= mean score of the male subjects

For the main effect of gender there was found to be a significant difference between mean scores of females and males, $F (1, 179) = 28.50, p<.001$. Thus, the researcher rejects Ho1. (Table 2)

Hypothesis Two
The second hypothesis proposed by the researcher pertains to the gender specific language main effect.

Ho2: M1=M2

The mean scores of the subjects in the female specific condition and the subjects in the male specific condition are equal.

Ha2: M1≠M2

The mean scores of the subjects in the female specific condition and the subjects in the male specific condition are not equal.

Where:
- M1= mean score of the female specific condition subjects
- M2= mean score of the male specific condition subjects

For the main effect of gender specific language there was found to be a significant difference between mean scores of the female specific condition subjects and the male specific condition subjects, F (1, 179) = 11.08, p<.001. Thus, the researcher rejects Ho2. (Table 2)

Hypothesis Three

The third hypothesis proposed by the researcher pertains to the interaction of gender by gender specific language.

Ho3: There is no gender x gender specific language interaction.

Ha3: There is a gender x gender specific language interaction.
Table 2

Two-Way ANOVA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>3234.925</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3234.925</td>
<td>28.500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE</td>
<td>1257.450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1257.450</td>
<td>11.078</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Interaction</td>
<td>5.192</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.192</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER x LANGUAGE</td>
<td>5.192</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.192</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>4476.012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1492.004</td>
<td>13.145</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>20317.737</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>113.507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24793.749</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>136.229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
** This hypothesis was not stated symbolically since there are four possibilities of finding significance and Ha3 is only looking for any one of them in order to reject Ho3.

For the interaction of gender by gender specific language there was found to be no significant interaction, $F (1, 179) = .046, p<.031$. Thus, the researcher fails to reject or retains Ho3. (Table 2)

Additional Findings

Directional Implications

The aforementioned alternative hypotheses did not state direction of the significant difference. However, within the context of scoring the ARSS one can derive direction. The larger the numerical value of an obtained score on the ARSS, the more negative attitudinal response one has toward rape survivors (Lee & Cheung, 1991; Ward, 1988). Therefore, for the main effects of gender and gender specific language, direction of the significant difference can be stated.

The main effect of gender yielded a significant difference between mean scores of female subjects and male subjects, $F (1, 179) = 28.50, p<.001$. The mean score for female subjects, $(N=92)$, was 45.66, $(M=45.66)$, with a standard deviation of 10.19, $(SD=10.19)$. The mean score for male subjects, $(N=91)$, was 53.95, $(M=53.95)$, with a standard
deviation of 11.58, (SD=11.58).

The overall difference was 8.27 points between female and male mean scores. This difference yielded a higher numerical value for the male mean score, (M=53.95). Thus, the direction which can be stated is that the men’s attitudinal response toward rape survivors is significantly more negative than the women’s attitudinal response toward rape survivors, $F (1, 179) = 28.50, p < .001$. (Table 3)

The main effect of gender specific language yielded a significant difference between mean scores of female specific language condition subjects and male specific language condition subjects, $F (1, 179) = 11.08, p < .001$. The mean score for the female specific condition subjects, (N=90), was 47.19, (M=47.19), with a standard deviation of 10.34, (SD=10.34). The mean score for the male specific language condition subjects, (N=93), was 52.31, (M=52.31), with a standard deviation of 12.31, (SD=12.31).

The overall difference was 5.12 points. This difference yielded a higher numerical value for the mean score of the male specific language condition subjects, (M=52.31). Thus, the direction which can be stated is that the attitudinal response toward rape survivors is significantly more negative for those subjects within the male specific language condition, $F (1, 179) = 11.08, p < .001$. (Table 4)
Table 3

Directional Findings: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Numerical Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score (M1)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>53.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score (M2)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>45.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in Mean Scores (M1-M2)</td>
<td>Between Male &amp; Female</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A higher numerical value for mean score translates to a more negative attitudinal response toward rape survivors.

$SD_1 = 11.58 \quad F (1, 179) = 28.50, p<0.001$

$SD_2 = 10.19 \quad \text{Total N} = 183$
Table 4

Directional Findings: Gender Specific Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Numerical Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score (M1)</td>
<td>Male Specific Language</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>52.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score (M2)</td>
<td>Female Specific Language</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in Mean Scores (M1-M2)</td>
<td>Between Male &amp; Female Specific Language</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A higher numerical value for mean score translates to a more negative attitudinal response toward rape survivors.

SD1 = 12.31  \( F(1, 179) = 11.08, p \leq 0.001 \)
SD2 = 10.34  Total N = 183
These directional findings, since no interaction was found to be significantly evident between gender and gender specific language, are independent of one another. Thus, men, irregardless of gender specific language, tended to express a more negative attitudinal response toward rape survivors. Secondly, irregardless of gender, those who were subjects within the male specific language condition, tended to express a more negative attitudinal response toward rape survivors.

