



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Research Commons

<http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/>

Research Commons at the University of Waikato

Copyright Statement:

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from the thesis.

Rapists Among Us?
Rape Proclivity and Correlates in a New Zealand Sample of Men

A thesis
submitted in fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree
of
Master of Social Sciences
at
The University of Waikato
by
ANN TAPARA



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

2017

Abstract

Rates of rape proclivity reported by men have remained relatively unchanged since the infancy of rape proclivity research. International studies have found that a significant number of men admit to having some proclivity for rape, a proclivity that is associated with a range of sexually coercive and sexually aggressive behaviours.

The purpose of this research was to explore the proposition that many men are attracted to rape in the New Zealand context. The first aim of this study was to ascertain the prevalence of self-reported rape proclivity in a New Zealand community sample of men ($N = 118$). The second aim was to explore the relationship between rape proclivity and theoretically-related attitudes and beliefs including rape myth acceptance, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs and the acceptance of interpersonal violence.

Findings confirmed that the rate of self-reported rape proclivity was similar to those found in international samples, with men more willing to admit to some likelihood of rape when responding to behavioural descriptors than explicit questions. Rape proclivity was associated with theoretically-related attitudes and beliefs in the expected direction. Furthermore, there was a clear difference in responding between men who reported no likelihood of rape and men responding that they perceived were somewhat likely to rape.

The implications of these findings for those who work with men in this area include the need to acknowledge that strategies to raise awareness of rape and rape myths do not appear to be effective in isolation, and the need to develop more effective methods of addressing rape proclivity to impact on rates of sexual coercion and assault.

Acknowledgments

There are many people to thank for their involvement in and encouragement of this project. First and foremost, thank you to the men who participated; I value both your honesty and time.

Second, thank you to my friends and family. I owe you all a great deal of love, tea, time, chocolate, and alcohol. There are many of you who deserve special acknowledgement. My parents, Jean and Bernard, thank you for supplying constant support, and an unprecedented amount of nagging. My amazing, fierce daughters, you demonstrated fantastic free-ranging skills while mothering duty was suspended. Mokai, you have given years of assistance and encouragement in getting to this point in my education. My friends Ryan and Heidi, for the always open, but undoubtedly tired ear, difficult conversations, and fearless moral inventories. Glen Kilgour, you ignited both an interest in offending and self-belief. My current and former classmates, you have always been my cheerleaders. My wider family, friends, and the residents of Wombat Towers, you have listened to two years of whinging and consistently responded with positivity. It has required massive forbearance by all and you all have nothing but my gratitude. I may now stop ranting about patriarchy and rape, but I make no promises.

I must also thank my supervisors, Dr Armon Tamatea and Dr Jo Thakker. I have appreciated your invaluable guidance, vast knowledge, and enormous patience. You have both been the face of calm in my sea of self-doubt and pointed me in the right direction while I fumbled around with little idea of how to accomplish this task.

I would lastly like to acknowledge the University of Waikato for their generous financial assistance.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of tables.....	viii
Chapter one: Literature review	1
Defining sexual coercion and rape	1
New Zealand Definitions	3
Rape culture	5
Rape myths	8
Research on self reported likelihood of raping	14
Attraction to sexual aggression	14
Self-reported likelihood of raping	15
The semantic value of the word ‘rape’	17
The impact of perceived risks and rewards of rape on rape proclivity	18
Rape proclivity as a measure of potential for rape	19
Rape myth acceptance and rape proclivity	20
The impact of rape myth acceptance on rape proclivity	20
The mechanism by which rape myth acceptance influences rape proclivity	22
The impact of implicit and explicit rape-supportive beliefs on rape proclivity	23
Rape proclivity and perpetration of sexual assault	24
Individual differences influencing rape proclivity	26
The impact of individual variables on rape proclivity	26
The impact of sexually aggressive pornography and sexual fantasy on rape proclivity	27
The impact of personality variables on rape proclivity	29
The impact of beliefs and attitudes towards sexual interactions on rape proclivity	29
The impact of knowledge regarding the consequences of rape on rape proclivity	31

The impact of identification with the traditional male gender role on rape proclivity	32
Victim blaming	33
The rape myth of victim blaming	33
The influence of victim characteristics on attribution of blame	34
Physical attractiveness and attributions of victim blame	34
Prior sexual activity and attributions of victim blame	34
Hostile and benevolent sexism	36
Criticism of the construct of rape myths	41
Limitations of previous research	42
The current study	45
Chapter two: Methods	47
Recruitment	48
Participants	49
Age	49
Ethnicity	49
Sexual orientation	49
Employment	50
Relationship status	51
Measures	52
Attraction to Sexual Aggression Scale	53
Rape Scenarios	55
Acceptance of Modern Myths About Sexual Assault	58
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	61
Adversarial Sexual Beliefs	62
Acceptance of Interpersonal violence	64
Crowne-Marlow Scale	65
Administration	66
Statistical analysis	67
Ethical considerations	70
Informed consent	70
Privacy, anonymity and confidentiality	71
Risk and safety	71

Social and cultural responsivity	71
Chapter 3: Results	72
Descriptive Statistics for Questionnaires	72
Attraction to Sexual Aggression Scale	72
Acceptance of Modern Myths About Sexual Assault	72
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	73
Adversarial Sexual Beliefs	74
Acceptance of Interpersonal violence	74
Crowne-Marlow Scale	75
Descriptive Statistics for Rape Scenarios	75
Hypothesis 1	76
Attraction to Sexual Assault Scale	76
Rape Proclivity Scenarios	77
Hypothesis 2	79
Scale Correlation Analysis	79
Attraction to Sexual Aggression Scale correlations	81
Acceptance of Modern Myths About Sexual Assault Scale correlations	81
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory correlations	81
Adversarial Sexual Beliefs correlations	82
Acceptance of Interpersonal violence correlations	82
Rape proclivity scenario correlations	82
Hypothesis 3	83
Hypothesis 4	83
Attraction to Sexual Assault Scale correlations	83
Rape Proclivity Scenario Correlations	83
Hypothesis 5	84
Rape Proclivity Scenarios	84
Attraction to Sexual Assault Scale	85
Chapter four: Discussion	87
Discussion of Hypotheses	87
Hypothesis 1: Prevalence of self-reported rape proclivity	87
Hypothesis 2: Correlations between all measures except	

the CMSS	89
Hypothesis 3: Lack of correlation between the CMSS and other measures	90
Hypothesis 4: Strong positive correlation between the RP Scale and the ASA Scale with all other measures	90
Hypothesis 5: Mean scores on all measures greater for men with some self-reported likelihood of rape than men with no self-reported likelihood of raping	91
Between Group Differences	94
Implications	96
Limitations	100
Directions for future research	101
Conclusion	102
References	104
Appendix A: Informed consent	120
Appendix B: Rape scenarios	123

List of Tables

Table 1: Summary of research into rape proclivity rates	15
Table 2: Participant self-reported occupation by category	51
Table 3: Rape scenario variable	57
Table 4: Distribution of scores across rape scenarios	77
Table 5: Correlations between total scale and subscale scores for all measures	80
Table 6: Between group differences – Rape Scenarios	85
Table 7: Between group differences – Attraction to Sexual Assault measure	86

Chapter One: Literature Review

The current study aims to explore the proposition that many men are attracted to rape in the New Zealand context. The study aims to examine the proclivity for rape behaviour and rape-supportive beliefs in a New Zealand community sample and to explore the relationship between rape proclivity and theoretically-related attitudes and beliefs including rape myth acceptance, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs and the acceptance of interpersonal violence.

This section will first define the terms sexual assault and rape, and offer data pertaining to the prevalence of rape. It will then explain the concept of rape culture and explore specific rape myths. General theories of the motivation for rape will be discussed briefly before research into self-reported likelihood of raping is summarised. Next, the association between rape proclivity and rape myths will be explained. Individual differences that can impact on rape proclivity will be discussed, including differences in victim blaming attitudes, belief in a just world, and hostile and benevolent sexism. Situational factors that may impact on rape proclivity will also be discussed. Criticisms of the construct of rape myths will be offered, as well as a discussion of the limitations of past research in the area of rape proclivity. Finally, the purpose and expectations of the current study will be presented.

Defining Sexual Coercion and Rape

In 2014, Edwards, Bradshaw and Hinsz published a study entitled “Denying rape but endorsing forceful intercourse – Exploring differences among responders”. The study included 86 college aged males and examined group differences between individuals who did not endorse the intention to use sexually coercive behaviour or rape, those who endorsed the intention to engage in rape when described behaviourally but who denied the intention to rape when labelled as such, and those who endorsed the intention to rape outright. The study was widely reported on in the media, reverberating with the current focus on rape and rape culture. The finding that men who reported greater hostility towards women and more callous sexual attitudes – defined as the expectation of

sexual dominance of men and the positioning of women as objects for their pleasure (Edwards, Bradshaw and Hinsz, 2014) – would be more likely to endorse rape was not the aspect of the study that was most widely reported. The finding that appeared to be most widely reported was that 31.7%, or 26 of the 86 respondents admitted some intent to force a woman to engage in sexual intercourse.

In the sound bite format of news titles, the study was condensed down into a pithy summary with varying degrees of generalisation: “1 In 3 college men in survey say they would rape a woman if they could get away with it” (Filipovic, 2015), “A third of male students say they’d rape a woman if there were no consequences” (Warren, 2015), and most broadly “Study: 1 in 3 men would rape if they wouldn’t get caught or face consequences” (Culp-Ressler, 2015). The implication appeared to be that the study represented men as a homogenous group rather than a sample of 86 college aged males, and that one third of all men would rape a woman if they had the opportunity to do so undetected.

Edwards, Bradshaw and Hinsz (2014) noted that most studies in the area of sexual aggression do not clearly differentiate between sexual coercion and rape. The authors defined sexual coercion as “utilising nonphysical tactics to obtain a non-consensual sexual encounter” and rape as “utilising force to obtain non-consensual sexual encounter” (p. 189). The difference between the definitions of rape and sexual coercion in this instance, focuses not on whether there is penile penetration, but whether physical force was used with rape characterised by physical dominance rather than a lack of consent.

Ryan (2004) earlier noted that the terms rape, sexual aggression and sexual coercion often lack clarity in the literature, so drew on research from several sources to clarify the definition of these terms including Muehlenhard, Powch, Phelps and Giusti’s (1992) definition of rape as usually implying that penetration was achieved using force or drugs. Sexual coercion also involved the use of force as per Byers and O’Sullivan’s (1996) definition. They suggested that sexual aggression is a broad term that applies to a variety of forceful sexual behaviours. Sexual coercion was considered the broadest term, encompassing “any form of

force or pressure used in an attempt to make a non-consenting other engage in some type of sexual activity” (Byers & O’Sullivan, 1996, p. 3). Common forms of pressure included touching, flirting, commenting on or complementing the other person’s body or sexuality, demanding an explanation of their reluctance, tickling, sulking and talking about one’s feelings (Byers & O’Sullivan, 1996). These definitions provide a hierarchical system in which sexual coercion encompasses the more direct sexual aggression, and sexual aggression includes the still more specific act of rape.

Society, in general, may not view sexual assault and rape in such unambiguous terms based on the concept of consent, but rather employ rape scripts. Rape scripts are a prototypical view of rape that encompasses the nature of the interaction (e.g. the location and use of weapons), the roles and conduct of each party according to their gender, the boundaries of vulnerability to being raped, and the disposition of and responsibility accorded to the victim (Crome & McCabe 2001). A number of researchers have found that the stereotypical definition of rape involves a surprise sexual attack by a stranger, who uses violence to overcome the woman’s physical resistance and complete the rape (Bachman & Paternoster, 1993; Estrich, 1987), with traditional stranger rape scripts typically occurring outdoors (Krahe, 1991). This lack of recognition of rape as a denial of an individual’s right to withhold consent for sexual activity may obscure occurrences of rape that do not conform to stereotypical rape scripts (Crome & McCabe, 2001; Ryan, 2011). Rape by acquaintances or intimate partners, rape that does not occur outside and rape in the absence of physical force fail to meet the stereotypical definition of rape and may cause such events to be overlooked.

New Zealand Definitions

The Crimes Act (1961) defines the broader offence of sexual violation in New Zealand law. Sexual violation occurs when a person has a sexual connection with another without their consent or without believing on reasonable grounds that they consent to the connection. Sexual

violation includes penetration with objects or parts of the anatomy other than the penis and of bodily orifices other than the genitalia.

The act of rape is more narrowly defined. Section 128 of the Crimes Act 1961 (Crimes Act, 1961) specifies that rape occurs when sexual connection occurs when a person penetrates the genitalia of another person with their penis without their consent, and without believing on reasonable grounds that they consent. According to the legal definition of rape in New Zealand, rape is a gender bound crime: rape can only be effected by an individual with a penis, and can only be perpetrated against people with genitalia capable of being penetrated. Rape is a sex crime perpetrated exclusively by men against women, whereas sexual violation can be perpetrated by either sex against male or female victims.

The Crimes Act (1961) goes on to clarify that acquiescing to sexual activity does not imply consent in all circumstances. Section 128A (Crimes Act, 1961) explains that a lack of protest or physical resistance does not equate to consent. Compliance due to force being applied to the non-initiator or any other person, an expressed or implied threat of such force against the non-initiator or any other person, or the fear of such force being applied also fails to constitute consent. Consent is unable to be given if an individual is asleep, unconscious, or affected by alcohol or drug intoxication to the point where they cannot intentionally decide whether to engage in the activity or not. Consent is also unable to be given by someone affected by an intellectual, mental or physical condition that prohibits them from consenting or refusing in an informed manner. Finally the Act specifies that consent is not considered to be given if a person submits to or participates in sexual activity because they are mistaken about the identity of the other person or the nature and quality of the act. Section 129A of The Crimes Act (1961) also renders people criminally liable if they induce consent using threats against a person's physical safety, reputation, or employment or economic position. The Act makes clear that consent involves an informed choice free of coercion, violence or threat, made when the individual making that choice is not asleep, unconscious, or otherwise impaired.

Rape Culture

The act of rape cannot be examined in isolation. Rape does not occur in a vacuum; rather it is symptomatic of a pervasive rape culture endemic to Western society (Pearson, 2000). Pearson (2000) describes rape as “the common cold of society” (Pearson, 2000, p. 12), an act assimilated into our wider cultural landscape and surrounded by much inaccurate folklore, similar to the common cold. This rape supportive culture, eroticises and often glamorises sexual violence, portraying rape as a normal course of events in heterosexual relationships (Wolf, 1990). Pearson (2000) explains that rape culture fosters the act of rape through rape-supportive media representations of the interactions between men and women. These depictions suggest that it is acceptable for men to use aggression to accomplish their goals and meet their needs while simultaneously suggesting women should be subordinate, capitulating to men’s power and demands. Rape, Pearson posits, is the logical extension of this pattern of gender-based interaction, and has become a relatively unquestioned part of our social system.

Similarly, Quakenbush (1989) defines rape culture as the subtle and not-so-subtle supports for rape with the ubiquitous social scripts depicting men as aggressive and women as passive, creating a climate that serves to promote the occurrence of rape, hostility to rape victims, and ready justifications for actual and potential rapists. A number of other authors have also suggested that rape is a logical extension of sex role socialisation processes that both encourage the sexual objectification of women and legitimise coercive sexuality in men (Brownmiller, 1975; Burt, 1980; Check & Malamuth, 1983; Diamond 1980).

Rape culture is pervasive. It is represented in advertising, cinema, and newspaper headlines (Brinson, 1992; Franiuk, Seefeldt, & Vandello, 2008; Los & Chamard, 1997). Research on the frequency of rape myth endorsement in different mediums has found that media consumers are regularly exposed to rape myths in newspaper headlines, newspaper articles, and on television with the most frequently espoused myth being that the female victim is lying (Cuklanz 2000; Los and Chamard 1997; Zaleski, Gundersen, Baes, Estupinian, & Vergara, 2016).

Media also offer a response to the issue of rape, which has the power to shape public opinion. The solution commonly proposed by the media is “avoidance” (Pearson, 2000). Placing the onus to prevent rape solely on women, safety messages suggest that potential victims avoid dark streets, unsafe places, bad situations, going out by themselves, consuming too much alcohol, dressing in a revealing manner, being too aggressive or insecure or smiling too much (Pearson, 2000).

Sills et al. (2016) note that for young people, social media interaction operates against a distressing and taken-for-granted backdrop of rape culture including rape jokes, “slut shaming”, demeaning sexualised representations of women and the celebration of male conquest.

Humour can also reflect rape culture. Ryan and Kanjorski (1998) found enjoyment of sexist humour to be positively correlated with self-reported likelihood of rape; physical, psychological and sexual aggression in men; and rape-related attitudes and beliefs, adversarial sexual beliefs and acceptance of interpersonal violence. As Richlin (1992, p. xxviii) noted, “cultures where rape is a joke are cultures that foster rape”.

Anderson, Cooper, and Okamura (1997) explain that the feminist perspective proposes that male hostility towards women, including sexual aggression, is caused by the social conditions perpetuated by the patriarchal culture. Patriarchy has supported the development of sex roles that maintain a power differential between men and women with the traditional male role emphasising aggression and dominance and the traditional female role emphasising the contrasting quality of submissiveness. Failure to act in accordance with the expectations inherent in the female role magnifies men’s negative attitudes towards women, creating a situation in which adversarial sexual beliefs abound and men struggle to dominate women who do not fit their expectation of passivity.

A number of authors have conceptualised men’s sexual aggression as primarily the result of gender role socialisation (Brownmiller, 1975; Burt, 1980; Check & Malamuth, 1983; Diamond 1980). This concept emerged from second-wave feminism but has remained a prominent viewpoint in the discussion of male dominance (for example, Jensen, 2017). The

gender socialisation process operates through the society in which men and women find themselves, and the institutions they interact with within those societies (Anderson & Doherty, 1997). Males are socialised to be sexually dominant and initiate sexual activity while women are socialised to be more passive and initiate sexual interactions less frequently (Impett & Peplau, 2002; Seal & Ehrhardt, 2003). Littleton (2001) suggested that in this context, rape between dating partners may be viewed as a normative sexual interaction founded on the dominance of the male and his role as the initiator of sexual contact. Similarly, a review by Grubb and Turner (2012) concluded that women who violate traditional gender norms are blamed more as rape victims than women who ascribe to traditional feminine roles, highlighting the relationship between socially constructed gender norms and sexual violence.

Fear of sexual assault and rape is a source of anxiety for many women; anxiety which serves to limit their freedom of movement and increase their dependence on men for access to public places (Day, 1995; Riger & Gordon, 1981). This is also evident in the unwillingness of many women to go out at night and their avoidance of certain places due to fears of sexual assault or rape (Riger & Gordon, 1981; Warr, 1985). The fear of being raped “keeps women at home. Keeps women passive and modest for fear that they be thought provocative” (Griffin, 1979, p. 21). Although it has been argued that the contribution of rape to gender oppression has been overemphasised, the generalised sense of fear felt by many women and the practical accommodations they make in their lives to avoid it would suggest that this criticism is unfounded (Anderson, 2016).

One concerning reflection of rape culture is the high number of unreported rapes – rape is often not adequately identified as such by either the perpetrators or the victims. This reflects the socialisation of women into accepting aggressive and coercive sexual behaviour as normative and the socialisation of men to believe that sexual aggression is an acceptable way of interacting with women (Pearson, 2000; Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004). It is estimated that only 10% of the cases of sexual

violence are reported in New Zealand (United Nations Committee Against Torture, 2015).

The view of male sexual aggression emerging as result of socialisation processes in Western society is based on the premise that this socialisation process supports the development of opposing roles and characteristics in men and women, such as aggression versus passivity. The resultant social situation is one in which rape is viewed as an extreme point on a socially constructed continuum of sexually aggressive behaviour rather than a psychopathological aberration (Bouffard & Exum, 2003) with rape being an extension of the natural process of male socialisation rather than a criminal act (Murphy et al., 1986). Rather than reflecting psychopathology, sexual aggression is seen as occurring due to male attitudes towards women and aggression learned via the enculturation process (Murphy et al., 1986).

As Murphy, Coleman and Haynes (1986) point out, the sociological and psychopathology models of sexual coercion and aggression are not mutually exclusive. The sociocultural model posits that factors such as inaccurate beliefs about rape, sex role stereotyping and a tendency to sexualise and dominate women are central to men's sexual aggression, while the psychopathology or individual differences model highlights factors such as hostility, generalised anger and level of arousal to rape depictions. Individual differences in such characteristics can be viewed as reflection of wider societal attitudes. Part of this socialisation involves the acceptance of rape myths, implicit and explicit beliefs about rape, rapists and their victims.

Rape Myths

The term "rape myth" was first coined by Burt (1980) and Brownmiller (1975). Rape myths have variously been described as "prejudiced beliefs that serve to exonerate the rapist and blame the victim" (Bohner et al., 1998, p. 257), "prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists" (Burt, 1980, p. 217) and "attitudes and beliefs that are generally false but are widely and persistently held, and that serve to deny and justify male sexual aggression against women" (Lonsway &

Fitzgerald, 1994, p. 134). Perhaps the most thorough description is provided by Bohner who defines rape myths as “descriptive or prescriptive beliefs about rape (i.e. about its causes, context, consequences, perpetrators, victims and their interaction) that serve to deny, trivialise or justify sexual violence exerted by men against women” (Bohner, 1998, p. 14, in Abrams et al., 2003). Franiuk, Seefeldt, and Vandello (2008) also suggest that rape myths also function to provide a justification for perpetrators of sexual violence. Unsurprisingly, men demonstrate higher rape myth acceptance than women (for a review see Grubb & Turner, 2012).

As Abrams and colleagues (Abrams et al., 2003) point out that rape myths are defined by the cultural functions that they serve rather than representing empirical facts. Rape myths acceptance is associated with other attitudes and beliefs that are related to and also have an impact on gender relations including sex role stereotyping, acceptance of interpersonal violence and adversarial beliefs (Quakenbush, 1989). Franiuk, Seefeldt and Vandello (2008) suggest that rape myths allow women to protect themselves from the uncomfortable reality that they or their loved ones are vulnerable to rape by supporting their belief in a just world hypothesis, which holds that the world is fair; that good things happen to good people, and that bad things only happen to bad people (Lerner, 1980, in Franiuk, Seefeldt, & Vandello, 2008). This belief may function to allow women to feel that they have control over being a victim of a sex crime and men to distance themselves from the “bad” men who commit such assaults, an effect described by Grubb and Turner (2012) as overcompensation for a seemingly undeserved act.

Grubb and Turner (2012) suggest that in addition to sustaining male sexual violence, rape myths perpetuate victim blaming attitudes. Victim-blaming is the phenomenon whereby victims are considered to be responsible for their own victimisation (Whatley, 1996). These false beliefs about rape are centred on the victim, the perpetrator and the nature and seriousness of sexual assault. Myths surrounding victims included that the victim is lying, that women deserve rape because of their behaviour or attire, that women enjoy and desire to be raped, and that a woman can

physically resist rape if she really wants to. Myths about perpetrators of rape include the belief that male sexuality is uncontrollable and rapists could not stop themselves, and that an individual was not the type of person to commit a sexual assault. Myths about the act of rape itself included that it is a natural consequence of some interactions between men and women, and that it is a trivial, benign event (Franiuk, Seefeldt, Cepress, & Vandello, 2008; Franiuk, Seefeldt and Vandello, 2008; Frese, Moya, Megías, 2004).

Ben-David and Schneider (2005) proposed a tripartite conceptualisation of rape myths including the belief that women enjoy rape (victim masochism), the belief that women bear the responsibility for rape (victim precipitation) and the belief that a woman has lied about rape (victim fabrication). Grubb and Turner (2012) suggested that “rape myth acceptance is therefore synonymous with the concepts of victim blaming and each serves to propagate one another” (Grubb & Turner, 2012, p. 445). A 2004 study of 20 male social work and psychology students found that 70% of participants believed that rape may sometimes occur due to a man’s misinterpretation of a woman’s desires and intentions regarding sexual activity (Lev-Wiesel, 2004). This belief was clearly illustrated by the participant quote “she fools you...I won’t say she deserves to be raped but she brings it on herself” (Lev-Wiesel, 2004, p. 205). Willan and Pollard’s (2003) research also found that likelihood of acquaintance rape was best predicted by male initial perception of female sexual intent.

Polaschek and Ward (2002) discussed a number of implicit theories about women posited to underlie rape and that align with the rape myths originally identified by Burt (1980). The authors examined the existing literature discussing rape-related cognitive distortions and inferred the underlying beliefs in order to account for the distortions most frequently expressed by rapists. Five major areas of belief were identified: women as unknowable, women as sex objects, male sex drive as uncontrollable, entitlement, and dangerous world beliefs. The belief that women are unknowable suggests that women are inherently different from men in ways that cannot be understood, resulting in stereotyped thinking in which women are categorised as “nice girls or whores” (Polaschek & Ward,

2002, p. 394). Polaschek and Ward further suggested that this belief facilitates sexual violence as it is easier to harm someone who is perceived as different to oneself. They note that this belief is similar to other rape myths in which women are portrayed as deliberately deceptive, disguising their own needs and wants including their sexual desires, and as resisting sexual advances from men due to such resistance constituting “a socially scripted form of foreplay, not an indicator of a woman’s desires” (Polaschek & Ward, 2002, p. 394). The belief that women are inherently different and therefore unknowable becomes self-confirming; less effort is made to get to know women as this is viewed as an impossible outcome. The belief is also self-serving as it is used to justify sexual aggression. Similarly, a review by Grubb and Turner (2012) concluded that rape myths may serve as cognitive neutralisers that allow men to silence prohibitions against aggressing against women in situations where they want to engage in sexual activity against a woman’s will. Quakenbush (1989) also suggested that as the sex role socialisation processes support rape myth acceptance, such myths are most likely to influence date or acquaintance rape situations rather than stranger rape situations.

The view of woman as sex objects describes the belief that women are constantly in a state of sexual reception, existing to cater to the sexual needs of men. The authors suggested that this belief contributes to the misattribution of sexual intent to non-sexual behaviour and the belief that women do not know their own sexual desires, saying “no” while their body language says “yes” to sexual advances. Viewing women as constantly receptive sexual targets causes non-consent to be viewed as a cue to increase efforts to obtain sexual contact. The authors also suggest that this view of women contributes to the belief that rape is not harmful and that some forms of rape are not “real rape”. Scully’s interview with a rapist convicted of abducting and raping a 15 year-old girl clearly illustrates this point; the man stated that women’s rejection is a “societal no so they won’t have to feel responsible later” (Scully, 1990, p. 104).

According to Polaschek and Ward (2002), the belief that the male sex drive is uncontrollable, positions women as gatekeepers of sexuality with a responsibility to control the force of men’s libido. It also allows

women to be viewed as inviting or provoking rape through their behaviour – specifically a failure to fulfil their gate-keeping responsibility – and contributes to the belief that rape complaints are often false and vindictive attacks on the male party (Polaschek & Ward, 2002). Rather than placing men in a position of responsibility for committing rape, it blames the victim for permitting, even provoking, such behaviour. Viewing the male sex drive as uncontrollable exonerates rapists and removes the need for accountability.

Entitlement refers to the belief that men should have their needs – including sexual needs - met on demand. It is based on the Western belief that women are inferior to men, sexually naïve, psychologically immature, and in need of male control. Punishment, including rape, is considered to be warranted if a woman does not conduct herself in the expected manner. This belief supports the feminist position that rape is a means of social control (Brownmiller, 1975; Day, 1995; Griffin, 1979).

The dangerous world belief related by Polaschek and Ward is “based on core beliefs that the world is inherently a hostile and uncaring place where, by default, others are out to harm, exploit, and degrade and deceive in order to promote their own interest” (Polaschek & Ward, 2002, p. 398). This stance may underpin adversarial sexual beliefs in which women are viewed as harmful and malevolent, with aggressive action required to pre-empt their deceptive and hostile behaviour. It is easy to see how believing that the intention to harm, exploit, degrade and deceive others in one’s own interest is normative, could position men and women as sexual adversaries, which could support the use of aggression to obtain sexual gratification.

The beliefs that rape is not harmful and that sex is a male entitlement regardless of the wishes of the woman identified by Poaschek and Ward (2002) was also identified in research into marital rapists by Bergen (1996) and Finkelhor and Yllo (1985). Frese, Moya and Megías explained that as women are socialised into inhibiting expression of sexual interest, their “refusal is interpreted as token, whereas men learn to act out their sexual interest and they are told that in certain circumstances, it is not necessary to control their sexual urge” (Frese et al., 2004, p. 143).

A 2004 study by Anderson, Simpson-Taylor, and Herrmann (2004) examined the internal 'rules' stipulating, when a man can assume a woman wants to have sex with him, that men may ascribe to. They found that a greater endorsement of rules was associated with self-reported sexually coercive behaviour and postulated that if a female is perceived as having broken any of these unspoken rules, a male may believe it acceptable to forcibly have sex. Anderson and colleagues (2004) illustrated with the reciprocity rule (Cialdini, 2000), in which a man may believe that if he pays for dinner and a movie with a woman, he is entitled to be repaid with sex. Conversely the rule suggests that if a woman breaks that rule by refusing to engage in sexual activity, a man is entitled to force intercourse. In line with a feminist perspective, the authors assert that these unwritten rules are most likely to exist alongside gender inequality. They further suggest that such an oppressive system of rules possibly originated as a form of social control in which "groups with social authority and power (e.g. men) then subvert these rules into erroneous beliefs and myths that benefit their group and maintain the inferiority and subordination of less powerful groups (e.g. women)" (Anderson et al., 2004, p. 78). More broadly, Aosved and Long (2006) found a relationship between rape myth acceptance and other oppressive belief systems with participants with high rape myth acceptance also demonstrating prejudicial attitudes towards sexual orientation, gender, race, age, class and religion. They suggested that while each constituted a specific type of dominance within an overarching intolerant belief system. Suarez and Gadala (2010) also found a correlation between rape myth and other oppressive belief systems including racism, heterosexism, classism and ageism.

Not only is the degree to which men ascribe to traditional gender roles predictive of rape myth acceptance (Burt, 1980), it is associated with greater rape proclivity and perpetration of sexual aggression. Truman, Tokar and Fischer (1996) examined the relationship between masculine gender roles and date rape. Their research found that that identification with masculine related constructs predicted self-reported endorsement or perpetration of sexually coercive behaviours. Research by a number of other authors supports the assertion that men who more strongly adhere

to traditional notions of masculinity are more likely to report past sexual aggression, and are also more likely to report rape supportive attitudes and a proclivity for rape (Good, Hepper, Hillenbrand-Gunn, & Wang, 1995; Locke & Mahalik, 2005; Malamuth, Heavey & Linz, 1996; Malamuth, Sockloskie, Koss, & Tanaka, 1991; Tieger, 1981;). The next section will focus on this manifestation of rape culture – men’s own beliefs about their likelihood of raping.

Prior Research on Self-reported Likelihood of Raping

This section will provide an overview of the research into self-reported likelihood of raping. The attraction to sexual aggression will be discussed, followed by research into rates of self-reported likelihood of raping. The impact of the word rape on men’s willingness to disclose a proclivity to rape will be discussed, also the impact of perceived risks and rewards on rape proclivity. Additionally, the use of rape proclivity as a measure of potential for rape will be considered.

Attraction to sexual aggression. Much research into sexual aggression has focussed on the inclination – or proclivity – of men to engage in sexually aggressive behaviour, with studies attempting to ascertain the likelihood of such behaviour under specified conditions (Malamuth, 1989a). Malamuth explained that “the construct of attraction to sexual aggression refers to the belief that aggressing sexually is likely to be a sexually arousing experience, both to aggressors and victims, so that the respondent believes that he might aggress in were it not for fear of punishment or other inhibitory factors” (Malamuth, 1989a, p. 30). Malamuth described these facets of the belief as the “expectancy component” and the “lure component” (Malamuth, 1989b), factors that have been implicated in self-reported rape proclivity by other researchers. O’Donohue, McKay and Schewe (1996) found that past sexual coercion was associated with lower expectancies of negative outcomes from the behaviour; Bouffard (2002) also found that self-reported likelihood of rape was correlated with perceived expectancies of negative outcomes associated with rape, although this effect was mediated by arousal.

Self-reported likelihood of raping. A number of studies have considered men's self-reported likelihood of raping under various conditions and in various circumstances, summarised in Table 1.

Table 1

Summary of Research into Rape Proclivity Rates

Author	Year	N	Act	Proclivity rate (%)
Tieger	1981	172	Rape	37
Briere & Malamuth	1983	356	Rape and sexual force	28
			Sexual force only	30
Osland, Fitch & Willis	1996	159	Rape or forced sexual activity	34
			Both rape and forced sexual activity	17
Stille, Malamuth & Schallow	1997	unknown	Rape	22
			Forced sexual activity	49
Yates	1997	652	Rape	10.3
			Sexual force	26
Bohner et.al.	1998	125	Sexual violence	33
Bouffard & Exum	2003	89	Rape	38
Edwards, Bradshaw & Hinsz	2014	86	Rape	31.7

Despite research being conducted over several decades, the studies have reported rates of self-reported likelihood of raping that are similar across time, with proclivity ranging from 10.3% to 38% for rape with even higher rates found for non-specific sexual violence. The study by Yates (1997, in

Lev-Wiesel 2004) appears to be somewhat of an anomaly with a 10.3% proclivity rate; most studies find rates in the range of 20% to 30%.

Malamuth (1981) summarised six collaborative studies in his 1981 paper "Rape Proclivity Among Males". The studies examined the participant's self-reported likelihood that they would rape someone if they were certain they would not get caught or suffer punishment as a result. Responses were coded according to a five point scale ranging from not at all likely (a score of 1) to very likely (a score of 5). The conditions employed included no exposure to stimuli that might influence their response, exposure to a videotaped interview with an actual rape victim, and exposure to an auditory pornographic description of rape. Surprisingly Malamuth (1981) reported a high level of consistency across conditions; around 35% of males expressed the belief that they had some likelihood of raping, as indicated by selecting a score of 2 or more. Also, an average of about 20% of participants responded with a score of 3 or above.

Tieger (1981) asked 172 males about the likelihood that they would rape if it could be guaranteed that their actions would be undetected, finding that around 37% of men indicated some likelihood of raping with around 20% indicating a likelihood greater or equal to "somewhat" likely, the midpoint of the associated rating scale. Tieger also found that males who fell into this category were more likely to believe that other males would rape in the same circumstances; that the victim acted seductively, enjoyed being raped, and was to blame; and to view the victim as more attractive.

Other studies have differentiated between subjects' self-reported likelihood of raping and likelihood of using sexual force, providing a behavioural description of rape in addition to labelling the act. Briere and Malamuth (1983) found that of 356 subjects, 28% indicated some likelihood of both raping and using sexual force and 30% admitted some likelihood of using force but not rape. Osland, Fitch & Willis (1996) found similar rates of proclivity. Their study engaged 159 college men and found that 34% indicated some proclivity to rape or forced sexual activity. Breaking it down further, 17% of participants indicated some likelihood of both raping and forcing sexual activity, 15% endorsed forced sexual

activity but not rape, and 5% endorsed rape but not forced sexual activity. Bohner and colleagues (Bohner et al., 1998) found that overall, 33% of their sample of 125 University students in Germany indicated some likelihood that they would use sexual violence against a woman, Yates (1997, in Lev-Wiesel, 2004) found that 26% of subjects reported some likelihood of using sexual force. Stille, Malamuth and Schallow (1987, in Osland, Fitch & Willis, 1996) reported higher rates with 22% of men indicating some likelihood of raping, and 49% endorsing that they would be likely to force a woman to engage in sexual activity when she was unwilling. Similarly, Bouffard and Exum (2003) found that 38% of their sample of 89 university aged males indicated some likelihood of behaving in the same manner as the rapist in the scenario presented.