Male Target Rape Survivor

The first two additional findings were directly related to the proposed main effect hypotheses within this study. The third additional finding is a product of the language manipulation within the ARSS. The items within the ARSS were manipulated in order to create two versions, female specific and male specific. This language manipulation process created two target rape survivors, one female (ARSS1) and one male (ARSS2).

The male target rape survivor, referred to in the ARSS2 or male specific language version, consistently received a more negative attitudinal response. This is to say that, female subjects responded with a higher mean score, (M=48.06, SD=10.89), for the male rape survivor than for the female rape survivor, (M=43.15, SD=8.84). Male subjects responded with a higher mean score, (M=56.55, SD=12.29), for the male
rape survivor than for the female rape survivor, (M=51.22, SD=10.23). Lastly, the ARSS2 version, overall, received a higher mean score, (M=52.31, SD=12.31), than the ARSS1 version, (M=47.19, SD=10.34). (Graph 1)

Open Ended Responses

The fourth and final additional finding is related to the structure of the items within the ARSS. The statements within the ARSS are structured so that responses given by subjects are limited to delineated, close ended categories. The categories are presented in a Lickert scale format, with five levels. The levels are disagree strongly (DS), disagree mildly (DM), neutral (N), agree mildly (AM), agree strongly (AS).

However, within this study, a substantial proportion of subjects (N=55.00, 30.00% of total 183) also provided open ended responses. The open ended responses ranged from editorial comments to sincere commentaries. There were 69 total open ended responses, since some of the 55 subjects provided more than one response. (APPENDIX E)

The majority of subjects, who provided open ended responses, (N=46.00, 83.64% of the total 55), were concerned with two particular items from the ARSS, statements 10 and 15. Twenty subjects, (N=20), provided open ended responses concerned only with statement 10. Twelve subjects, (N=12), provided open ended responses concerned only with statement
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Note: A higher numerical value for mean score translates to a more negative attitudinal response toward rape survivors.

Where:
1 = Female; 1 = Female Specific Language (ARSS₁)
2 = Male; 2 = Male Specific Language (ARSS₂)
SD₁:₁=8.84  SD₂:₁=10.23  SD₁:₁=10.34
SD₁:₂=10.89  SD₂:₂=12.29  SD₂:₂=12.31
N₁:₁=45  N₂:₁=45  N₁:₁=90
N₁:₂=47  N₂:₂=46  N₁:₂=93
15. Fourteen subjects, (N=14) provided open ended responses concerned with both statements 10 and 15. (Table 5)

Statement 10 is as follows;

Even men/women who feel guilty about engaging in pre-marital sex are not likely to falsely claim rape (ARSS1 and ARSS2).

This statement was quite consistently responded to with the structured category of neutral (N). The most common open ended response provided pertained to the need of rewording the statement due to its lack of clarity. Therefore, statement 10 received editorial open ended responses.

Statement 15 is as follows; "Men not women are responsible for rape" (ARSS1 and ARSS2). This statement was quite consistently responded to with the structured category of neutral (N). The most common open ended response provided pertained to the fact that men are not solely responsible for rape, but rather, the rapist, irregardless of gender, is responsible for rape. Therefore, statement 15 received commentarial open ended responses.

Summary

This chapter presented a demographic description of the subjects within the study, as well as presenting the statistical analysis of the data. Additional findings were also reported within this chapter.
Table 5

Additional Findings: Open Ended Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Ended Responses</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Ended Responses</td>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Ended Responses</td>
<td>10 &amp; 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Ended Responses</td>
<td>Only Statement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Ended Responses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Ended Responses</td>
<td>Only Statement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Ended Responses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Ended Responses</td>
<td>Duplicated</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Ended Responses</td>
<td>Statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Ended Responses</td>
<td>10 &amp; 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The 55 subjects are 30% of the total sample size of 183. 
N = 55 subjects who gave open ended responses. It is not the total number of actual responses. Some of the subjects duplicated themselves, yielding 69 total responses.
This study examined the effects of a gender specific language questionnaire on college students' attitudinal responses about rape survivors. The main effect null hypothesis, (Ho1), regarding gender, (M1=M2; Female=Male), was rejected, $F (1, 179) = 28.50, p<.001$. The main effect null hypothesis, (Ho2), regarding gender specific language, (M1=M2; Female specific=Male specific), was rejected, $F (1, 179) = 11.08, p<.001$. The interaction null hypothesis, (Ho3), regarding gender by gender specific language was not rejected or retained, $F (1, 179) = .046, p<.831$.