A study by Alleyne, Gannon, O’Ciardha and Wood (2013) examined interest in multiple perpetrator rape, also known as ‘gang rape’. They found that 66% of their sample of 80 male university students “did not emphatically reject an interest in Multiple Perpetrator Rape”. In line with research into proclivity for individually perpetrated rape, they found a correlation between interest in this type of rape and rape supportive beliefs. The statistic is perhaps unsurprising given that Margolis (1998, in Lev-Wiesel 2004) identified a positive correlation between self-reported propensity to commit rape and the belief that peers supported such behaviour. Peer similarities were also examined by Malamuth (Malamuth, 1981) who found greater similarity between confirmed rapists and men who reported some likelihood of raping with regard to callous attitudes to sex and sexual arousal to rape depictions than between rapists and men who reported no likelihood of raping.

The semantic value of the word ‘rape’. The word rape has a strong semantic value. The 2014 study by Edwards, Bradshaw and Hinsz found that a substantial minority of men admitted they would rape when a behavioural descriptor was used rather than the value-laden, pejorative label ‘rape’. Lev-Wiesel (2004) found a similar conflict – while rapists were perceived by participants as aggressive, mentally disturbed and impulsive when labelled with the term ‘rapist’, 30% of these same participants

admitted that they would be capable of rape under specific circumstances. Likewise, Malamuth (1989b) found that 84% of 189 participants reported that they were not at all likely to commit rape, whereas that figure dropped to 62% when the term 'forced sex' was used. A second study replicating these questions (Malamuth, 1989b) found rates of 80% and 56% respectively. These studies consistently demonstrate that men are more likely to admit to a propensity for rape when a less affectively laden term is used. Forced sex appears to be a behaviour that men will more readily acknowledge as a possibility when compared to the same behaviour labelled in a more forthright manner, as rape.

The impact of perceived risks and rewards of rape on rape proclivity. Bouffard and Bouffard (2011) examined the relative perception of risk and reward associated with rape supportive attitudes. Attitudes included traditional gender norms, rape myth acceptance and the opposing yet often simultaneously held views of women as both acting as sexual gatekeepers and as being unable to provide more than "token resistance" (Bouffard & Bouffard, 2011, p. 629) to sexual advances, with such resistance being a cue for increased effort of the part of the male. The study presented a scenario to participants that clearly involved sexual activity with a non-consenting female, with the scenario concluding that the woman states her lack of interest in having sex but does not physically try to stop the male. Participants were exposed to one of three conditions: photographs of fully clothed women, photographs of nude women or a video of consensual heterosexual intercourse. They were then asked about the likelihood that they would employ specific strategies in order to engage the woman in sexual intercourse.

The study found that over the three conditions an average of 45% of men indicated that they would say things they did not mean to get the woman to agree to have sex, 20% would attempt to get her drunk in order to have sex and nearly 6% would have sex with her despite her protests. Nearly 29% of men suggested that rape would contribute to the possibility of a future romantic or sexual relationship with the victim, despite 81% also believing that such behaviour could have negative legal

consequences, suggesting an awareness of rape as a criminal act. Unsurprisingly, men in this group indicated a greater willingness to use coercive tactics than men who did not perceive rape to have potential relationship benefits. Surprisingly, the difference between the two groups with regards to having sex with the woman despite her protests, was not statistically significant. Stronger rape myth acceptance was the key factor differentiating men who would force sex from those who reported they would not. Margolis (1998, in Lev-Wiesel, 2004) also identified an association between self-reported propensity to commit rape and a narrow view of the acts that constitute rape, peer support for rape, and greater perceived rewards and costs of rape.

Demare and Briere (1988) examined the relationship between violent pornography and self-reported likelihood of sexual aggression. They found similar rates of self-reported likelihood of raping as other studies in the area; 27% of their sample of 222 undergraduate males reported some hypothetical likelihood of raping or using sexual force against a woman. The likelihood of such behaviour was associated with acceptance of interpersonal violence against women and the use of sexually violent pornography. The authors suggested that as both these factors had predictive power for sexual aggression, sexually aggressive behaviour may be a function of the fusion of sex and aggression, which produces a proclivity to be sexually aggressive and is influenced by other variables such as peer support. Although the study found a lower rate of self-reported likelihood of raping or using sexual force than some previous studies, the authors note that their sample was both younger and less sexually experienced, with lesser sexual experience tied to lower self-reported sexual aggression in at least one study (Kanin, 1967).

Rape proclivity as a measure of potential for rape. When conducting research into rape proclivity and sexual aggression, it is important to remain mindful that the potential for sexual aggression tapped by the measures does not occur in isolation, rather it interacts with other social, environmental, interpersonal and intrapersonal variables. As Malamuth, Haber and Feshbach (1980) explained, it should not be

assumed that men would actually commit rape because of their belief that there was a possibility of rape under hypothetical circumstance, while being assured of avoiding detection and punishment. They further suggested that a self-reported proclivity to rape may only be predictive of sexual aggression when found in an exaggerated form and combined with other factors (Malamuth et al., 1980). As Malamuth explained, rape proclivity measures deal with potential and as “people have the potential to engage in virtually any behaviour” (Malamuth, 1981, p. 139) it is not possible to use such tools to accurately identify potential rapists (Malamuth, 1989a). More appropriate, according to Malamuth (1981), is the attempt to determine a relatively likelihood of rape under specific conditions that may or may not occur. These statements were made during the infancy of rape proclivity research; while rape proclivity does not mark a person as being destined to rape or force sexual activity, the likelihood that a male with a high degree of rape myth acceptance may engage in such behaviour does not appear as remote as these quotes may suggest.

Rape Myth Acceptance and Rape Proclivity

Greater acceptance of rape myths is associated with rape proclivity. The mechanism behind this association is not clear – rape myths possibly serve a neutralising function or position the behaviour as normative. This effect holds true for both implicit and explicit rape-supportive beliefs.

The impact of rape myth acceptance on rape proclivity. Other research has focussed more broadly on the relationships between proclivity for sexual aggression, actual sexual aggression and rape myth acceptance. Higher levels of rape myth acceptance have consistently been found to be associated with greater rape proclivity and perpetration of sexual assault (Abbey, Mc Auslan, & Ross, 1998; Burt, 1980; Bohner, Jarvis, Eyssel, & Siebler, 2005; De Gue & Di Lillo, 2004; Eyssel, Bohner, & Siebler, 2006; Loh, Gidycz, Lobo, & Luthra, 2005; Widman & Olson, 2013). Murphy, Coleman and Haynes (1986) concluded that men who engage in sexually coercive behaviour hold multiple misconceptions

regarding rape and “see women as wanting and desiring to be raped” (p. 273). Supporting these conclusions, White, Donat and Humprey (1996) also found that men who admitted to engaging in past sexual coercion were more likely to endorse rape-supportive attitudes, particularly affectively-based items, also that they held more negative beliefs about women who have been sexually victimised than non-coercive men.

Bouffard and Bouffard (2011) found that 29% of men believed that there was the potential for a future romantic or sexual relationship between the rapist and victim in a given scenario. Men who ascribed to the view that women may still be willing to enter into a relationship with a man who had raped them also demonstrated an increased adherence to rape myths generally and a greater self-reported willingness to use sexually coercive tactics against women.

Research also suggests that perpetration of sexual assault by males is related to a greater endorsement of adversarial sexual beliefs (Grubb & Turner, 2012). Adversarial sexual beliefs describe the view that sexual interactions between males and females involve a power exchange in which one will conquer and one will surrender (Burt, 1980). Adversarial sexual beliefs involve “the expectation that sexual relations will be exploitive or manipulative and that the other party cannot be trusted” (Murphy et al., 1986, p. 267) with women viewed as “sly, manipulative, and self-centred” (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995, p. 708). Rapaport and Burkhart (1984) also found that adversarial sexual beliefs were correlated with self-reported coercive sexual behaviour.

Bouffard and Exum (2003) found that attitudes supporting sexual coercion had both a direct and indirect effect on self reported likelihood of sexual aggression. Their research found that stronger coercion-supportive attitudes increased participant’s self-reported likelihood of engaging in sexual coercion, while also increasing arousal to cues of coercion. Greater sexual arousal to coercive cues was also found to be related to self-reported likelihood of using sexually aggressive tactics, creating two pathways by which coercion-supportive attitudes increased self-reported proclivity.

The mechanism by which rape myth acceptance influences rape proclivity. While the relationship between rape proclivity and rape myth acceptance has been consistently demonstrated, the mechanism of the effect has not always been clear. Bohner and colleagues (1998) explained that high rape myth acceptance may relate to rape proclivity in several ways. They suggested that it may serve to neutralise norms that oppose sexual violence in advance of sexual aggression, thereby facilitating the behaviour; that rape myths may be endorsed as a means of justifying sexually aggressive behaviour after the fact to excuse actions already completed; or it may be that there is no direct causal link and that another as yet unidentified variable affects both rape proclivity and rape myth acceptance. Their 1998 study examined the causal pathway between rape proclivity and rape myth acceptance, finding that the correlation between rape myth acceptance and rape proclivity was significantly higher after participants had either responded to a number of realistic date rape scenarios or filled out a rape myth acceptance scale. When the cognitive accessibility of rape myths was high, men reported a higher likelihood of rape. Anti-victim attitudes were also identified as influencing the behavioural inclination to rape rather than behavioural inclination cuing anti-victim attitudes. On the basis of their findings they suggested that rape myth acceptance has a causal influence on rape proclivity. The authors went on to explain the applicability of their research to non-laboratory conditions: many natural situations contain cues that likely heighten the cognitive accessibility of rape myth beliefs, particularly in situations where the male has the opportunity to exert sexual violence. For example, a woman reluctantly declining sex may trigger the belief that a woman's "no" is not genuine and really means "yes". The increased salience of this particular rape myth may then increase the likelihood of the man engaging in sexually coercive behaviour.

Eyssel, Bohner and Siebler (2006) demonstrated that it is not only the extent to which a male endorses rape myths that impacts on rape proclivity, but exposure to other males endorsement of similar beliefs providing a normative influence. They proposed that perceiving that other men hold rape-related beliefs contributes to the development of rape-

supportive social norms that affect men's willingness to engage in sexually violent behaviour. Such collective beliefs provide a shared interpretation of the acceptability of their own behaviour and that of women towards men. Research by Strang and Peterson (2013) also demonstrated that the belief that peers acted with similar levels of sexual aggression impacted on self-reported rape and verbal coercion. Their research concluded that that a substantial proportion of the variance in participants' own reports of verbal coercion and rape was accounted for by perceived peer acceptance of such behaviour. A review of research by Schwartz and De Keseredy (1997) concluded that there was a significant relationship between men engaging in sexually aggressive behaviour and having male friends who support and use the behaviour themselves.

The impact of implicit and explicit rape-supportive beliefs on rape proclivity. Chapleau and Oswald (2010) conducted research based on a dual process model of rape proclivity to determine how both implicit power-sex associations and explicit power-sex beliefs contribute to rape proclivity and rape myth acceptance. Their research suggested that rape myth acceptance mediated the relationship between these implicit and explicit beliefs and rape proclivity. They found that neither implicit power-sex associations nor explicit power-sex beliefs in themselves added to the prediction of rape proclivity but suggested that these implicit and explicit beliefs reflect the learning that sex is equivalent to power that underpins rape myth acceptance, with rape myth acceptance then predicting self-reported likelihood of rape. Participants were more likely to endorse rape myths when experimental conditions had resulted in stronger mental processing between power and sex, suggesting that a rape myth schema had been triggered. This schema potentially caused participants to pre-consciously perceive women's behaviour and attire in a manner congruent with the consciously accessible rape myths. The implicit power-sex beliefs may be particularly salient when time and attention are limited, motivation is low, and judgement seemingly less important – such as when a person is under the influence of alcohol. This is consistent with research indicating

that men over-estimate women's sexual interest, particularly when intoxicated by alcohol (Abbey et al., 1998).

A more recently a study by Nunes Hermann and Ratcliffe (2013) concluded that the most sexually aggressive participants showed fewer negative implicit and explicit attitudes towards rape and that although implicit and explicit attitudes towards rape were independent, they were more strongly associated with sexual aggression together than alone. They also found significant differences between men admitting to past sexual coercion or likelihood of rape and non-sexually aggressive men who denied such behaviour with the most sexually aggressive group having fewer negative explicit and implicit attitudes to rape. Similarly, Widman, Olson, and Bolen (2013) found that implicit rape supportive attitudes were significantly associated with past sexual assault perpetration in both a university and community sample of males and that this association occurred independently of rape supportive cognitions and hostility towards women - explicit belief constructs. The research used latency means to assess implicit attitudes; 29% of men responded more quickly to positive words following rape images than to negative words, suggesting pro-rape attitudes. These pro-rape attitudes were significantly related to and emerged as a significant unique predictor of the reported frequency of sexual assault perpetration. The research did not, however, find a significant relationship between automatic and self-reported rape attitudes raising the possibility that men hold implicit attitudes towards rape that they do not explicitly endorse or that they may not even be consciously aware of. Hockett, Saucier, Hoffman, Smith and Craig (2009) also assert that similarities in rape myth acceptance between men who have raped women and those who have not suggest that rape myth acceptance likely occurs in many more men than the number who sexually aggress against women.

Rape Proclivity and Perpetration of Sexual Assault

The high rates at which men report that they may perpetrate sexual assault, as indicated by self-reported rape proclivity, is perhaps unsurprising given the rates of completed past sexual assaults. A 2010

meta-analysis of 37 studies on rape myth acceptance published between 1997 and 2007 identified three studies that reported on rates of previous rape and/or sexual assault, with the average prevalence rate being 33% (Suarez & Gadalla, 2010). Widman et al. (2013) found that 60% of their community sample of males admitted that they had committed at least one sexual assault since the age of 14; 46% reported perpetrating more than one sexual assault and 26% admitted for five or more sexual assaults. Furthermore 18% admitted to engaging in sexual contact against a woman's will, 28% admitted to sexual coercion and 12% admitted to attempting or completing rape. Koss and Oros (1982) found that 23% of male college students surveyed admitted forcing intercourse against woman's will.

Anderson et al. (2004) enquired into sexual coercion among middle school, high school and university aged males using a five-point scale including 'never, rarely, sometimes, frequently, often' and found that only 54.2% of participants endorsed that they 'never' sexually coerced females. Comparably, White and colleagues (1996) found that 33% of their sample of undergraduate males reported engaging in sexual coercion since age 14 with 48% using physical force and 25.2% using verbal coercion to obtain sex with a woman when she did not want to engage in intimate relations. Behaviour meeting the legal definition of attempted or completed rape was reported by 3.1% of males. Other studies have found a similarly high rate of sexual assault perpetration (Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987; Miller & Marshall, 1987; Murphy et al., 1986; Strang & Peterson, 2013; Truman et al., 1996).

A 10-year longitudinal study (Malamuth, 1993) found that sexual aggression at Time 1 predicted sexual aggression at Time 2 and that violence supportive attitudes, including rape myth acceptance, also independently predicted sexual aggression at Time 2. Noticeably, attitudes do influence future coercive sexual behaviour and sexual aggression. A meta-analysis of 72 studies published between 1977 and 1993 (Anderson, Cooper & Okamura, 1997) also found that past perpetration of sexual coercion was the strongest predictor of rape myth acceptance among males, and conversely, that cognitive predispositions were the strongest

predictor of the acceptance of rape. Remarkably, the study revealed that rape myth acceptance increased with age. Research by White et al. (1996) found a greater endorsement of rape-supportive attitudes by men who admitted to engaging in past sexual coercion, a relationship also identified by Gubb and Turner (2012)

Rape proclivity also appears to be associated with future sexual aggression. Gidycz, Warkentin, Orchowski and Edwards (2011) found that among male college students, self-reported likelihood of engaging in sexually coercive and aggressive behaviour was significantly associated with the perpetration of sexual coercion and sexual aggression during a three month follow up period. Rape perpetration has also been linked to the endorsement of male domination and greater acceptance of traditional gender roles (Muehlenhard & Falcon, 1990). Evidently, men differ in terms of whether they have a proclivity for rape and sexual aggression, as well as the magnitude of such an inclination. These differences may reflect broader individual differences associated with rape proclivity.

Individual Differences Influencing Rape Proclivity

Individual differences also impact rape proclivity. The literature describes a number of variables that are internal to the individual and that affect their acceptance of and proclivity for sexual aggression. These factors include the use of pornography depicting sexual aggression, fantasies about sexual aggression, personality variables, broad beliefs about sexual interactions between men and women, knowledge about the negative impact of rape on women, and degree of identification with the traditional male gender role.

The impact of individual variables on rape proclivity. Another strand of research has examined rape myth acceptance and rape proclivity in relation to a multitude of other individual variables including personality characteristics and attitudes. Attitudes towards women, gender relations and rape are important considerations as meta-analyses have shown “medium to large average correlations between attitudes and

subsequent behaviour”, suggesting that “attitudes can be important determinants of behaviour” (Nunes et al., 2013, p. 2658).

Nunes and colleagues (2013) defined attitudes towards rape as summary evaluations of rape in a positive or negative direction that encompass a range of cognitions including excuses, justifications, rationalisations, and stereotypes about rape, women, and rape victims. They suggested that rape-supportive cognitions may facilitate sexual offending prior to the act or excuse offending after the offending had occurred (Maruna & Mann, 2006). In a similar vein, Burt (1978, in Briere & Malamuth, 1983) asserted that the antecedents to rape are cultural, socially transmitted attitudes about women, rape, and rapists which are stereotyped and prejudicial, and which serve as psychological releasers for sexual aggression. Attitudes towards women and rape may be more salient when the situational information is, or is perceived to be, ambiguous such as in an acquaintance rape situation as compared to situations when it is unambiguous, such as in stranger rape (Abrams et al., 2003).

From this perspective the psychopathology of sexual aggression is seen as occurring due to attitudes towards women and aggression learned via the enculturation process (Murphy et al., 1986); the impact of psychopathology models need not negate the influence of the sociological models of sexual aggression (Murphy et al., 1986). Studies in this area have focussed on the intersection of sexual aggression and rape proclivity with individual dimensions such as hostility, generalised anger, arousal to rape depictions and personality characteristics, indeed, a meta-analysis by Anderson and colleagues (1997) identified theoretically relevant constructs associated with attitudes towards rape included traditional gender role beliefs, adversarial sexual beliefs, a need for power and dominance, and levels of aggression and anger.

The impact of sexually aggressive pornography and sexual fantasy on rape proclivity. Davis, Norris, George, Martell and Heiman (2006) found that self-reported likelihood of sexual aggression after exposure to violent pornography was related to self-reported sexual

arousal. One such experimental manipulation involved exposing participants to a scenario in which the victim experienced pleasure rather than distress in response to rape. Greater arousal was reported by men who more strongly believed that the women in the scenario were more promiscuous, sexually available and vulnerable due to alcohol consumption.

Research suggests a relationship between sexually coercive fantasy and sexual aggression (Bouffard & Exum, 2003; Carroll, 1978; Gold & Clegg, 1990; Greendlinger & Byrne, 1987; Zurbriggen & Yorst, 2004). It is possible that sexually coercive fantasy operates on the likelihood of sexual aggression via the desensitising effect of such fantasies on perpetrators of sexually coercive behaviour (Gold & Clegg, 1990) or the mental rehearsal of sexually coercive behaviour resulting in a heightened expectation such behaviour will occur as well as a greater intention to engage in such behaviour (Anderson, 1983; Carroll, 1978).

A number of other studies affirm this link between sexually coercive fantasy and sexually aggressive behaviour. Dean and Malamuth (1997) found a significant correlation between rape supportive attitudes and coercive sexual fantasies, self-reported likelihood of rape, and actual sexual aggression in college aged men. Bouffard and Exum (2003) found that while the level of coercive fantasy did not appear to directly affect self-reported likelihood of sexual coercion, it did produce an indirect effect by increasing arousal to cues of sexual aggression. Sexual arousal to rape themes was also found to be predictive of laboratory aggression against women and related to self-reported sexually aggressive behaviour (Malamuth, 1983). Lev-Wiesel (2004) found that 30% of a sample of 20 male social work and psychology students indicated they both fantasised about rape and believed that they would rape or force sexual activity if they were in the same situation as presented by the research scenario; 30% of the sample indicated that they fantasised about watching or committing rape but denied any likelihood of completing the act. Only 40% of the sample reported no likelihood of raping under any circumstances. Ryan's (2004) literature review suggests that fantasy appears to play a significant role in rape, concluding that it is likely that rape scripts are

rehearsed in fantasy. Ryan provides the caveat that many more men engage in rape fantasies than those who are willing to force intercourse, so fantasies of coercion alone does not account for sexual aggression.

The impact of personality variables on rape proclivity. There has been less research focus on personality variables associated with rape proclivity with individual differences and their moderating role being a relatively neglected aspect of aggression research (Smith, Martin & Kerwin, 2001). According to Smith and colleagues (2001), it is important to consider individual differences related to or underlying rape and sexual aggression in addition to rape-supportive cognitions because these differences can moderate the elicitation of thoughts and emotions that may facilitate or trigger aggressive behaviour. Studies have also found that colleagues found that participant scores on the psychoticism and neuroticism scales of the Eysenck Personality Inventory showed significant correlations with sexual arousal to rape depictions (Barnes, Malamuth & Check 1984; Malamuth & Check, 1983). A replication of this study by Murphy et al. (1986) identified extraversion and neuroticism as significant predictors of self-reported sexually coercive behaviour in a non-clinical sample of males.

The research also revealed a significant relationship between the attitudinal variable of rape myth acceptance, psychoticism as measured by the Eysenck Personality inventory, and sexual coercion. High levels of sexual guilt have also been implicated in negative responses to women displaying specific sexual behaviours (Smith et al., 2001). Voller and Long's (2010) study found that rape perpetrators reported lower levels of agreeableness and conscientiousness relative to sexual assault perpetrators and non-perpetrators, and that overall sexual assault perpetrators were more similar to non-perpetrators than rapists lending credence to the suggestion that there is a fundamental difference between men who report rape proclivity and those who do not.

The impact of beliefs and attitudes towards sexual interactions on rape proclivity. Briere and Malamuth (1983) found that sexuality

variables such as sexual frustration and sexual maladjustment were not predictive of self-reported likelihood to sexually aggress or rape, but that rape supportive attitudes and endorsement of rape myths were much more reliable predictors. They considered that rape and sexual assault occurred on a continuum of aggression towards women that was underpinned by culturally and socially transmitted attitudes about rape, rather than occurring as a discrete, isolated event. They concluded that rape and sexual force was unrelated to sexual frustration or maladjustment because variables including sex life rating, the importance of sex, relationships with women, the use of pornography, and sexual inhibitions failed to have predictive value (Briere & Malamuth, 1983). Their findings also supported the conceptualisation of rape as occurring on a continuum of sexual aggression with men who reported that they were likely to force a woman to do something sexual she did not want to do, but who denied that they would commit rape lying between men who endorsed both behavioural items and men who endorsed neither on a number of attitudinal variables.

Attraction towards coercive sexual interactions was also examined by Chiroro, Bohner, Viki and Jarvis (2004) who conducted a series of studies to examine whether the relationship between rape myth acceptance and rape proclivity was mediated by anticipated sexual arousal or anticipated enjoyment of sexual domination. The study found that anticipated enjoyment of sexual dominance of the victim mediated the relationship, whereas anticipated sexual arousal did not. Their succinct summary of research conducted across three countries concluded that a higher rape proclivity, associated with stereotypical views regarding sexual violence, may be motivated by the desire to achieve sexual dominance over women, supporting the feminist position that “rape functions as an expression of male dominance over women in broader society” (Chiroro et al., 2004, p. 436). They further explained that their research found a significant relationship between anticipated sexual arousal and anticipated enjoyment of sexual dominance, suggesting that the motives of sexual domination and sexual stimulation may be strongly linked. They further suggested that some previous studies purported to support a sexual

motive for rape based on a correlation between sexual arousal and rape proclivity may in fact reflect the confounding of sexual arousal with the desire for sexual domination, with participants admitting to the sexual motive due to social desirability factors. It is also possible that participants are not aware of the underlying motive of achieving sexual dominance, focussing on the perhaps more immediate and salient experience of arousal. Malamuth (1986) also asserted that sexual arousal to sexual aggression, dominance as a sexual motive, hostility toward women, and acceptance of interpersonal violence are significant predictors of coercive sexual behaviour.

The impact of knowledge regarding the consequences of rape on rape proclivity. Research by Hamilton and Yee (1990) found that participants who had a greater knowledge of the aversive nature of rape and the traumatic consequences for the victim were less likely to report a likelihood of raping and less likely to endorse rape supportive attitudes. On this basis they concluded that rape was more likely to be an instrumental act to secure coitus using “a low-cost and, given our rape conviction rates, nearly risk-free method of sexual access” (Hamilton & Yee, 1990, p. 112) than an act belying hostile intent. They argued that if rape were an act of hostility, rapists would be motivated by the desire to injure and hurt women, to force her into an aversive experience. They argued that as knowledge about the aversive nature of rape for women decreases the self-reported likelihood of rape, rape cannot be motivated by hostility towards women. The authors also suggested that rape is more likely to be an instrumental rather than hostile act because rapists tend to endorse the belief that women become sexually aroused by and enjoy rape. It could be argued that this belief is founded on the idea that women are lesser, inferior: women are not competent to decide for themselves what is arousing and when they wish to engage in sexual activity and so are not to be afforded the same autonomy and rights as men. It could also be argued that believing women to enjoy rape does not necessarily preclude a person from harbouring hostility towards women generally.

The impact of identification with the traditional male gender role on rape proclivity. The degree to which an individual identifies with traditional concepts of masculinity also influences rape proclivity, sexual aggression and acceptance of rape myths. Yescavage (1999) found that sexually aggressive men – a characteristic associated with the stereotype of traditional masculinity – made an approximately equal number of negative comments towards perpetrators and victims when presented with rape vignettes, whereas non-sexually aggressive men made three times as many negative remarks concerning perpetrators than they did towards victims. Quakenbush (1989) found that masculine sex-typed men provided more rape-supportive responses than androgynous and undifferentiated males. They also exhibited greater adversarial sexual beliefs, more strongly endorsed an acceptance of interpersonal violence, and more strongly agreed with rape myths than men in the other two groups.

Malamuth (1989a) also found that men who reported a stronger attraction to sexual aggression perceived a rape victim's experience of rape to be more positive than men less attracted to sexual aggression. The participants' erroneous beliefs around the experience of rape victims correspond with rape myths and creates confirmation bias; the men's belief that the experience will be more positive for victims provides a justification for sexual aggression and contributes to a tendency to seek information from the victim's presentation that would confirm the belief. Supporting this hypothesis is the study's finding that men who indicated a stronger inclination to engage in sexually aggressive behaviour were more likely to positively endorse the future oriented item questioning their belief that they would engage in forced sex in the future. Malamuth (1989b) found that attraction to sexual aggression was associated with physiological and self-reported sexual arousal to sexual aggression, attitudes supportive of aggression towards women, hostility towards women, antisocial personality characteristics and dominance motives. Anderson and colleagues (1997) meta-analysis of 72 studies also found that traditional gender role beliefs, more negative attitudes towards male-female relationships, general aggressive motives and hostile attitudes towards women to be predictive of rape myth acceptance. Taken together

this research suggests that males who more strongly identify with the traditionally masculine role, which includes an inclination for sexual aggression, view rape less negatively. This is possibly due to a greater adherence to rape myths that support the dominance of men and the subordination of women. Such a negative view of women compared to men could be considered indicative of hostility, with hostility towards women having received specific attention in the literature. Several attitudes that vary on an individual basis have received particular attention in the literature, including victim blaming, a belief in a just world, and both hostile and benevolent sexism.

Victim Blaming

The belief that rape victims are responsible for their victimisation is one rape myth that has received specific attention in the literature. To reiterate, victim blaming is the phenomenon whereby victims are held accountable for having been victimised (Whatley, 1996). A number of factors have been found to be associated with the attribution of blame to rape victims including the attractiveness, modesty, and character of victims, prior sexual activity with the perpetrator, and the victim's relationship with the perpetrator.

The rape myth of victim blaming. Despite not using the term 'rape culture', Whatley explains relationship between rape culture and victim blaming as "a problem created by our society in which needless differences (e.g., economic and legal inequalities) exist among the sexes, and which are kept in balance by sexist attitudes, sexual exploitation of women's bodies, and violence against women" (Whatley, 1996, p. 91).

Individuals may incorporate rape myths into a cognitive schema about rape that guides and organises the processing of relevant information including salient characteristics of the victim and perpetrator (Bohner et al., 2009; Cheapleau & Oswald, 2010; Süssenbach, Eyszel, & Bohner, 2013). According to Grubb and Turner (2012), these cognitive schemas serve to influence the attribution of relative blame and responsibility to perpetrators and victims of rape. Characteristics may

include, but are not limited to, the victim's attire, character, attractiveness, prior sexual activity, alcohol consumption, and the relationship between the victim and perpetrator.

The influence of victim characteristics on attribution of blame.

Whatley's 1996 meta-analysis of 49 studies on rape myth acceptance considered the characteristics of victim attractiveness, character, modesty of clothing and acquaintance with her attacker. Unsurprisingly the research found that victims dressed in revealing clothing were considered to be more responsible for being raped. Victims with a 'questionable character' were also viewed as more blameworthy when compared to more 'respectable' victims, for example, prostitutes were seen as being more culpable for having been raped when compared to virgins (Whatley, 1996). Krahe (1991) also found that whether or not a woman was seen as deserving the blame for being raped was linked to levels of social respectability. Similarly, Cassidy and Hurrell (1995) also found that participants viewed victims who were dressed provocatively as more responsible for being a victim of date rape than victims who were dressed conservatively.

Physical attractiveness and attributions of victim blame.

Interestingly, research into the impact of physical attractiveness on the attribution of responsibility for rape has been inconclusive (Whatley 1996) with some studies finding that more blame was apportioned to attractive women, and others finding that women deemed to be unattractive were perceived as having responsibility for being raped. Whatley suggests that the former finding may reflect a belief that attractive women should be effective gatekeepers of men's sexuality, and the latter a product of the belief that for an unattractive woman to have been raped she must have significantly transgressed gender role norms to have caused a man to act in such a way.

Prior sexual activity and attributions of victim blame. Yescavage (1999) found that prior consensual sexual activity had a strong bearing on

the relative attribution of responsibility to the victim and perpetrator in rape vignettes, with such prior sexual activity between the pair resulting in higher attributions of blame to victims and lower attributions of blame of perpetrators in rape vignettes. Yescavage (1999) suggested that participants may assume that the woman is offering only token resistance since she had engaged in prior sexual activity – that is, the participants ascribe to rape myths regarding the ability of a woman to withhold consent for sexual activity – and judge the responsibility of rapists and victims accordingly. As Yescavage (1999) points out, women are expected to simultaneously display sexual disinterest and to maintain the interest of men sufficiently to ensure continued interactions, balancing their own feelings of sexual attraction with the culturally enforced responsibility of being the gatekeeper of sexuality for both themselves and their partners. Yescavage (1999) goes on to consider the implied justifications associated with such apportioning of male entitlement and female responsibility, suggesting that such responses are based on the patriarchal idea of ownership of women which results in the belief that women who are perceived as misleading a man and then subsequently deny his entitlement to have sex may deserve being taught a lesson.

Adding weight to this viewpoint is a study by Frese et al., (2004) who found that victim blame was highest in acquaintance rape compared to stranger and marital rape. It is notable that in the research by Yescavage (1999), self-identified sexually aggressive men were more strongly affected by the onset of refusal, particularly when the vignette depicted an ongoing relationship of a sexual nature. The comments made by these men strongly implied that they believed forced sex to be a logical consequence of allowing some sexual activity to occur). Sexually aggressive respondents were also less likely to label the rape scenarios as rape, again minimising the victim's experience (Yescavage, 1999). Quakenbush (1989) also found that men exposed to acquaintance rape scenarios "revealed greater propensity to rape, reported less empathy for the rape victim, attributed greater responsibility to the victim and less responsibility to the rapist, and perceived the rape as less serious, than

did males exposed to the stranger rape stimulus” (Quakenbush, 1989, p. 335).

Hostile and Benevolent Sexism

The impact of sexist attitudes on rape proclivity has also received specific attention in the literature. Rather than viewing sexism as a concept with a singular facet, Glick and Fiske (1996) differentiated hostile sexism from benevolent sexism. Benevolent sexism can be defined as “a set of interrelated attitudes towards women that are sexist in terms of viewing women as stereotypically and in restricted roles, but that are subjectively positive in feeling tone” (Glick & Fiske, 1996, p. 491). Benevolent sexism places women on a pedestal, viewing them as pure and innocent, and as requiring of protection (Grubb & Turner, 2012). These sentiments result in more positive behaviour towards women who fit the stereotype of traditional femininity (Grubb & Turner, 2012).

Hostile sexism is based on the corresponding belief that women who defy traditional gender roles should be punished (Grubb & Turner, 2012) and has been defined as “the typical antipathy that is commonly assumed to characterise sexist prejudices” (Abrams et al., 2003, p. 112). Together they provide “complementary ideologies that serve to maintain and justify male dominance over women” (Abrams et al., 2003, p. 112). Benevolent sexism also suggest that some women deserve to be punished because in holding women up as pure, special and deserving of attention, it obligates women to behave in ways that make them appear worthy of being protected (Abrams et al., 2003). Those who fail to meet these expectations may be viewed as no longer deserving of this protection. A meta-analysis of 37 studies by Suarez and Gadala (2010) found that rape myth acceptance was strongly associated with hostile attitudes and behaviour towards women. They concluded that their analysis provided support for the feminist position that sexism perpetuates rape myth acceptance.

Smith and colleagues (Smith et al., 2001) suggest that men may fail to inhibit sexual aggression towards women if they are perceived as deserving of punishment due to having violated the individual’s moral code through her behaviour. This assertion is supported by research into the

effects of benevolent and hostile sexism. Studies have found that high levels of hostile sexism do indeed correspond with high levels of rape myth acceptance. A series of studies by Glick, Diebold, Bailey-Werner, and Zhu (1997) found that negative feelings towards women in non-traditional roles were predicted by hostile sexism. It was suggested that by engaging in such roles, women transgressed perceived boundaries of modesty and behaviour, and were therefore seen as deserving of rape, in accordance with rape myths. Earlier work by Glick and Fiske (1996) also found that high levels of hostile sexism correlated with high levels of rape myth acceptance, also that women who defied traditional gender roles were perceived to be more deserving of rape.

Greater benevolent sexism has also been found to be correlated with greater victim blaming in instances of acquaintance rape, however the same relationship was not found for stranger rape (Abrams et al., 2003). Viki, Abrams and Masser (2004) also found a predictive effect for benevolent sexism on attribution of victim blame, but did not find any such effect for hostile sexism. Abrams and colleagues (2003) conducted a series of experiments designed to examine the effect of both benevolent and hostile sexism on the allocation of blame to victims of different types of rape. The four studies provided consistent results, demonstrating that individuals high in benevolent sexism were more likely to blame victims of acquaintance rape than those with low benevolent sexism. The authors suggested that this may have occurred due to the perception that victims had transgressed relevant norms and behaved in a manner that contravened standards for respectable female conduct. Grubb and Turner (2012) concluded that although the relationship between gender role conformity, rape myth acceptance and victim blaming is not clear, but suggest that “gender role conformity enhances rape myth acceptance and ergo victim blaming by reinforcing cognitive schema that support the traditional stereotypical notion that rape victims are deserving of their misfortune” (Grubb & Turner, 2012, p. 447). This schema – that of harm only befalling the deserving – can also be described as the ‘just world’ hypothesis.