Additional findings pertaining to this study were also found. The main effects, (Ho1 and Ho2), were found to have directional implications. Men's attitudinal response toward rape survivors, (M=53.95), was found to be significantly more negative than the women's, (M=45.66), $F (1, 179) = 28.50, p<.001$. Subjects within the male specific language condition were found to have a significantly more negative attitudinal response toward rape survivors, (M=52.31), than subjects within the female specific language condition, (M=47.19), $F (1, 179) = 11.08, p<.001$.

Thirdly, within the additional findings, the male target rape survivor, referred to in the ARSS2 or male specific language version, was found to have consistently received a more negative attitudinal response than the
female rape survivor. Lastly, a substantial proportion of subjects within this study, (N=55.00, 30.00% out of total 183), provided open ended responses in conjunction with their structured close ended response category.

Chapter five will provide an overview of the study, a summary of the obtained results, a discussion of conclusions drawn from the results, limitations of the study and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter begins with an overview of the study. This is then followed by both a summary of the obtained results and a discussion of the conclusions drawn from the results. Limitations of the study will follow. Finally, recommendations for further research will be suggested.

Overview of the Study

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to obtain college students' attitudinal responses about rape survivors and ascertain if these responses are at all affected by a gender specific questionnaire. It was hoped the results of this study would yield valuable information for assessing attitudes about rape and its survivors. It has been purported that the use of gender exclusionary language within research can yield sexist tainted results (Buck, 1990; Galivan, 1991; Gastil, 1990; Greene & Rubin, 1991; Hale et al., 1989; Harrigan & Lucic, 1988; Kasof, 1993). In this study the element of language was manipulated to ascertain the actual affect that gender
specific language might have upon attitudinal responses about rape survivors. Therefore, this study attempted to control for the gender exclusive nature of rape research in order to obtain a more accurate assessment of attitudes about rape survivors.

Sample Selection

The sampling procedure used for this study was of a nonprobability nature. Subjects were a nonrandom, self-selected sample. They were obtained from a population of students at a south west university.

Students were recruited through a systematically organized process, that allowed for voluntary and anonymous participation. Ten to 15 minute explanatory presentations were given, by the researcher, in either classes or club/organizational meetings at the university. To maintain consistency, a specific outline was followed at each of the presentations. Upon conclusion of the presentations, students were requested, by the researcher, to voluntarily answer the anonymous rape attitude questionnaire. Those who chose to answer the questionnaire became the self-selected subject sample.

Data Collection

The sampling process and recruitment strategy employed in this study yielded a nonrandom sample that was voluntary, anonymous, and self-selected with regard to participation.
The subjects, within this sample, were provided with a rape attitude questionnaire packet. The packet contained a consent explanation, counseling references, instructions on how to answer the questionnaire, a demographic profile, and the questionnaire itself. Once provided with a packet, the subjects answered the questionnaire. The researcher left the room while the subjects answered the questionnaire and then returned to the class/organizational meeting to retrieve the data.

Research Design

This study employed a 2x2 factorial research design. The two independent variables were gender and gender specific language. The dependent variable was the attitudinal response score each subject obtained on either the ARSS1 or ARSS2. Thus, this study analyzed two main effects, gender and gender specific language and one interaction, gender by gender specific language. A total of three hypotheses were analyzed. The statistical procedure used for data analysis was an analysis of variance, a two-way ANOVA test.

Instrumentation

One questionnaire instrument, (ARSS), with two versions, (ARSS1 and ARSS2), was employed in this study. In addition a demographic profile was used to further identify subjects. The questionnaire used, the Attitudes
About Rape Survivors Scale (ARSS), was a modified version of the original Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale (ARVS). The only existing difference between the modified ARSS and the original ARVS was the usage of gender specific language within the ARSS versions.

The ARSS1 was the female specific version. Thus, it contained female specific language. The ARSS2 was the male specific version. Thus, it contained male specific language. Both versions were a self-administered, pencil and paper test consisting of 25 items. These 25 items were statements about rape survivors, which were presented with Lickert response categories.

The point scale consisted of a 0-4 point range for each statement response. Thus, the total score could range from 0-100. Higher scores indicated a more negative attitudinal response about rape survivors (Lee & Cheung, 1991; Ward, 1988).

Summary of the Results

Demographic Description of Sample

The subjects, which participated in this study, were all students at a south west university. The sample size was 183 subjects, (N=183). These 183 subjects were obtained through presentations given by the researcher. Specifically, subjects were recruited from four separate class meetings, two sorority meetings, and one dormitory
The resulting sample of 183 subjects was categorized in two ways, age and gender. The subjects ranged in age from 18 to 31 years. The mean age was 20.10 years, \( \mu = 20.10 \), with a standard deviation of 2.07, \( \sigma = 2.07 \). Of the 183 subjects, 50.30\%, \( N = 92 \), were female and 49.70\%, \( N = 91 \), were male. Therefore, the sample used in this study contained an equal distribution of females and males with a mean age of 20.10 years.

**Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis One**

\[ H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]

The mean scores of the female subjects and the male subjects are equal.

\[ H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \]

The mean scores of the female subjects and the male subjects are not equal.

This hypothesis pertained to the gender main effect. There was found to be a significant difference between mean scores of females and males, \( F(1, 179) = 28.50, p < .001 \). The researcher rejected \( H_0 \).

**Hypothesis Two**

\[ H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 \]

The mean scores of the subjects in the female specific condition and the subjects in the male specific condition are equal.

\[ H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \]
The mean scores of the subjects in the female specific condition and the subjects in the male specific condition are not equal.

This hypothesis pertained to the gender specific language main effect. There was found to be a significant difference between mean scores of the female specific condition subjects and the male specific condition subjects, $F(1, 179) = 11.08$, $p \leq .001$. The researcher rejected $H_02$.

**Hypothesis Three**

$H_03$: There is no gender X gender specific language interaction.

$H_{a3}$: There is a gender X gender specific language interaction.

This hypothesis pertained to the gender by gender specific language interaction. There was found to be no significant interaction, $F(1, 179) = .046$, $p \leq .831$. The researcher failed to reject or retained $H_03$.

**Additional Findings**

Additional findings pertaining to this study were also found. The main effects, ($H_01$ and $H_02$), were found to have directional implications. Men’s attitudinal response toward survivors, ($M=53.95$), was found to be significantly more negative than the women’s, ($M=45.66$), $F(1, 179) = 28.50$, $p \leq .001$. Secondly, subjects within the male specific language condition were found to have a significantly more
negative attitudinal response toward rape survivors, 
(M=52.31), than subjects within the female specific language 
condition, (M=47.19), F (1, 179) = 11.08, p<.001.

Thirdly, within the additional findings, the male 
target rape survivor, referred to in the ARSS2 or male 
specific language version, was found to have overall, 
consistently received a more negative attitudinal response 
than the female target rape survivor. Lastly, a substantial 
proportion of subjects within this study, (N=55.00, 30% out 
of total 183), provided open ended responses in conjunction 
with their structured close ended response category.

Conclusions From the Results

The following conclusions are suggested as a result of 
synthesizing the data analysis with the findings expected 
due to the review of the literature. This discussion 
focuses on two main areas of interest: the nature of the 
sample obtained, and the relation of both the proposed 
hypotheses and additional findings from this study to 
previous research findings.

Sample

The sample obtained in this study was of adequate size 
to interpret meaningful results, N=183 (Anastasi, 1988; 
LoBiondo-Wood & Haber, 1990; Shavelson, 1988). However, the 
sample was nonrandom consisting of only college students at 
a particular south west university. It is possible that this
nonrandom sample may not be truly representative of the population at large. Thus, the obtained results may not accurately reflect the attitudinal response, of the population at large, toward rape survivors.

This sample of 183 college students was, however, randomly assigned to the two conditions within the study, ARSS1 and ARSS2. Thus, the obtained results do accurately reflect a random selection of college students' attitudinal responses toward rape survivors.

Therefore, the sample of 183 subjects was selected nonrandomly but assigned randomly within the study. This yielded a nonrepresentative sample of the population at large but a random representation of the 183 college students' attitudinal responses toward rape survivors.

The sample of 183 college students consisted of an equal distribution of females, (N=92), and males, (N=91). This distribution of gender allowed for a balanced reflection of female and male attitudinal responses toward rape survivors. Thus, the obtained results were not skewed by a gender weighted sample.

**Hypotheses and Additional Findings**

The theoretical foundation for this study was based in two areas of research. The first was prior rape research. The second was social psychological research of the defensive attribution theory. These two areas aided in both
the design of the study and the formulation of specific hypotheses.

Prior Rape Research and Results

Rape research has traditionally found that negative attitudes about rape and its survivors are consistently and often significantly, higher for males than females (Abbey et al., 1987; Bell et al., 1992; Blumberg & Lester, 1991; Fischer, 1986; Larsen & Long, 1988; Lottes, 1991; Stacy, et al., 1992). Specifically, the original ARVS studies found consistently, in all 14 studies conducted, that men significantly express a more negative attitudinal response toward rape survivors (Lee & Cheung, 1991; Ward, 1988).

This study, found that there was a significant difference in female and male attitudinal response scores toward rape survivors, $F(1, 179) = 28.50$, $p < .001$. Additionally, it was found that the significant difference in female and male scores translated to a directional finding. The male's responded with a significantly more negative attitudinal response toward rape survivors. Therefore, this study was consistent with the prior rape research findings that males tend to express a more negative attitudinal response toward rape and its survivors.