Although benevolent sexism has been found to be associated with a greater degree of victim blaming (Abrams et al., 2003; Viki et al., 2004), individuals high in benevolent sexism have not found to be significantly more likely to report a likelihood of engaging in sexual aggression (Abrams et al., 2003). Abrams and colleagues (2003) proposed that benevolent sexism does not serve to justify sexual aggression but rather preserve a belief in a just world where women are responsible for the behaviour of men with whom they are acquainted, through their adherence to norms for 'proper' behaviour. It follows that women who are viewed as having transgressed these norms may then also be viewed as responsible for their own victimisation. Abrams and colleagues (2003) research also suggested that, in contrast, hostile sexism did serve to justify and rationalise sexual violence and was also predictive of rape proclivity. They found that rape proclivity in response to an acquaintance rape scenario was significantly associated with hostile, but not benevolent sexism, also that rape proclivity was mediated by the perception that the victim really did want to engage in sexual intercourse but was falsely appearing not to so as to appear chaste. The authors point out that this belief in this rape myth is more broadly indicative of adversarial sexual beliefs, suggesting that "benevolent sexism may provide the sociocultural climate that allows for hostile sexist behaviour to be manifested...consistent with the feminist argument that rape is used as a form of social control" (Abrams et al., 2003, p. 122). They further suggested that benevolent and hostile sexism work together to support the acceptance of rape myths and consequently keep women in a subservient position. Franiuk and colleagues (Franiuk, Seefeldt, Cephress, & Vandello, 2008) also suggested that rape myths are used by perpetrators to justify their sexual violence and by non-perpetrators to express hostile sexism and excuse the sexual violence perpetrated by others.

Conceptualising rape as an act of aggression towards women, Malamuth (1986) devised a clever experiment in which he first assessed the self-reported likelihood of raping among 42 College aged males, and then later, in a seemingly unrelated experiment, investigated the willingness of the participants to vent their aggression towards a female

confederate who had mildly rejected and insulted them. Aggression could be expressed by exposing the confederated to varying levels of aversive noise for incorrect responses. The study found that self-reported likelihood of raping was correlated with self-reported feelings of anger towards and desire to hurt the confederate as well behavioural aggression as demonstrated by the level of aversive noise they chose to inflict. Research by Yates, Barbaree, and Marshall (1984) also found that men failed to inhibit sexual arousal to rape stimuli when angered by a female confederate. Malamuth (1989b) found self-reported sexual aggression to be significantly associated with hostility towards women while a meta-analysis by Suarez and Gadala (2010) found rape myth acceptance strongly associated with both hostile attitudes and hostile behaviour towards women.

Hostile and sexist attitudes towards women are associated specifically with a specific facet of self-reported hostile behaviour among men – that being sexual assault (DeGue & DiLillo 2004; Malamuth, Sockloski, Koss, & Tanaka, 1991; Murnan, Wright, & Kaluzny, 2002). Murphy and colleagues (1986) concluded that men who engage in coercive sexual behaviour are aggressive and hostile individuals in general. More recently, Edwards et al. (2014) found that men reported that there was no possibility that they would engage in sexually coercive behaviour or rape, men who endorsed the intention to use sexual force but who denied the intention to rape when labelled thusly, and men who endorsed the intention to rape outright could be differentiated by their varying levels of hostility towards women and scores on hypermasculinity scales.

Demare and Briere's 1988 study found a unique association between self-reported likelihood of raping or using force to obtain sex with the use of sexually violent pornography and acceptance of interpersonal violence towards women. They hypothesised that the propensity to behave in a sexually aggressive manner is a direct result of the association between sex and violence within a belief system that supports gender based interpersonal aggression. One issue with studies revealing an association between sexually violent media and self-reported likelihood of raping is

that the direction of the effect is unclear. As the authors point out, the use of such pornography may reflect pre-existing attitudes; sexually violent attitudes and beliefs may have a causal role in the development of both interest in pornography and sexually violent behaviour. It is also likely that this association reflects learned behaviour. Drawing on the work of Ellis (1989) and Bandura (1977), Lev-Wiesel succinctly summarised the sociological perspective, saying “aggressive sexual behaviour is thought to be learned the same way as other behaviours, involving observation, imitation and obtaining rewards” (Lev-Wiesel, 2004, p. 2000). Lev-Wiesel (2004) further suggested that rape occurs due to four learning processes: the modelling effect including exposure to and imitation of sexual aggression in the media; the linking of sex and violence schema; belief in rape myths; and desensitisation due to high levels of exposure to violence towards women, including sexual violence.

Although a psychopathological perspective posits that individual differences underlie differences in sexual aggression, Suarez and Gadalla (2010) found that “male pathology and psychopathic traits were not associated with rape myth acceptance, indicating that individuals who displayed hostility in general may be less likely to justify rape myths as opposed to individuals whose hostility is targeted against women” (Suarez & Gadalla, 2010, p. 2025). The authors also suggested that tools designed to measure rape myth acceptance may actually be measuring hostility towards women, positioning it as an overlapping construct. As Malamuth (1989b) suggested, “It may be that the difference between actual sexual aggressors and those with considerable attraction for it who do not aggress lies in the combination of exceeding some ‘threshold’ on such dimensions and having the opportunity to be sexually aggressive” (Malamuth, 1989b, p. 349). Research by DeGue and DiLillo (2004) also suggested that differences in rape myth acceptance, acceptance of interpersonal violence, hostility towards women, and adversarial sexual beliefs differentiated non-offenders from men who crossed the line into engaging in sexual coercion

As Frese et al. (2004) point out, much research attempts to isolate cognitive factors from situational factors. They identified a number of

studies demonstrating an interaction between situational and attitudinal factors when the scenario provided is ambiguous. Factors such as gender-role stereotyping were found to affect the assessment of victim truthfulness, sexual arousal to acquaintance rape compared to stranger rape, and blame attribution for resistive compared to non-resistive victims. Their own research emphasised the importance and interaction of both rape myth acceptance and situational factors in accounting for differing evaluations made around rape including victim responsibility and the degree of victim trauma. Personality variables and individual differences must be considered in light of the context in which they exist with situational variables also playing a role in rape proclivity.

Criticism of the Construct of Rape Myths

Research into rape proclivity has not been without controversy. Criticism has been levelled at the construct of rape myths, the methodology used to elicit self-reported proclivity, and the validity of this data when considering potential future behaviour.

Abrams and colleagues (2003) noted that the construct of rape myths has been criticised as most rape myth scales do not reference a particular type of rape, thus they fail to distinguish between stranger and acquaintance rape. As the authors point out, participants may be thinking of different types of rape when answering survey questions and their answers may be responses to very different perceptions of the same stimulus. Furthermore, people may pay more attention to the relationship between victim and perpetrator in situations of acquaintance rape where there is the potential for consensual sex to occur than they are to the events described. Abram's and colleagues (2003) suggest that the concept of rape myth acceptance may be too broad to account for differences in reaction to stranger and acquaintance rape. Although their research found a relationship between benevolent sexism and blame, and hostile sexism and rape proclivity, this relationship only held for the acquaintance rape scenario. It seems possible that these attitudes are particularly salient when judging the relationship between men and women rather than when judging the behaviour in isolation. In addition to criticisms

of the construct of rape myths, research in the area involves a number of important limitations.

Limitations of Previous Research

There are a number of limitations in the area of self-report research; one unique limitation associated with studies of self-reported likelihood of raping is that the question is purely hypothetical – there is no way to test relevant behaviours in the natural or laboratory setting. Malamuth (1981) suggested that individuals who are sexually aroused by rape depictions in violent pornography may infer that they would be similarly aroused by participating in the act of rape, and that they are capable of such behaviour. This proposition was somewhat supported by five studies that Malamuth conducted with fellow researchers, all confirming that “higher likelihood of raping reports are associated with greater sexual arousal to rape but not mutually consenting depictions” (Malamuth, 1981, p. 152) however, experiencing an interest in and sexual arousal to certain sexual stimuli does not necessarily mean that an individual will engage in, or even want to engage in the practice. To illustrate, some rape myth research suggests that many individuals may accept rape myths but not sexually aggress against women (Hockett et al., 2009). Rape proclivity research may also identify relatively extreme responders while not differentiating between men who respond that they are not likely to rape at all but who, nevertheless have some inclination to use sexual aggression and force (Briere & Malamuth, 1983).

Another relatively unexamined complexity of proclivity research identified by Malamuth (1981) is the possibility that people who find themselves aroused by rape depictions may experience such arousal as negative and become more inhibited in sexual interactions. Such a response may provide a conscious or unconscious means of counteracting the impact of such patterns of arousal on sexual behaviour with a partner, reducing the likelihood of actual sexual coercion or aggression as this is experienced as aversive.

Bouffard and Bouffard (2011) identified another major limitation in rape proclivity research – the narrow range of sample characteristics. Most

of the research has engaged participants from the United States. Participants are typically college students, an equivalent level of education to university students in New Zealand. Most are of Caucasian ethnicity. Accordingly, the demographic characteristics of the sample will match those of the universities, excluding those without access to higher education and frequently making for a relatively young participant group. The findings of studies based on such a demographically limited sample may not be able to be generalised to males who differ from the given sample and do not consider potential cultural differences in the manner in which women are viewed and treated. It is also possible that the results from these studies reflect the pressure and reinforcement to engage in sexual aggression supplied by similarly minded peers on campus, a factor that may or may not affect the wider male population. Rape on campus has been a topical issue in the United States for some time since being recognised as a pervasive problem supported by campus rape culture (Loh et al., 2005). Some research has utilised a community sample of men; Malamuth (1989) notes that research with men in the community (for example, Murphy et al., 1986) has yielded similar results.

Bohner and colleagues (1998) noted potential issues for research into rape myth acceptance and rape proclivity among convicted rapists. Convicted rapists may not be representative of rapists in general and may differ from non-convicted rapists in important ways, reducing the comparability of results between groups and the extent to which the findings can be assumed to generalise to the male population as a whole.

Aside from limitations related to participant responses and characteristics, the methodologies employed in rape proclivity research also have limitations. Scenario based questions are subject to a number of methodological issues. The vignette method has questionable ecological validity, containing only focal pieces of information that contribute to the participants' decision making process (Süssenbach et al., 2013; Whatley, 1996). The vignettes often contain pointed victim descriptions that target and trigger rape myths such as the victim wearing revealing clothing or drinking alcohol (Süssenbach et al., 2013). Frequently vignettes serve to reinforce rape myths themselves by focussing on aspects of the behaviour

and appearance of the victim known to have an impact on blame attribution rather than focussing on the behaviour, appearance and responsibility of the offender. Such vignettes may also exclude information that may be salient and impact on participant behaviour in a natural setting. Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994) also concluded that measures of rape belief may lack content validity due to unclear definitions of central concepts such as consent.

While one benefit of scenario based research is that the information presented can be tailored to fit the research question, the flexibility of scenario based research can contribute to the inclusion of scenario characteristics that are unlikely to be found in real life. A study by Davis et al. (2006) found heightened sexual aggression proclivity was related to sexual arousal, with sexual arousal higher among those who had read a scenario in which the victim clearly experienced pleasure in comparison to those who read the story in which the victim experienced distress. In reality, it is unlikely that a rape victim will experience the event as positive and pleasurable even in the presence of any physical reaction that could be interpreted as such; the effect seen in the research would be unlikely to operate in a real world sexual violation. In addition, the scenarios employed in rape proclivity research are inconsistent (Whatley, 1996). Differences in factors such as victim, perpetrator or situational cues may activate schema held by participants that are not tapped by the research. Whatley (1996) also pointed out that research may not access moderator variables that interfere with the predictability of the measure.

Rape proclivity research frequently uses the strategy of 'hiding' rape proclivity items among a number of items detailing other forms of sexual activity. Bohner and colleagues (1998) suggested that this method may suggest to participants that rape was simply one of a number of acceptable variants of sexual behaviour rather than the act of violence it is typically viewed as being.

Another measurement based concern is the assessment of sexual aggression using measures that contain only one or two questions, such as the rape proclivity measure (Malamuth 1989). It is a highly targeted question but it may be too blunt to account for variations in individual and

situational characteristics. What's more, some researchers (Forbes, Adam-Curtis & White (2004) have suggested that many measures of rape myth acceptance may actually be assessing hostility towards women.

The social desirability effect, whereby participants respond in a way they believe will be socially desirable, may also impact on rape proclivity research (Chiroro et al., 2004; Widman & Olson, 2013). Demand characteristics of the experiment may also influence outcome, particularly when the participants are involved in research while engaging in rape prevention programmes (Widman & Olson, 2013). Despite this concern, Malamuth (1981) found that self-report measures concerning rape proclivity yield responses that are related to responses on other related measures in the theoretically expected direction.

The Current Study

The current research is an exploratory study into rape proclivity among a community based sample of New Zealand men. The study aims to ascertain the prevalence of rape proclivity as well as establish which attitudes are associated with this proclivity. Attitudes examined include hostile and benevolent sexism, rape myth acceptance, acceptance of interpersonal violence, and adversarial sexual beliefs. The tendency for socially desirable responding will also be examined to help determine the veracity of participant responses.

In line with the research reviewed, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1: That the prevalence of self-reported rape proclivity will be similar to the range reported in previous studies into self-reported rape proclivity.

Hypothesis 2: That there will be a positive correlation between all measures and their subscales and all other measures and subscales with the exception of the Crowne-Marlow Scale (CMS).

Hypothesis 3: That the CMS will not correlate strongly with any other measure.

Hypothesis 4: That there will be a strong positive correlation between both the Attraction to Sexual Assault (ASA) measure and the Rape

Proclivity (RP) measure with all other measures – including each other - with the exception of the CMS.

Hypothesis 5: That the mean scores of men indicating some proclivity for rape (as measured by the ASA and RP measures) will be higher on all other measures excluding the CMS, than those of men indicating no likelihood of rape.

Chapter Two: Methods

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a detailed account of the methods employed in this study. The recruitment strategy and sample characteristics are discussed, followed by an outline of each measure used and their associated psychometric properties. The administration procedure will then be outlined, followed by an overview of the process of statistical analysis. Finally, ethical considerations will be discussed.

Psychological research typically involves the application of a scientific approach to gathering information to answer a question. According to Krathwohl (1993), the purposes of research are to describe findings following a creative exploration, organise findings in a manner that fits the explanation proposed, and test those findings. The current study describes the data obtained from the sample using quantitative research methods and proposes an explanation that accounts for the findings of the research.

Quantitative research produces numerical data that can be used to describe an area of interest. This can be an advantage when variables cannot be manipulated for ethical or practical reasons by allowing testing of the hypothesis that such variables are related in some way (Mitchell & Jolley, 2013). In the current study, this approach allowed for the relationships between variables to be examined to ascertain whether they correlated, including both the strength and direction of the relationship. The current research utilised quantitative methods to provide for such an analysis, assigning numeric values to the strength of attitude or belief in the sample and allowing for correlations to be examined and comparisons between groups to be made. The analytic procedures are described in a subsequent section. One disadvantage of this methodology is that while it can provide information about the occurrence of behaviours, which may include covert behaviours such as attitudes and beliefs, it cannot provide information about a definitive cause of behaviours (Mitchell & Jolley, 2013).

Recruitment

Recruitment was pursued via three avenues: flyers, snowball dissemination following a Facebook post, and through an offer of course credit for participation made through the University of Waikato faculty website. Posters detailing the survey website address were put up throughout the campus at both the University of Waikato and the Waikato Institute of Technology in Hamilton, New Zealand. The poster alerted potential participants to the possibility of obtaining course credit of 1% for selected papers at the University of Waikato and a prize draw for a \$100 petrol voucher for which they were eligible upon completion of the survey.

A copy of this poster was posted to the author's Facebook page with the request that it be shared among their friends and acquaintances and that if male, they complete the survey. A personal request was made to male friends, family members and colleagues of the author that they fill out the survey. At that time the author worked for the New Zealand Police.

At the end of the survey a link was provided to a separate survey into which participants could enter their details to obtain course credit and enter the prize draw if desired. This page was independent of the primary survey so ensured continued participant anonymity with regards to their responses to the primary survey.

Recruitment efforts in the current study were initially targeted at the author's friends and associates; this relationship would have also likely reduced participant honesty had face to face interview techniques been employed to research such a sensitive topic as rape proclivity with anonymity likely to increase the honesty, and therefore validity of reporting (Malacad & Hess, 2011). Furthermore, the gender difference between the author and participants may have negatively impacted the willingness of participants to answer honestly had the surveys been administered in person – men may have felt reluctant to share their beliefs about women and rape, particularly their own likelihood of raping, with a female researcher. It is possible that the gender difference would impact on men who more strongly ascribe to the attitudes and beliefs under investigation, based, as they are, on a foundation of adversarial and negative attitudes towards women. Perceived social norms and beliefs regarding the

prevalence of sensitive behaviour have a strong influence on participant honesty when researching sensitive topics (Näher & Krumpal, 2012), with misreporting on sensitive topics motivated by the desire to avoid embarrassment or third party repercussions (Tourangeau & Yan, 2007).

Furthermore, a female research conducting face to face research into such sensitive topics with male participants can create vulnerability and safety concerns for the researcher (Lee, 1997; Yassour-Borochowitz, 2012). The use of an online survey minimised the risk of potential physical or psychological harm to the researcher.

Participants

Age. The all-male sample consisted of 118 individuals ranging in age from 18 to 78 years old, with a mean age of 34.42 years ($SD = 12.58$).

Ethnicity. The ethnic breakdown of the sample was as follows: 72.9% New Zealand European, 10.2% New Zealand Maori, 5.9% other European, 5.1% Asian, 4.2% New Zealander (participants in this category selected the “Other” ethnicity option then entered “New Zealander” into the text box provided to describe themselves), and 1.7% other.

The ethnic breakdown of the sample is not representative of the New Zealand population as a whole, as per the 2013 census. The 2013 census found that 74% of people identified with at least one European ethnicity, 15% identified as Maori, 12% identified with at least one Asian ethnicity, 7% identified with at least one Pacific ethnicity, and 1% with at least one Middle Eastern, African, or Latin American ethnicity (Statistics New Zealand, 2015 <http://www.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census/profile-and-summary-reports/infographic-culture-identity.aspx>). The sample in the current sample did not include any participants identifying with a Pacific, Middle Eastern, African, or Latin American ethnicity. Asian and Maori were also underrepresented in the current sample.

Sexual orientation. The majority of participants (89.83%) identified as heterosexual, with 5.93% identifying as bisexual and 3.39% as

homosexual. One participant (0.85%) declined to say. As the study was an exploratory study of New Zealand men the decision was made to retain people identifying across the spectrum of sexuality. This decision also avoids making any assumptions regarding the views of homosexual men about women or rape, or their current or past sexual interactions with women. Furthermore, it is possible that men identifying as homosexual may be less attracted to the idea of raping a woman, causing data to be more conservative than it might otherwise.

Employment. The sample was predominantly comprised of employed individuals, with a large minority of students - 30.5 % of the participants, with the remaining 69.5% as non-students. Being in full time employment (defined as 40 hours or more per week) was reported by 60.2% of participants, 12.7% were employed part time, 22% were full time students, 2.5% retired, 1.7% home makers, and 0.8% unemployed.

Participants were employed in a wide range of fields. Some participants who were not working also provided information regarding their typical occupation. This data has been included in the breakdown of occupation by category so as to provide as much detail as possible regarding the breadth of occupational backgrounds. As shown in Table 2, employment in the government sector accounted for 17% of the sample, with Police accounting for another 2.5% and law/law enforcement/youth justice a further 2.5%. It is unclear given how many of those who described themselves as government employees were engaged in the justice sector. The next largest area of employment was IT/software related employment, accounting for 11% of the sample. Building, transport and trades accounted for a further 7.7%.

The remaining participants described their area of employment as bush craft, business analysis, design/consultancy, the energy sector, engineering, entrepreneur, office administration, pilot, postal services, process controller, recruitment consultant, science, supermarket, and technician.

Table 2
Participant Self-reported Occupation by Category

Occupation	Number	Percentage
Government	20	16.9
Information technology/Software	13	11.0
Building/Transport/Trades	9	7.6
Sales/Retail/Service	8	6.8
Health/Medicine/Caregiver/People work	8	6.8
Academic/Education/Tertiary education	5	4.2
Law/Law enforcement/Youth justice	3	2.5
Police	3	2.5
Kitchen/Baking	3	2.5
Meat works	2	1.7
Media	2	1.7
Property	2	1.7
Research	2	1.7

Relationship status. People who were married or living with each other in a de facto relationship constituted 51.7% of the sample. Of the remaining participants 30.5% were single, 13.6% in a relationship not living together, 2.5% separated and one person each (0.8%) was widowed or divorced.

The number of short and long term relationships reported by participants varied widely. The mean number of short term intimate relationships of less than two years was 10.04 ($SD = 37.93$), however this result was heavily skewed by one outlier who reported over 400 short term relationships. When this participant was excluded the mean number of short term relationships was 6.7, with the range being 0-80. The modal score was 0 with 20.3% of participants reporting no short term relationships.

The mean number of long term relationships (defined as more than two years) was 1.39 with a range of 0-6 long term relationships and a mode of 1 (34.7%); 25.4% of the sample reported no long term relationships.

Measures

The use of various pre-existing tools that have been frequently utilised in the area of rape proclivity research was considered appropriate because the current study is an exploratory study of a New Zealand sample of men that required consideration of a number of constructs theoretically associated with rape proclivity – such as ambivalent sexism and acceptance of rape myths. The measures used were validated tools measuring the constructs found to be theoretically related to rape proclivity during the literature review. Correlational data was produced from the raw data to ascertain whether variables were consistently related in the expected direction; more confidence in the credibility of research findings – and therefore greater validity – can be attributed to findings with greater consistency (Casey & Murphy, 2009).

The use of existing surveys was also appropriate for reasons of time, convenience, ease of administration, and ease of data analysis. Surveys can be administered in an online format (Breakwell, Hammond, Fife-Schaw, & Smith, 2006) with this method being the most time and cost efficient way to reach the large number of men required for a sample size sufficient to provide statistical significance in the current study. Furthermore the anonymous format was considered the most likely to elicit honest answers. Previous research into sexual behaviour has suggested that participant bias due to embarrassment or privacy concerns may be reduced by using less intrusive methods of eliciting information, such as computer assisted surveys (Fenton, Johnson, McManus, & Erens, 2001).

Two measures of rape proclivity were used, the Attraction to Sexual Assault Scale (ASA) and a series of five scenarios containing varying degrees of sexual coercion and force. Four measures were used to examine attitudinal correlates of proclivity including the Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Assault Scale (AMMSA), the Ambivalent

Sexism Inventory (ASI), the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale (ASB), and the Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scale (AIV). The Crowne-Marlow Short Scale (CMSS) was also included as a measure of socially desirable responding to ascertain the validity of the responses.

Attraction to Sexual Aggression Scale. The items drawn from the ASA (Malamuth, 1989a) measured a participant's perception of their own likelihood of forcing a woman to do something sexually she did not want to do and of committing rape. The full scale is a 14-item questionnaire that "evaluates the extent to which he finds these behaviours attractive, whether or not he has thought about such behaviours, his likelihood of engaging in each of these behaviours, the degree to which he would be sexually aroused by these behaviours, and the extent to which he believes other men and women would be aroused by these behaviours (Wilson, Holm, Bishop, & Borowiak, 2002). Wilson et al. (2002) reported that Cronbach's alpha was .86 for their sample of 108 men; the scale had adequate test-retest reliability at a one-week interval ($r = .75$). Additional research by Malamuth (1989a, 1989b) also supports the validity of the instrument

The likelihood of force and likelihood of rape items (LF/LR) from Malamuth's Attraction to Sexual Aggression Scale were used in the current study but the other evaluative questions were excluded in an effort to avoid participant fatigue as the survey in its entirety was lengthy. The likelihood of force/rape scaled utilised in past research into rape proclivity has used a three-level hierarchy considering the likelihood of force (LF), of rape (LR) or of both (LFR) (Malamuth, 1989a). As Malamuth (1989) explains, likelihood items are intended to "measure the lure of sexual aggression, both to the subject himself as well as his perception of its attraction to others" (Malamuth, 1989a, p. 30).

These two items (LF/LR) were embedded in a list of 14 sexual activities; participants were asked to rate the likelihood that they would engage in each behaviour if they could be assured that no one would know and there was no possibility that they would be punished. Respondents indicated their likelihood on a five point scale from 'Not at all

likely' to 'Very likely'. Higher scores are considered to be indicative of a stronger belief by an individual that they are capable of rape or sexual assault, however for the purpose of analysis responses of 2 or more were collapsed into one group. This reflects the assumption that there is a qualitatively different attitude towards rape between men who believed there was some possibility that they would engage in such behaviour and those who unequivocally stated that was not a possibility for them (Osland et al., (1996). This assumption was supported by research finding that men who scored 1 on the LF/LR index responded in a significantly different way on the dependent measures than those who scored 2 or greater (Osland et al., 1996).

Malamuth (1981) summarised a number of studies using the measure, finding that around 35% of males expressed the belief that they had some likelihood of raping. Tieger (1981) similarly found that 37% of men in their sample reported some likelihood of raping.

Stille, Malamuth and Schallow (1987, in Osland et al., 1996) reported that 22% of men in their sample indicated some likelihood of raping, and that 49% expressed that there was some likelihood that they would force a woman to engage in sexual activity when she was unwilling.

More recently in a study of 86 primarily Caucasian 86 college aged males (age $M = 21$, $SD = 3.6$) found that 13.6% agreed that there was some likelihood that they would rape a woman if they could get away with it, while 31.7% admitted to some likelihood that they would force sexual intercourse against a woman's will – although this is the definition of rape these results demonstrate the impact that labelling rape has on participant response (Edwards et al., 2014)

The ASA in its entirety reveals psychometric properties. The original sample of 288 male introductory psychology students found that 26.1% of men reported some likelihood of rape while 58.3 reported some likelihood of forcing a woman into unwanted sexual behaviour (Malamuth, 1989a). The alpha coefficient was .91 with item-total correlations ranging from .46-.77 and the mean inter item correlation being .41. The test-retest correlations at around two weeks for the likelihood items were for .66 for LR and for .74 for LF. Malamuth and Ceniti (1986) also found support for

the test-retest stability of LF and LR ratings and both LF and LR have been found to have significant relationships with criterion measures (Malamuth 1989a; Malamuth 1989b). A second study of 189 men recruited at a university campus by the Malamuth (1989b) provided LR and LF rates of 15% and 37% respectively with a LR mean of 1.39 and a LF mean of 1.72. A further sample of 302 male introductory psychology students in the same study yielded LR scores of 16.03%, mean 1.25 and LF of 36%, mean 1.57.

More recently Schewe, Adam and Ryan's (2009) study on 83 men from a Midwestern university in the USA found Cronbach's alpha of .82 for the ASA, with 27% of participants reporting having been tempted to use force to obtain sexual contact with a woman one or more times. A study of 113 male university students of the University of Mannheim who participated as paid volunteers (Bohner et al., 1998) found the two proclivity items of the ASA to be highly correlated ($r = 0.71$). Of the sample, 63% reported some likelihood of using sexual force against a woman.

The two items drawn from the measure were the most salient aspects of the measure, which in its entirety would have been too large and unwieldy for the current study, likely increasing participant fatigue and drop out. This decision also reflected the central focus of the thesis on how other attitudinal variables related specifically to proclivity. Furthermore, including only likelihood of force/likelihood of rape questions is a strategy that has been employed in past research exploring how self-perceived rape proclivity related to other constructs of interest. Malamuth summarised that "likelihood of rape and likelihood of force ratings have been shown to account for a significant proportion of the variation of the variance in theoretically relevant variables" (Malamuth, 1989a, p. 27).

Rape Scenarios. A series of five scenarios was included, first utilised by Bohner and colleagues (Bohner et al., 1998). The scenarios were used as originally depicted and no modifications were made. The scenarios provided realistic depictions of date rape with varying degrees of force though the word rape was absent from the scenario. As such, it

provided a behavioural descriptor of the act rather than using a loaded label that may automatically elicit guarded or negative reactions from participants.

Scenarios differed in a number of ways. Table 3 summarises the differences between scenarios including the victim-perpetrator relationship; victim intoxication; the presence or absence of prior sexual activity; the presence of coercion, verbal objection and physical resistance. Only scenario five fit the prototypical stranger rape script where rape is perpetrated by a stranger using violent force. The remaining four scenarios presented the perpetrator and victim as having known each other prior to the rape, with varying combinations of coercion, verbal objection and physical force employed to perpetrate the rape. Victim intoxication was present in only scenario one, with prior sexual activity depicted in two scenarios (scenario one and scenario four). Scenario three differed in that there was no intoxication, no prior sexual activity, and no verbal or physical force used. This scenario, involving an employer/employee relationship, relied exclusively on coercion. The full scenarios are provided in Appendix 2.

Participants were invited to imagine themselves in the same situation and provide a rating on a seven point Likert scale for three questions. The first question was 'In this situation, how sexually aroused would you be?' with response options ranging from 1 (*not at all sexually aroused*) to 7 (*very strongly sexually aroused*). The second question was 'In this situation, would you have done the same?' with response options ranging from 1 (*would definitely not have done the same*) to 7 (*would definitely have done the same*). The third question was 'In this situation, how much would you have enjoyed getting your way?' with response options ranging from 1 (*would not enjoy it at all*) to 7 (*would greatly enjoy it*). These questions correspond with three indices – the arousal index, behavioural inclination index and enjoyment index. The mean score across all five scenarios was computed for each index with a higher score indicative of a higher self-perceived rape proclivity.

Previous research has attested to the reliability and validity of this measure - the internal consistency has been found to be satisfactory to

Table 3
Rape Scenario Variables

Variable	Scenarios				
	1	2	3	4	5
Relationship	Acquaintance	Acquaintance	Employer/employee	New acquaintance	Stranger
Alcohol	Female intoxicated	No	No	No	No
Prior sexual activity	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Coercion	No	Yes – persuasion	Yes – implied career impact	No	No
Verbal objection	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Physical resistance	No force	Minimal force	No force	Some force used	Violent force used

high (Bohner et al., 1998; Bohner, Siebler, & Schmelcher, 2006; Eyssel et al., 2006), and it has demonstrated significant covariance with self-reported sexually aggressive behaviour (Bohner et al., 2005). Gerger, Klay, Bohner and Seibler (2007) found the Cronbach's alpha to be .81 for a German version of the measure and .76 for an English version.

A study of 113 male university students of the University of Mannheim who participated as paid volunteers provided the following mean scores: arousal ($M = 2.64$, $SD = 0.83$), behavioural inclination ($M = 1.72$, $SD 0.65$), enjoyment ($M = 1.99$, $SD = 0.73$). The internal consistency of each subscale was good with the following alpha values: arousal .76, behavioural inclination .78, and enjoyment .74 (Bohner et al., 1998).

Previous research using the measure has employed varying score computations. Bohner and colleagues (1998) calculated a mean score for each index while later research considered the arousal scale to be a filler question and computed a mean for the behavioural inclination and enjoyment scores of each scenario, considering this to be a measure of overall rape proclivity (Bohner, Pina, Viki, & Siebler, 2010; Eyssel et al., 2006). Supporting this stance is research that found that anticipated enjoyment of sexual dominance mediated the relationship between rape myth acceptance and rape proclivity, whereas anticipated sexual arousal did not (Chiroro et al., 2004). Bohner and colleagues (2010) followed this scoring methodology, averaging behavioural inclination and enjoyment scores with a sample of 40 British men from the University of Kent, mean age 23 years. Cronbach's alpha for the five scenarios was found to be .85. The overall proclivity mean was 1.83 ($SD = 0.68$).

A similar methodology using a single scenario was used by Truman et al. (1996) to assess likelihood of rape; Wilson and colleagues (2002) also employed audio scenarios describing rape and a 7 point rating scale.

Acceptance of Modern Myths About Sexual Assault. The Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Assault Scale (Gerger et al., 2007) is a 30 item scale with a 7-point response scale ranging from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 7 (*totally agree*). The mean of all items is defined as the individuals score on the measure with a higher score indicating a

greater acceptance of rape myths (Gerger et al., 2007). The scale includes the following content categories: denial of the problem, antagonism towards victims' demands, lack of support for policies designed to help alleviate the effects of sexual violence, beliefs that male coercion forms a natural part of a sexual relationship, beliefs that exonerate male perpetrators by placing blame on the victims or circumstance (Gerger et al., 2007).

This scale was devised to be a more subtle measure of rape-related beliefs in comparison to the blunter tools originally devised myths (Gerger et al. 2007) such as Costin's R-scale (Costin, 1985). These traditional measures tend to yield highly skewed results with most participants close to the low end point; the data does not differentiate well between individuals regarding how strongly they ascribe to common rape myths. As Gerger and colleagues (Gerger et al., 2007) point out, this response pattern can be problematic in terms of statistical analyses and measuring the impact of interventions. It may also reflect the obvious nature of the items and the impact of socially desirable responding whereby participants do not want to endorse attitudes that are so explicitly supportive of sexual aggression.

The means of the measure are higher than traditional rape myth acceptance scales and the distributions of the items more closely approximate normal. This is also possibly because the items included are more subtle in nature and are therefore more likely to be endorsed than the more obvious questions about rape included in traditional measures. As Gerger et al. (2007) noted, sexist beliefs may have become increasingly subtle and covert. They suggest that "old-fashioned" sexism was characterized by the endorsement of traditional gender roles, discrimination against women, and stereotypes portraying women as less competent. By contrast, they suggest that modern sexism is characterised by "the denial of continued discrimination, antagonism toward women's demands, and a lack of support for policies designed to help women" (Gerger et al., 2007, p. 425)

Four studies ($N = 1279$, including 303 German speaking males and 148 English speaking males, mean age 23.5-32.5 years, age range 14-99

years) supported the reliability and validity of the measure, particularly for an internet based administration of the English language version; evidence was also provided for the concurrent and predictive construct validity of the measure. Retest reliability over 3 to 12 weeks was found to be satisfactory, ranging from .67 to .88. The mean score for males in the four studies ranged from 3.15 to 3.6 (Gerger et al., 2007).

Coefficients of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) were very good for all scales, ranging from .90 to .95. The measure was strongly correlated with other closely related constructs in the expected direction including sex-role stereotyping, adversarial sexual beliefs and the acceptance of interpersonal violence, likelihood to sexually harass, and hostile sexism. The AMMSA correlated across all four studies with coefficients ranging from $r = .79$ to .88. A moderate correlation was found with benevolent sexism with coefficients ranging from .37 to .53. The measure was also moderately and positively correlated with social dominance orientation. People with higher AMMSA scores were more likely to endorse a belief in a just world however AMMSA scores were uncorrelated with impression management (Gerger et al., 2007).

The AMMSA was chosen as a more modern and relevant measure of rape myth acceptance. When reviewing its predecessors, it became clear that older measures of rape myth acceptance utilised very explicit statements regarding rape that on the face of it seemed unlikely to be endorsed by participants. Given the intervening decades of increasing awareness and media coverage of the issue, it was considered prudent to use a more subtle and modern tool. While the measure contained 30 items it was easily administered using the online rating scale.

Similar means have been provided by subsequent studies. A 2013 study by Süssenbach and colleagues (2013) included 84 men and 170 women (age $M = 24.20$ years) with the majority being students. This study yielded a mean total score for males of 3.63.