Prior rape research has also purported that male rape survivors tend to be attributed with more blame than a
female rape survivor. This translates to a more negative attitude towards male rape survivors (Burzcyk & Standing, 1989; Calderwood, 1987; Frazier, 1993; Goyer & Eddleman, 1984; Groth & Burgess, 1980; Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988; Smith et al., 1988; Struckman-Johnson, 1988). Specifically, the Burzyck and Standing study found that males, when compared on their ratings of blame for a female versus male rape survivor, attributed more blame to the male rape survivor (Burzyck & Standing, 1989).

This study, found that there was a significant difference in attitudinal response scores between the female specific language condition and the male specific language condition, $F(1, 179) = 11.08$, $p \leq .001$. Additionally, it was found that this significant difference translated to a directional finding. The male specific language condition received a significantly more negative attitudinal response score. So, consistently, overall, the target male rape survivor, in the male specific language condition, received a more negative attitudinal response. This was consistent with the prior rape research findings of a more negative attitude toward male rape survivors.

Therefore, the significant findings for the main effects of gender and gender specific language are in congruence with prior rape research. Additionally, the directional findings for male attitudes about rape survivors
and attitudes toward a male target rape survivor were also found to be consistent with prior rape research. However, the non-significance of the interaction between gender and gender specific language did not allow for support of the prior defensive attribution theory research.

**Defensive Attribution Theory and Results**

Defensive attribution research purports that less blame will be attributed to a survivor if anticipation of being in a similar situation is established (Gilmartin-Zena, 1983; Myers, 1993; Shaver, 1970). The key element here is that a person can identify with the survivor and their circumstances. Specifically, Gilmartin-Zena has suggested that male subjects cannot identify with the "ideal female victim (survivor)" thus, they tend to attribute more blame to the rape survivor due to lack of identification with their situation.

This study did not find support for the theory of defensive attribution for male subjects. In fact, male subjects, in this study attributed a more negative attitudinal response toward male rape survivors. Thus, the identification with a male rape survivor did not yield less blame or a more positive attitudinal response for male subjects. The interaction of males with male specific language did not yield any sort of significant result.

The lack of support for the defensive attribution
theory could be due to several factors. One, the nonrandom sample affected the results. Two, identification for the males with the male rape survivor created a threat to their belief system. Three, sex role stereotypes may have been involved.

**Nonrandom Sample**

The first issue of a nonrandom sample would be attributed to sampling error. A replication of this study, with a more randomized sample, could remedy this factor.

**Just World Hypothesis**

The second issue of the threat to the male subjects' belief system could be attributed to the social psychological concept of just world hypothesis. This concept is defined as "the belief that people get what they deserve, and so can be held accountable" (Chaplin, 1985). The theory then follows, that if this view is distorted, and one is threatened, they tend to attribute an internal locus of control for a situation as opposed to an external. (Burzyck & Standing, 1989; Myers, 1993).

The just world belief system purports that the specific individual is at fault for the situation, not the random environmental conditions. As a result, one who believes in a just world, is free from a threatening situation randomly happening to them (Myers, 1993).

This is to say, if one is raped, they are to blame
(internal locus of control), otherwise, this event of rape could randomly happen to anyone (external locus of control). According to a study by Smith, Keating, Hester, & Mitchell, the just world belief was hypothesized to make it difficult for subjects to rate unacquainted or stranger rape as a random event. This hypothesis was supported through significantly high subject ratings for carelessness and responsibility for the survivor of a stranger rape (Smith, Keating, Hester, & Mitchell, 1978).

This issue could be remedied through a replication of this study specifically with a theoretical base in just world hypothesis research as opposed to defensive attribution research. The research could be attempted through the addition of an instrument which measures the extent one's just world belief system. The just world instrument could then be analyzed in conjunction with ARSS scores to ascertain whether a correlational relationship exists.

**Sex Role Stereotypes**

The third issue deals with sex role stereotypes. Sex role stereotypes involve certain beliefs about how females and males should behave (Burzyck & Standing, 1989). An example could be; "Men are physically aggressive and women are physically passive" or "Men are sexually aggressive and women are sexually passive". These types of sex role
stereotypes for men and women can lead to assumptions about the female versus male rape survivor.

The first example of a sex role stereotype was the assumption that men are physically aggressive. In this situation the male rape survivor may be seen as stereotypically more capable of physically resisting a rapist. Therefore, if a man is raped, it may be assumed that he did not adequately physically resist and is at fault for the rape (Calderwood, 1987; Frazier, 1993; Goyer & Eddleman, 1984; Groth & Burgess, 1980; Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988; Smith et al., 1988; Struckman-Johnson, 1988).

The second example of a sex role stereotype was the assumption that men are sexually aggressive. In this situation the male rape survivor may be seen as stereotypically wanting or inviting the sex, and not seen as being sexually victimized. Therefore, it may be assumed that he wanted and desired the sex, whether forcible or not (Muehlenhard et al., 1992; Smith et al., 1988).