There is some support for the cross cultural applicability of the AMMSA. Two studies conducted with students of the University of Grenada ($N = 305$, 99 of whom were male with a mean age of 21.3 years; $N = 236$, 111 of whom were male with a mean age of 20.8 years) found

similar internal consistencies and means for both men and women to the original development sample, also finding the expected correlation and relationship with one other traditional rape myth measure and the ASI (Megías, Romero-Sánchez, Durán, Moya, & Bohner, 2011). A study by Helmke, Kobusch, Rees, Meyer and Bohner (2014) also found similar means to the development sample among a sample of French men, and somewhat lower means than expected among a sample of German men. There is also some support for the use of the measure among Greek and Spanish men (Hantzi, Lampridis, Tsantila, & Bohner, 2015; Megías et al., 2011).

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1997) measures “positively correlated components of sexism that nevertheless represent opposite evaluative orientations towards women” (Glick & Fiske, 1996, p. 491) including hostile sexism, or sexist antipathy, and benevolent sexism, a subjectively positive orientation towards women among men.

The ASI is a 22 item self-report measure utilising a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (*disagree strongly*) to 5 (*agree strongly*). Six items are reverse scored. Standardised instructions describe the instrument for subjects as a “series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society” (Glick & Fiske, 1996, p. 512) and provide the rating scale. Items reflect either of the two subscales of hostile sexism and benevolent sexism with 11 items mapping onto each, allowing subscale means to be calculated separately. The total ASI score is a measure of overall sexism and is calculated by averaging all items after reversing the items specified. Scores range from 0 to 5. Higher scores indicate a greater degree of overall sexism; higher scores on the hostile or benevolent sexism subscales indicate a greater endorsement of those specific attitudes.

Six studies reported by Glick and Fiske (1996) ($N=2,250$) established the convergent, discriminant and predictive validity of the measure with the authors concluding that total scores corresponded with ambivalent attitudes towards women, hostile sexism scores correlated with negative

attitudes towards and stereotypes about women, and benevolent sexism scores correlated with positive attitudes and stereotypes concerning women, though for non-student men only. The sample was predominantly college undergraduates but two small community samples were also included. The internal consistency reliability of the AIS total score as well as each of the subscales was acceptable with alphas averaging in the .8 to .9 range (Glick & Fiske, 1997). Across the six studies the mean AIS score for males ranged from 2.45-2.96, the hostile sexism mean ranged from 2.38-3.05 and the benevolent sexism mean ranged from 2.31-2.87 (Glick & Fiske, 1996).

More recently a 2012 study of 827 Swedish men and 43 Swedish women drawn from the general adult, industrial employee and high school student populations found that men scored higher than women on both hostile sexism and benevolent sexism. Male scores for hostile sexism were $M = 2.35$, $SD = 1.22$ and $M = 1.92$, $SD = 1.00$ for benevolent sexism (Zakrisson, Andrežen, Lenell & Sandelin, 2012).

An analysis by Glick et al. (2000) of ASI data from 15,000 men and women across 19 nations found that hostile and benevolent sexism correlated as expected, predicted the ascription of positive and negative traits to women as expected, and predicted gender inequality across nations as expected, supporting the utility of the tool cross-culturally.

The ASI was employed in the current research due to its cross-cultural applicability and cemented position in gender based attitudinal research, having been used to examine a wide range of topics since its development. The ASI is easy to administer as an electronic test and uses plain language. It is also easily scored with few reversed items and a mean score being produced for total sexism, hostile sexism and benevolent sexism.

Adversarial Sexual Beliefs. The Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale (Burt, 1983) is a nine-item self-report scale that “assess participants’ belief that men and women’s romantic relationships with each other are, by nature, adversarial and exploitative” (Chapleau et al., 2008); Burt (1985) suggested that the measure reflects a unidimensional construct. The items

are scored on a seven-point Likert scale with item responses summed to give an overall total score, with higher scores indicative of a greater endorsement of adversarial sexual beliefs.

The development sample was randomly drawn from the general public aged over 18 in Minnesota. The sample ($N=598$) consisted of 40% males with an average sample age of 42 ($SD = 17.6$). This sample provided a mean of 29.0 ($SD = 8.5$). Cronbach's Alpha was .80 with inter-item correlations ranging from .38 to .58 (Burt, 1983). A more recent study of 423 college students in a USA sample (35% males; age $M = 19.6$ years, $SD = 2.74$) by Chapleau et al. (2008) found the coefficient alpha to be .83.

A 2014 study by Emmers-Sommer including 777 participants, 342 of whom were men, mean sample age 22.22 years ($SD = 5.53$), found Cronbach's Alpha to be .79. This sample was drawn from college students and the survey was administered via an online format. The mean for male participants was 4.60 ($SD = 1.13$).

A total sample of 124 males enrolled at a large university in the USA were engaged for three studies by Schewe and O'Donohue (1998). Participant ages ranged from 18-33 years, with the modal age being 19 ($SD = 2.79$). The sample was 84% Caucasian. The test-retest reliability of the ASB was found to be .66 ($N = 86$) and .71 ($N = 19$); the alpha coefficient was .73 ($N = 86$) and .79 ($N = 21$). The studies found the measure to have acceptable internal consistency. It was also found to be positively correlated with a Rape Conformity Measure devised by the authors (.43, $p < 0.001$), also the ASA (.22) and AIV (.38, $p < 0.001$).

The ASB was included in the current research because adversarial sexual beliefs are correlated with and appear to underlie acceptance of rape myths. The measure is also easily administered via an online format and is useful given the relatively small number of items. Moreover, the ASB scale has frequently been used in previous research in the area of rape myth belief and rape proclivity, often in conjunction with the AIV, also developed by Burt (1983). Accordingly this measure was included in the current research.

Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence. The Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scale (Burt, 1983) is a 5-item self-report scale that examines the extent to which violence by men against women is endorsed by participants. It appears to tap two factors – women enjoy sexual violence, and acceptance of domestic violence, with a sole item reflecting non-gendered vengefulness. The items are scored on a 7-point Likert scale with item responses summed to give an overall total score, with higher scores indicative of a greater degree of acceptance of interpersonal violence between men and women.

The development sample was randomly drawn from the general public aged over 18 in Minnesota. The sample consisted of 40% males with an average sample age of 42 ($SD = 17.6$). This sample provided a mean of 18.3 ($SD = 5.9$). Cronbach's alpha was .586 with inter-item correlations ranging from .206 to .396. (Burt, 1983).

A more recent study of 423 college students in an American sample (35% males; age $M = 19.6$ years, $SD = 2.74$) by Chapleau, Oswald and Russell (2008) found the coefficient alpha to be .51.

In another study, a total sample of 124 males enrolled at a large Midwestern university in the USA were engaged for a series of three studies by Schewe and O'Donohue (1998). Participant ages ranged from 18-33 years, with the modal age being 19. The test-retest reliability of the AIV was found to be .56 ($N = 105$) and the alpha coefficient was found to be .48 ($N = 86$) and .59 ($N = 21$).

More recently, in 2009, Ogle, Noel and Maisto conducted research with 772 men from the University of North Carolina and surrounding areas. Participants ranged in age from 21-30 years ($M = 22.9$, $SD = 2.3$ years), and were predominantly heterosexual, with 74.0% European Americana, 91% African American, 5.1% Hispanic, and the remaining participants Asian American, Native American, multiracial or unspecified. The majority of participants were single (73%) or dating (24.7%) with the remaining divorced or other. The AIV scores for the sample ranged from 6-37 ($M = 14.1$, $SD = 5.0$). Internal consistency was .58. As the authors noted, despite the low internal consistency of the measure it was reported by Malamuth and colleagues (Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes, Acker, 1995)

to be one of the strongest predictors for future sexual aggression by men over a ten year time period.

A 2014 study by Emmers-Sommer including 777 participants, 342 of whom were men, with a mean sample age of 22.22 years ($SD = 5.53$) found Cronbach's Alpha to be .56, increasing to .62 when the item "People today should not use an 'eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth' as a rule for living" was excluded. This sample was drawn from college students and the survey was administered via an online format. Men produced a mean score of 5.31 ($SD = 1.12$).

The scale was included as it has previously been found to be a strong predictor of rape myth acceptance (Burt, 1980). It was also selected due to the utility of the measure for inclusion in an online survey format, and the usefulness of the measure in previous research in the field of rape myth acceptance and rape proclivity.

Crowne-Marlow Scale. The Crowne-Marlow Scale (Crowne & Marlow, 1960, in Johnston, Wright, & Weinman, 1995) was originally developed as a measure of social desirability. Social desirability, as defined by Crowne and Marlowe (1964) refers to the need for social approval. It consists of 33 forced-choice, true-false items relating to everyday behaviour, for example "I am always willing to admit it when I make a mistake". Several short scales were developed – the Crowne-Marlow Short Scale (Johnston, Wright, & Weinman, 1995), consisting of 13 items has been used in the current study so as to avoid participant fatigue.

The 13-item short form included 8 items that are allocated a score of 1 for the response of 'false' and 0 for a response of 'true'. The remaining 5 items are scored in the opposite direction, with 0 for 'false' and 1 for 'true'. Scores are then summed to give a total score.

The short form of the measure was found to have internal consistency of 0.76 using the Kuder-Richardson formula, and the scores correlated highly ($r = 0.93$) with the long form of the measure, demonstrating good psychometric properties; it is considered to perform similarly to the long form (Johnston, Wright, & Weinman, 1995). Reynolds'

(1982) sample consisted of 608 undergraduate students, 39.3% of whom were males and 81.2% of whom were white. The age range was 17-54 years with a mean age of 20.54 years ($SD = 4.01$). This sample provided a mean score of 5.67 ($SD = 3.20$) on the Crowne-Marlow Short Scale (Reynolds, 1982). Reynolds (1982) calculated male and female means but did not find any significant difference between the two. Zook and Sipps (1985) also did not identify any gender based differences in responding and recommended that the short form of the measure be considered when the standard form was too large to be conveniently used. In their study of 236 students across three samples from state universities in the USA (176 males; mean age of samples 20.5-28.1 years) they found a mean of 4.02 for males ($SD = 2.81$). Loo and Thorpe (2000) also failed to find any difference in responding due to gender and found the short versions of the measure to be superior to the full version.

Robinette (1991) found further support for the short form of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale in a sample of Basic Military Trainees. The sample consisted of 481 trainees, 64% of whom were male. The sample had a mean age of 20.5 years ($SD = 2.4$). The 13 item short form scale replicated the correlations between the long form of the measure and the validity scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory initially reported by Crowne and Marlowe (1960).

As the total survey in this study contained 109 items it was considered that the short form of the measure was more appropriate so as to reduce participant fatigue. Social desirability was not a core focus of the research; rather the CMSS was included as to ascertain the validity of the data. This was necessary given the sensitive nature of the attitudes and beliefs examined in subsequent questions; the CMSS provided this while still considering the need for brevity. There is also some evidence for the cross-cultural applicability of the measure (Sârbescu, Rusu, Costea, 2012).

Administration

Surveys were administered via an anonymous online format. Participants were provided with an introduction to the research and guided

through the informed consent process. Participants were required to indicate their understanding and acceptance of the statements pertaining to informed consent before progressing to the survey (see Appendix 1). Demographic data was gathered before the measures were introduced. Each measure was administered as one set of questions prefaced by a brief description. The format was forced choice; participants were required to fully complete each set of questions before proceeding to the next. At the end of the survey a further explanation of the research was provided, along with information regarding sexual consent and agencies where help could be obtained should participants be concerned about their own sexual attitudes or behaviours. Participants were provided with a link to a separate survey in which they could enter their details for entry into the prize draw or to gain course credits.

Statistical Analysis

Only participants who completed the entire survey (N = 118) were included in the analysis dataset.

One participant reported an age of “25 and a half” which was rounded down to 25 years. Participants who selected “Other” for ethnicity and then added a “European” specifier in the text box were included in the New Zealand European category. Due to the number of individuals who selected “Other” and added the non-specific ethnicity “New Zealander” into the associated text box, a separate category was created for this group.

The largest variation in the way in which data was reported was found in the questions pertaining to the number of short and long term relationships that participants had engaged in. When participants provided a range (i.e. 10-20) the midpoint was taken. When there was no midpoint (i.e. 3-4) the smaller number was taken as it was considered that the participant had indicated certainty regarding the minimum number of relationships they had experienced. When a participant provided a minimum number (i.e. 20+), the minimum number was used, again based on the assumption that they were expressing certainty they had engaged in at least that number of relationships.

Measures were scored as per the scoring protocols described in the methods section of the study including the reversal of specified items.

As explained in the section detailing the psychometric properties of the ASA, scores greater than one were collapsed into one category, allowing for comparison of men who deemed that they had no likelihood of committing rape with those who believed they had some likelihood of engaging in the behaviour, regardless of the magnitude of this perceived likelihood.

As the current research was an exploratory study it was considered appropriate to calculate the RP score associated with the Rape Scenarios as well as computing scores for each index separately so that more detail could be drawn from the data. It also allowed behavioural inclination to be focussed on more intently and for correlations with other measures to be calculated for each index. It was considered that the behavioural inclination index was analogous to the LR/LF questions in the ASA, with rape presented via behavioural descriptors rather than behavioural labels; analysing the indices separately allowed these two measures to be directly compared.

To acknowledge that some participants may have endorsed the belief that they may commit rape on one measure but not the other, one further variable was produced to allow for comparison between men who believed that they had some likelihood of rape on either measure (score of more than 1) to men who expressed the belief that they had no likelihood of rape (score of 1) on both measures.

Analysis was completed using the statistical analysis software package IBM SPSS Statistics (version 23). Descriptive statistics were calculated for the sample including age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, student and employment status, relationship status, and number of short and long term relationships. Descriptive statistics were also calculated for each measure included in the survey.

Normality was assessed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic because the sample size was greater than 100; for a sample size of less than 100 the Shapiro-Wilk statistic is more appropriate (Field, 2009). The scales did not yield unanimously normal or non-normal data. Non-normal

data was produced by the following scales: the Crowne-Marlow Short Scale, the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory total scores, the Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scale, the Attraction to Sexual Assault Scale and Rape Proclivity as measured by the scenarios, as well the three subscales of this measure. The Hostile and Benevolent Sexism subscales of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, the Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Assault Scale, and the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scales all yielded normal data. Accordingly correlations were computed using both Pearson's Correlation Coefficient and Kendall's Tau. Pearson's correlation was used to examine correlations between variables where both were normal. This parametric measure was selected because, as argued by Carifio and Perla, while Likert scale items are ordinal, the composite sum of the items provides interval data that is best examined parametrically given that non-parametric statistics are "less sensitive and less powerful than parametric statistics and are, therefore, more likely to miss weaker or emerging findings" (Carifio & Perla, 2008, p. 1150). Norman also argued that "if the numbers are reasonably distributed, we can make inferences about their means, differences or whatever. We cannot, strictly speaking, make further inferences about differences in the underlying, latent, characteristic reflected in the Likert numbers, but this does not invalidate conclusions about the numbers" (Norman, 2010, p. 629). The conclusion that parametric tests such as Pearson's Correlation Coefficient are appropriate for use with Likert scales has been reached by a number of other researchers (Boone & Boone, 2012; Sullivan & Artino, 2013).

Kendall's Tau, being a non-parametric statistic, was used to examine correlations between variables where one or both variables contained data that was not normally distributed.

As the data from the ASA and Rape Scenarios was not normal, between group differences were examined using the Mann Whitney U test. This test examined how men who reported some likelihood of rape on either measure performed on all other measures compared to men who reported that they were not at all likely to commit rape. The Mann Whitney U test was selected as it is the non-parametric alternative to the Independent Groups t-Test (Field, 2009), appropriate given that the data

from the ASA and rape proclivity scenarios was not normal. The Mann-Whitney U Test converts scores into ranks across both groups, and then evaluates whether the ranks differ significantly; accordingly it compares medians rather than means (Pallant, 2010). The conversion of scores to ranks means that the actual distribution of the scores does not matter for the computation of the statistic (Pallant, 2010).

The reliability of each measure was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha. Cronbach's Alpha is one of the most commonly used reliability coefficients (Field, 2009) and is a measure of internal consistency, which is ideally above .7 (Pallant, 2010). Scales with fewer than ten items commonly return low Cronbach values in which case "it may be more appropriate to report the mean item-item correlation for the items" (Pallant, 2010, p.97). Briggs and Cheek (1986) recommended an optimal range for the inter-item correlation of .2 to .4.

Ethical Considerations

The research proposal and human ethics application were approved by the University of Waikato Psychology Research and Ethics Committee. Ethical considerations considered included informed consent; privacy, anonymity and confidentiality; risk and safety; and social and cultural responsiveness.

Informed consent. Participants were provided with a clear explanation of the nature and purpose of the research, the risk of being exposed to potentially upsetting depictions of rape, and the assurance of confidentiality. Contact details for a number of resources available to assist with concerns regarding sexual behaviour, as well as contact details for the ethics committee and project supervisor (see Appendix A). This section concluded with a number of statements confirming participants understanding of the voluntary nature of participation, the confidentiality of their responses, who to contact should they have any concerns, and the right of withdrawal.

Privacy, anonymity and confidentiality. The anonymity of participants was assured by not recording any of their identifying details. The prize draw/course credit entry was recorded in a separate survey with no link to the research survey. Information regarding confidentiality was provided in the informed consent process affirming that data would be safely stored and that they were not able to be identified through their participation.

Risk and safety. The informed consent process explained to participants that they had the right to cease answering survey questions at any time. At both the start and the end of the survey, contact details were provided for support agencies should they have become distressed having reflected on their own or another person's behaviour. To ensure that the rape myths presented in the survey did not go unchallenged, information on consent was provided before participants were able to enter the prize draw.

Social and cultural responsivity. Participants were selected on the basis of gender only. The sample was self-selected and so was not representative of the population of New Zealand as a whole. A comparison of responses provided by ethnicity was not conducted so findings were not pejorative to any ethnic group; the responses provided by the sample were analysed as a whole. Data regarding ethnicity was only collected to provide demographic information. An offer was made to supply a summary of findings to participants with an invitation to request this through the prize draw/course credit survey. A summary will also be communicated via the University of Waikato website. Rape proclivity is a sensitive and confrontational topic. An anonymous online survey format was selected in order to be responsive to potential concerns around the confrontational nature of the study.