This issue of sex role stereotypes could be remedied through a replication of this study which attempted to correlate negative attitudes about rape survivors with sex role beliefs. The research could be attempted through the addition of a sex role belief scale, which could be analyzed in conjunction with the ARSS scores to ascertain whether a correlational relationship exists.
Previous research has been done with regard to both the just world hypothesis and sex role stereotypes in conjunction with the issue of rape (Burzyck & Standing, 1989; Smith et al., 1978; Smith et al., 1988). This study did not specifically consider these issues. However, sex role issues and just world beliefs did seem evident within the content of some open ended responses given by subjects in this study. (APPENDIX E)

Thus, the aforementioned conclusions, as to the ineffectiveness of the defensive attribution theory within this study, does seem to imply a study dealing with attitudes about rape survivors and the joint consideration of just world hypothesis and sex role stereotypes as motivating factors. Additionally, the content within some open ended responses obtained in this study lends support to the motivating factors of sex role stereotypes and just world hypothesis.

Limitations
The overall limitations of the study were:

1. Nonrandom sample was used. The subjects were all college students.
2. The ARSS2 version, male specific language, was not as highly normed and validated as the ARSS1 version, female specific language.
3. Culturally biased items were not controlled
for in this study.

4. Gender and sex may not always be interchangeable terms.

5. The manipulation of language was limited to the language within the original ARVS scale.

6. Gender specific language may overemphasize the inequalities that exist between men and women.

7. Attitudes assessed by a questionnaire are not always indicative of actual behavior.

Cautions in Interpreting Results

Additionally, there were limitations which specifically apply to the interpretation of the results obtained from this study. Thus, four cautions must be raised in interpreting the results of this study. The first of these would be with regard to the obtained sample used in this study. The sample was nonrandomly selected. Thus, the subjects within this study may not have been truly representative of the population at large.

The next caution specifically applies to the results obtained from the two-way ANOVA test. The interaction of gender by gender specific language was not found to be significant, $F(1, 179) = .046$, $p > .831$. This finding does not allow for a specific application of the defensive attribution theory. The male subjects and male specific
language did not interact in a way so as to support a positive identification of males with a male rape survivor. Thus, the defensive attribution theoretical basis for male attitudes about male rape survivors was not substantiated in this study.

The third caution, with regard to the interpretation of the results from this study, was the questionnaire instrument. Thirty percent of the subjects (N=55) provided open ended responses in conjunction with their Lickert scale category response. Some open ended responses commented on the structure of item statements within the ARSS instrument. Thus, the assessment tool employed in this study may require both editorial and conceptual revision.

The final caution is the fact that the open ended responses obtained within this study were not analyzed with regard to gender of the respondent or language version of questionnaire. This type of analysis could lend valuable qualitative information.

Recommendations For Further Research

A number of recommendations for further research are suggested to more comprehensively assess attitudes about rape survivors.

1. A replication of this study using a more randomized sample of the population at large. Less sampling error would provide for a more
accurate reflection of attitudes about rape survivors.

2. A replication of this study using an updated or revised version of the ARSS questionnaire instrument. This could be made possible through a preceding pilot study of the ARSS in its current form to ascertain the concerns for revision.

3. A replication of this study using a more extensive demographic profile. This could provide a more descriptive analysis of the obtained sample.

4. A replication of this study using the theoretical basis of the social psychological concept of just world hypothesis. This could aid in a more accurate discovery of the motivating factors for negative attitudinal responses toward rape survivors.

5. A replication of this study using a correlational analysis of sex role belief scales with negative attitudinal responses toward rape survivors. This could aid in a more accurate discovery of the motivating factors for negative
attitudinal responses toward rape survivors.

6. A replication of this study using a detailed interview process in conjunction with the ARSS questionnaire. Subjects could be randomly selected for interview from the pool of completed questionnaires. Their qualitative responses could reveal important information with regard to the motivations for negative attitudinal responses toward rape survivors.

Concluding Comments

The main effect hypotheses of this study were supported. The gender main effect found that men respond more negatively toward rape survivors. The gender specific language main effect found that the male specific language questionnaire received a more negative attitudinal response. These results were consistent with prior rape research findings.

The interaction hypothesis of this study was not supported. The interaction of gender by gender specific language was, therefore, not supported by the defensive attribution theoretical base. The interaction result from this study was not consistent with prior defensive attribution theory research.

Therefore, in summarizing, this study attempted to
ascertain the effects of a gender specific questionnaire on college students' attitudinal responses about rape survivors. The effects, according to the findings of this study, are that men, irregardless of gender specific language, expressed a significantly more negative attitudinal response toward rape survivors. Secondly, irregardless of gender, those who responded to a male specific language questionnaire, expressed a significantly more negative attitudinal response toward a male rape survivor.

The challenge for concerned researchers in the future is to determine, through a gender specific approach, the different motivations for negative attitudinal responses about rape survivors. Once these gender specific motivations are identified, perhaps more effective rape counseling, prevention, and education can be implemented. All of which are not devoid of the gender specific intricacies which exist and play a role in their level of effectiveness.
APPENDIX A

OUTLINE OF PRESENTATION
Outline of Presentation

I. Explain Study
   A. Introduce researcher (self)
      1. study is master's level thesis.
   B. Introduce topic: attitudes about rape survivors
      1. study is to assess college students' attitudinal responses about rape survivors.

II. Handout Consent Form
   A. Explain participation is both anonymous and voluntary.
   B. Explain assumed consent
   C. Point out counseling references

III. Handout Questionnaires
   A. Go over instructions
   B. Answer any questions
   C. Leave envelope in room for questionnaires to be put in.

IV. Leave the Room
   A. Allow subjects to answer questionnaire without researcher's presence

V. Return to Room
   A. Conclusion of class/meeting, retrieve data
APPENDIX B

HUMAN SUBJECTS LETTER OF APPROVAL
November 5, 1993

Victoria L. Turner, Candidate/MA
FCR: Counseling/Guidance
c/o Betty J. Newlon, Ph.D.
Esquire Apartments, #210
Campus Mail

RE: THE EFFECTS OF A NON-SEXIST SURVEY INSTRUMENT ON COLLEGE STUDENTS ATTITUDINAL RESPONSES' ABOUT RAPE SURVIVORS

Dear Ms. Turner:

We have received documents concerning your above cited project. Regulations published by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services [45 CFR Part 46.101(b) (2)] exempt this type of research from review by our Committee.

Thank you for informing us of your work. If you have any questions concerning the above, please contact this office.

Sincerely yours,

William F. Denny, M.D.
Chairman
Human Subjects Committee

WFD:rs

cc: Departmental/College Review Committee
APPENDIX C

RAPE ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE PACKET
CONSENT EXPLANATION

&

COUNSELING REFERENCES
Consent Explanation and Counseling References

Answering this questionnaire is completely voluntary. If there is a question that you find objectionable, just leave it blank.

Your identity will never be known. Your answers will be kept confidential; only anonymous group results will be shared.

THANK YOU FOR BEING AN IMPORTANT PART OF THIS RESEARCH.

NOTE: It is assumed that you are consenting to participating in this study by completing this questionnaire.

*** If participation in this study, in any way, elicits issues of your own please contact someone. Some references are listed below.

Tucson Rape Crisis Center--- 327-1171
(business) 327-7273
(Tucson Crisis Line)

Help On Call Crisis Line--- 323-9373

ASUA Helpline----------- 621-1000

Las Familias------------ 327-7122
INSTRUCTIONS

&

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE
Instructions and Demographic Profile

AGE: ____________
GENDER: _________ Male _________ Female

ATTITUDES ABOUT RAPE SURVIVORS SCALE (ARSS)

The following statements concern attitudes toward rape and rape survivors. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your reaction to each statement by indicating your response. Read each item carefully, but give your immediate response. Check the category which is closest to your opinion.

1= DS= Disagree Strongly
2= DM= Disagree Mildly
3= N= Neutral
4= AM= Agree Mildly
5= AS= Agree Strongly
Attitudes About Rape Survivors Scale (1)

1. A raped woman is a less desirable woman.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

2. The extent of the woman's resistance should be the major factor in determining if rape has occurred.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

3. A raped woman is usually an innocent victim.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

4. Women often claim rape to protect their reputations.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

5. 'Good' girls are as likely to be raped as 'bad' girls.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

6. Women who have had prior sexual relationships should not complain about rape.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

7. Women do not provoke rape by their appearance or behavior.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

8. Intoxicated women are usually willing to have sexual relations.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

9. It would do some women good to be raped.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

10. Even women who feel guilty about engaging in pre-marital sex are not likely to falsely claim rape.
    ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

11. Most women secretly desire to be raped.
    ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

12. Any female may be raped.
    ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

13. Women who are raped while accepting rides from strangers get what they deserve.
    ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14. Many women invent rape stories if they learn they are pregnant. | DS | DM | N | AM | AS |
| 15. Men, not women, are responsible for rape. | DS | DM | N | AM | AS |
| 16. A woman who goes out alone at night puts herself in a position to be raped. | DS | DM | N | AM | AS |
| 17. Many women claim rape if they have consented to sexual relations but have changed their minds afterwards. | DS | DM | N | AM | AS |
| 18. Accusations of rape by bar girls, dance hostesses, and prostitutes should be viewed with suspicion. | DS | DM | N | AM | AS |
| 19. A woman should not blame herself for rape. | DS | DM | N | AM | AS |
| 20. A healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist. | DS | DM | N | AM | AS |
| 21. Many women who report rape are lying because they are angry or want revenge on the accused. | DS | DM | N | AM | AS |
| 22. Women who wear short skirts or tight blouses are not inviting rape. | DS | DM | N | AM | AS |
| 23. Women put themselves in situations in which they are likely to be sexually assaulted because they have an unconscious wish to be raped. | DS | DM | N | AM | AS |
| 24. Sexually experienced women are not really damaged by rape. | DS | DM | N | AM | AS |
| 25. In most cases when a woman was raped, she deserved it. | DS | DM | N | AM | AS |
QUESTIONNAIRE: ARSS2
Attitudes About Rape Survivors Scale (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DS</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A raped man is a less desirable man.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The extent of the man’s resistance should be the major factor in determining if rape has occurred.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A raped man is usually an innocent victim.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Men often claim rape to protect their reputations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 'Good' guys are as likely to be raped as 'bad' guys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Men who have had prior sexual relationships should not complain about rape.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Men do not provoke rape by their appearance or behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intoxicated men are usually willing to have sexual relations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It would do some men good to be raped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Even men who feel guilty about engaging in pre-marital sex are not likely to falsely claim rape.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Most men secretly desire to be raped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Any male may be raped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Men who are raped while accepting rides from strangers get what they deserve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitudes About Rape Survivors Scale (2)

14. Many men invent rape stories if they learn they have contracted a sexually transmitted disease. () () () () ()

15. Men, not women, are responsible for rape. () () () () ()

16. A man who goes out alone at night puts himself in a position to be raped. () () () () ()

17. Many men claim rape if they have consented to sexual relations but have changed their minds afterwards. () () () () ()

18. Accusations of rape by bar guys, male strippers, and male prostitutes should be viewed with suspicion. () () () () ()

19. A man should not blame himself for rape. () () () () ()

20. A healthy man can successfully resist a rapist. () () () () ()

21. Many men who report rape are angry or want revenge on the accused. () () () () ()

22. Men who wear short shorts or tight jeans are not inviting rape. () () () () ()

23. Men put themselves in situations in which they are likely to be sexually assaulted because they have an unconscious wish to be raped. () () () () ()

24. Sexually experienced men are not really damaged by rape. () () () () ()

25. In most cases when a man was raped, he deserved it. () () () () ()
APPENDIX D

ORIGINAL ARVS
Original Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale

**ATTITUDES TOWARD RAPE VICTIMS (ARVS)**

The following statements concern attitudes toward women and rape. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your reaction to each statement by indicating your response. Read each item carefully, but give your immediate response. Check the category which is closest to your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DS</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. A raped woman is a less desirable woman. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

2. The extent of the woman's resistance should be the major factor in determining if rape has occurred. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

3. A raped woman is usually an innocent victim. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

4. Women often claim rape to protect their reputations. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

5. 'Good' girls are as likely to be raped as 'bad' girls. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

6. Women who have had prior sexual relationships should not complain about rape. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

7. Women do not provoke rape by their appearance or behavior. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

8. Intoxicated women are usually willing to have sexual relations. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

9. It would do some women good to be raped. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

10. Even women who feel guilty about engaging in pre-marital sex are not likely to falsely claim rape. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

11. Most women secretly desire to be raped. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Any female may be raped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Women who are raped while accepting rides from strangers get what they deserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Many women invent rape stories if they learn they are pregnant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Men, not women, are responsible for rape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>A woman who goes out alone at night puts herself in a position to be raped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Many women claim rape if they have consented to sexual relations but have changed their minds afterwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Accusations of rape by bar girls, dance hostesses and prostitutes should be viewed with suspicion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>A woman should not blame herself for rape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>A healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really tries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Many women who report rape are lying because they are angry or want revenge on the accused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Women who wear short skirts or tight blouses are inviting rape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Women put themselves in situations in which they are likely to be sexually assaulted because they have an unconscious wish to be raped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Sexually experienced women are not really damaged by rape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>In most cases when a woman was raped, she deserved it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

OPEN ENDED RESPONSES
Open Ended Responses

Editorial
1. "This statement needs rewording."
   (#10) --- 15 responses
2. "This statement is unclear."
   (#10) --- 5 responses
3. "Weird question!"
   (#10) --- 2 responses
4. "This question does not make sense."
   (#10) --- 4 responses
5. "Confusing!"
   (#10) --- 4 responses
6. "Question wording is ambiguous."
   (#12) --- 3 responses

Commentarial
1. "Depends upon who is doing the raping."
   (#15) --- 19 responses
2. "Depends on who has been raped."
   (#15) --- 6 responses
3. "No One is responsible for rape except for the rapist who disregards the wishes of the individual. If it is a male or female victim is irrelevant."
   (#15) --- 1 response
4. "Those who have raped others before."
   (#9) --- 2 responses
5. "Depends on the type of physical danger."
   (#20) --- 5 responses
6. "This is not my decision."
   (#17) --- 2 responses
7. "Because of their emotional unbalance."
   (#1) --- 1 response
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