Chapter Three: Results

This section will detail the results obtained from the survey data. First, descriptive statistics for each measure will be provided including the sample mean, confidence interval and Cronbach's alpha. Second, results pertaining to each hypothesis will be considered.

Descriptive Statistics for Questionnaires

This section will provide descriptive statistics for all measures, including mean, standard deviation, and a comparison with the development sample or another suitable sample.

Attraction to Sexual Aggression – Likelihood of Rape/Likelihood of Rape. For the two relevant items regarding likelihood of rape and likelihood of force, the sample produced a mean of 1.15 ($SD = 0.41$; range = 1.00-4.00) with a 95% confidence interval of 1.07-1.22. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .81.

When compared to the sample of 113 male students from the University of Mannheim surveyed by Bohner and colleagues (Bohner et al., 1998), the current sample had both a lower mean and a smaller standard deviation; these results were significant, $t(229) = 7.09$, $p < 0.0001$.

Acceptance of Modern Myths About Sexual Assault. The AMMSA scale produced a sample mean of 3.11 ($SD = 1.03$; range = 1.03-5.60) with a 95% confidence interval of 2.92-3.30. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .93. A t -test was used to compare the AMMSA means of the sample in the current study with that of one of the validation samples from the 2007 study by Gerger et al. This study utilised four samples: one to ascertain which items to include in the measure and three others to examine the psychometric properties of the measure. Of those three samples only one was drawn from the wider community rather than consisting purely of students. This is the sample with which the comparison was made. Although the mean and standard deviation were both smaller than those of the current sample, the difference was not

significant, $t(203) = 1.57$, $p < 0.117$, suggesting that the current sample does not have a tendency to either endorse or reject rape myths more than the development sample drawn from the community.

Ambivalent Sexism. The ASI scale overall produced a mean of 3.29 ($SD = 0.83$; range = 1.45-5.18) with a 95% confidence interval of 3.13-3.44. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .87.

The hostile sexism subscale produced a mean of 3.29 ($SD = 1.17$; range = 1.00-5.73) with a 95% confidence interval of 3.07-3.50 and the benevolent sexism subscale produced a mean of 3.29 ($SD = 0.91$; range = 1.27-5.73) with a 95% confidence interval of 3.12-3.45.

The ASI was developed and validated using a total of 2,250 individuals involved in six studies. Two of the six studies utilised community samples drawn from rural and urban public areas in Massachusetts. Although the sample was not representative, it included a range of occupations, income levels and ages. The means for males from these studies were compared with the mean from the current study. These studies contained 72 and 36 males respectively (Glick & Fiske, 1996). The current study produced a higher mean and larger standard deviation than the two validation samples considered. This effect was significant, $t(188) = 7.33$, $p < 0.0001$ and $t(152) = 5.13$, $p < 0.0001$.

The current sample also produced a higher mean and larger standard deviation for the hostile sexism subscale than either of these two samples and the community based sample of 827 Swedish men studied by Zakrisson et al. (2012). The effect was found to be significant in all three instances with respective t-scores of $t(188) = 4.04$, $p < 0.0001$, $t(152) = 2.66$, $p < 0.0087$, and $t(943) = 7.87$, $p < 0.0001$.

The current sample produced a higher mean score than either of the two samples in the original study, or that included in the study by Zakrisson and colleagues (2012). Again, in all three instances the differences were significant with respective t-scores of $t(188) = 7.17$, $p < 0.0001$, $t(152) = 5.48$, $p < 0.00017$, and $t(943) = 14.07$, $p < 0.0001$.

It is unclear why the New Zealand sample produced higher means on the ASI as a whole and both subscales contained therein, however it is

clear that the current sample more strongly supports both hostile and benevolent sexist beliefs.

Adversarial Sexual Beliefs. The ASB Scale development sample produced a mean of 25.36 ($SD = 9.35$; range = 9-45) with a 95% confidence interval of 23.65-27.06). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .82. The development sample for the ASB consisted of 40% males of the total sample of 598 participants (Burt, 1983). This sample had a higher mean than the current study with the difference being highly significant, $t(714) = 4.18, p < 0.0001$. This likely reflects sociocultural differences. The development sample was drawn from the general public in Minnesota in 1977. Attitudes towards women were significantly more conservative historically; the sociocultural climate of America in 1977 was likely much more conservative than that of New Zealand in 2015 with the intervening years of activism to improve the position of women in society.

Interestingly, the current sample mean was much higher than the mean for males produced by the 2014 study by Emmers-Sommer. This study utilised 777 students over the age of 18 years from an American university, 342 of whom were men. The difference was significant, $t(458) = 40.30, p < 0.0001$. Based on this data, it would appear that the current sample scores more similarly to the development sample from Minnesota in 1977 than the more recent American sample from 2014.

Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence. The AIV scale produce a sample mean of 13.13 ($SD = 5.34$; range = 6-28) with a 95% confidence interval of 12.15-4.10. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .50. Pallant (2010) explains that this value is sensitive to the number of items contained in the scale with low Cronbach values common in short scales of less than ten items. Pallant (2010) suggested that the mean inter-item correlation is a more appropriate measure in these circumstances, suggesting that an appropriate range is between .2 and .4. The mean inter-item correlation for the AIV is .15 with a range from -.105 to .505.

The 1977 development sample for the AIV consisted of 598 adults from Minnesota (Burt, 1983). Both the mean and standard deviation were

greater for this group than the current sample. The results were significant; $t(714) = 8.66, p < 0.0001$. Due to sociocultural differences between America in 1977 and New Zealand in 2016, this result is perhaps unsurprising.

When the current sample was compared to a 2009 sample of 772 men from the University of North Carolina (Ogle et al., 2009), the difference between means was not found to be significant ($t(888) = 1.94, p < 0.0521$). Interestingly, as with the ASB, the sample from the study by Emmers-Sommer (2014) produced a much lower mean for men and again, this difference was statistically significant ($t(458) = 25.55, p < 0.0001$). It is not clear why this sample produced such a low mean for both the ASB and the AIV. Perhaps as the participants were all enrolled in one course and offered credit for participation the sample consisted of men who had less interest in the topic but were participating for the purposes of obtaining course credit only, and therefore the sample was less affected by self-selection bias than the current sample.

Social Desirability. The CMSS produced a sample mean of 6 ($SD = 2.74$; range = 0-12) with a 95% confidence interval of 5.50-6.50. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .64. Although the sample returned a slightly higher mean than the development sample for the CMSS, and a slightly reduced spread by comparison, the effect was not significant, $t(724) = 1.05, p < 0.295$ suggesting that the scores of the current sample are similar to that of the development sample, further suggesting that the current sample was not engaging in impression management as a whole.

Descriptive Statistics for Rape Scenarios

The rape scenarios produced an overall sample mean of 1.61 ($SD = 0.93$; range = 1.00-6.70) with a 95% confidence interval of 1.44-1.78. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .91 though, interestingly, that dropped to .63 when only the two subscales of enjoyment and behavioural inclination were included. The enjoyment subscale produced a mean of 1.82 ($SD = 1.17$; range = 1.00-6.80) with a 95% confidence interval of 1.61-2.03. The behavioural inclination subscale produced a mean of 1.40 ($SD = 0.85$;

range = 1.00-6.60) with a 95% confidence interval of 1.25-1.56. These means were compared with those from the study by Bohner et al., (1998).

Hypothesis 1

The hypothesis that the prevalence of self-reported rape proclivity would be similar to the range reported in previous studies into self-reported rape proclivity, was somewhat supported. Rape proclivity was measured by the ASA Scale and the Rape Proclivity Scenarios.

Attraction to Sexual Assault Scale. When the responses for the two behaviours were amalgamated, 83.1% of men believed that it was not at all likely that they would either commit rape or force a woman to do something sexual that she did not want to, with 16.9% of men (20 of the 118 men surveyed) believing that it was somewhat likely they would engage in one or both behaviours.

92.4% of men (109 of the 118 participants) stated that it was not at all likely they would commit rape with 86.4% of men (102 of the 118 participants) asserting that it was not at all likely that they would force a woman to do something sexual she did not want to. Of course the inverse finding was that 7.6% (or 9 of the 118 men surveyed) said that it was somewhat likely they would commit rape, and 13.6% of men (16 of the 118 men surveyed) believed they were somewhat likely to force a woman to participate in a sexual activity against her will. This data supports hypothesis one, which predicted that the self-reported rape proclivity would be in the range found by previous studies, that being 10.3% to 38%.

Rape Proclivity Scenarios. Asking men to respond to behavioural descriptors of rape yielded a quite different result to that obtained by the explicit questions in the ASA. Considering whether they would behave similarly, 38.1% of men (45 of the 118) believed there was some likelihood that they would behave the same in at least one of the situations presented, while 56.8% believed they would be somewhat likely to enjoy getting their own way in at least one non-consensual situation. Of the sample of 118 men, 93 (78.8%) believed that they would be somewhat

aroused in at least one scenario, with 21.2% saying that they would not be aroused at all. Overall, 41.5% of the sample believed that it was not at all likely they would behave in a similar manner to any of the scenarios presented or enjoy getting their own way in such situations. This data further supports hypothesis one, which predicted that the rape proclivity prevalence would fall within the range found in previous research, that being 10.3% to 38%; 38.1% of the current sample believed they may engage in rape.

Examining the results associated with the five scenarios individually also yields interesting results, as shown in Table 4. The order in which the scenarios results are discussed reflects the consistency of ranking across the three subscales of enjoyment, behavioural inclination and arousal. Scenario two consistently ranked first for all subscales and scenario five consistently ranked last across subscales. Scenarios 3, 4 and 5 fell in between these two extremes.

Table 4

Distribution of Scores Across Rape Scenarios.

Response	Scenarios				
	1	2	3	4	5
No arousal	40.7	34.7	54.2	35.6	79.7
Some arousal	59.3	65.3	45.8	64.4	20.3
Would not have done the same	82.2	67.8	85.6	78.8	94.1
Some likelihood of doing the same	17.8	32.2	14.4	21.2	5.9
No enjoyment	63.6	54.2	69.5	64.4	89.0
Some enjoyment	36.4	45.8	30.5	35.6	11.0

Scenario 2 – in which the female was known to the male, verbally objected and offered minimal physical resistance - was the scenario for which the highest proportion of men judged that they would be somewhat aroused (65.3%), also the scenario in which the most men believed they would be somewhat likely to behave the same if they were in that situation

(32.2%) and in which they expected they would somewhat enjoy getting their own way (45.8%).

Conversely, Scenario 5 – which involved a stranger using considerable force to rape a woman who had objected both verbally and behaviourally - consistently ranked least likely to elicit arousal, similar behaviour, or enjoyment. While between 45.8% and 65.3% of men judged they would be somewhat aroused in the other scenarios, only 20.3% judged that they would be aroused in scenario five. Likewise, between 14.4% and 32.2% of men believed they were somewhat likely to behaving in a similar manner to the male in the other scenarios presented while only 5.9% believed they would respond similarly to the man in scenario five. There was a similar pattern for how strongly men believed they would enjoy getting their own way; between 30.5% and 45.8% of men believed they would enjoy getting their own way in the scenarios one to four, while only 11% believed that they would enjoy getting their own way in scenario five.

Scenario 3 – which involved a manager having sex with a woman despite her behaviour indicating a lack of consent – also ranked consistently as the fourth most likely scenario to elicit arousal (45.8%), similar behaviour (14.4%), and enjoyment (30.5%). While these response rates were all twice that reported for scenario 5 despite it not being a scenario that appealed to participants.

Scenario 4 – which involved prior sexual activity, physical and behavioural objection by the woman, and the use of physical force by the man – was ranked as the scenario second most likely to elicit arousal and the same behaviour, but ranked third for enjoyment.

Scenario 1 – which involved an intoxicated woman known to the man, and verbal non-consent but no physical force – showed the opposite pattern. This scenario was ranked the third most likely to elicit arousal and the same behaviour but ranked second for enjoyment.

Hypothesis 2

The hypothesis that there would be a positive correlation between all measures and their subscales and all other measures and subscales with the exception of the CMSS was supported.

Scale Correlation Analysis. As the Hostile and Benevolent Sexism subscales of the ASI, the AMMSA, and the ASB all yielded normal data, the correlations between these items was computed using the Pearson Correlation while all other correlations used Kendall's Tau as they dealt with at least one variable that did not produce normal data. Scale and subscale correlations are shown in Table 5.

With the exception of the CMSS, all scales correlated positively with all other scales and subscales, with most correlations reaching significance at the 0.01 level. The majority of correlations were small ($r = 0.10 - 0.29$; Pallant, 2010) to medium ($r = 0.3 - 0.49$; Pallant, 2010) in size; the large effect sizes ($r = 0.5 - 1.0$) were primarily found in correlations between the total score for a measure and the associated subscale scores (i.e. Rape Proclivity total score with the Arousal, Enjoyment, and Behavioural subscales; the Ambivalent Sexism total score and Hostile and Benevolent subscales of the same measure). These findings support hypothesis two which predicted that there would be a positive correlation between all measures and their subscales and all other measures and subscales with the exception of the CMSS.

A notable exception to this was the strong positive correlation between the AMMSA and total ASI ($r = .54$; $p < 0.01$), with the AMMSA showing a particularly strong correlation with the Hostile Sexism subscale of the ASI ($r = .75$; $p < 0.01$). The Hostile Sexism subscale of the ASI also had a strong positive correlation with the ASB scale ($r = .67$; $p < 0.01$), while the ASB itself had a strong positive correlation with the AMMSA ($r = .65$; $p < 0.01$). These three measures all had a moderately strong positive correlation with the RP scale.

Table 5

Correlations Between Total Scale and Subscale Scores for All Measures

	CMS	ASI	HS	BS	AMMSA	ASA	ASB	AIV	RP	Arous.	Enj.	Beh
CMS	-	.056	.030	.055	-.011	-.129	-.035	-0.88	-.07	-.160*	-.084	-.061
ASI		-	.652**	.548**	.544**	.108	.405**	.236**	.337**	.176**	.302**	.347**
HS			-	.272**	.752**	.124	.666**	.287**	.304**	.124	.284**	.316**
BS				-	.415**	.003	.191*	.039	.198**	.131**	.187**	.203**
AMMSA					-	.254**	.652**	.333**	.443**	.253**	.413**	.438**
ASA						-	.231**	.269**	.354**	.225**	.352**	.336**
ASB							-	.306**	.350**	.169**	.332**	.379**
AIV								-	.184**	.111	.180**	.263**
RP									-	.569**	.923**	.712**
Arous.										-	.578**	.397**
Enj.											-	.601**
Beh.												-

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$

Attraction to Sexual Assault Scale Correlations. The ASA demonstrated a moderately strong positive correlation with Rape Proclivity, particularly the Enjoyment and Behavioural Inclination subscale. It demonstrated only a small positive correlation with the ASI total, the Hostile Sexism subscale of the ASI, the ASB, the AIV and the Arousal subscale of the Rape Proclivity measure. There was no relationship between the ASA and Benevolent sexism.

These findings did not support hypothesis four, which predicted that there would be a strong positive correlation between the ASA and all other measures, with the exception of the CMS.

Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Assault Scale Correlations. The AMMSA showed a large positive correlation with the ASI total, and an even stronger correlation with the Hostile Sexism subscale. It also correlated strongly with the ASB scale. The AMMSA had a moderate positive correlation with the AIV, the Benevolent Sexism subscale of the ASI, and Rape Proclivity, particularly the Enjoyment and Behavioural Inclination subscales. There was only a small positive correlation between the AMMSA and the ASA, also between the AMMSA and the arousal subscale of the Rape Proclivity measure.

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory Correlations. The ASI total correlated strongly and positively with the Hostile Sexism and Benevolent Sexism subscales contained therein. It showed a moderately strong positive correlation with the ASB, Rape Proclivity total, and the Enjoyment and Behavioural Inclination subscales of the Rape Proclivity measure.

The Hostile Sexism subscale of the ASI had a moderately positive correlation with the total Rape Proclivity and the Behavioural Inclination scale of that same measure, and a small positive correlation with the Benevolent subscale of the ASI, the ASA, the AIV, and the Arousal and Enjoyment subscales of the Rape Proclivity measure. The Benevolent Sexism subscale of the ASI had a correlation of small magnitude with the twin subscale of Hostile Sexism, the ASB, and the Rape Proclivity total score as well as the three subscales contained in this measure. There was

a moderate positive correlation between Benevolent Sexism and the AMMSA.

Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale Correlations. The ASB scale correlated to a small degree with the ASA, Benevolent Sexism and the Arousal subscale of the Rape Proclivity measure, with a moderately strong positive correlation with the ASI, AIV, and the Behavioural Inclination and Enjoyment subscales of the Rape Proclivity measure. Interestingly, it correlated in a strong positive direction with the AMMSA and Hostile Sexism.

Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scale Correlations. There was no relationship established between the AIV and Benevolent Sexism, however there was a small positive correlation between the AIV scale and Rape Proclivity (including all three subscales), the ASI and the Hostile Sexism subscale of that same measure, and the ASA scale.

Rape Proclivity Scenario Correlations. Rape Proclivity showed a small positive correlation with the AIV and Benevolent Sexism, and a moderately strong positive correlation with the ASI total, the Hostile Sexism subscale, the AMMSA scale, the ASA scale, and the ASB scale. Unsurprisingly rape proclivity overall showed a strong positive correlation with all three subscales contained in the measure, with the strongest being between the Rape Proclivity total and the Enjoyment subscale ($r = .92$; $p < 0.01$). Similarly the three subscales correlated positively with each other, with the strongest correlation being between the Behavioural Inclination and Enjoyment subscales. There was also a strong positive correlation between the Enjoyment and Arousal subscales but only a moderately strong correlation between the Arousal and Behavioural Inclination subscales. The Arousal subscale demonstrated a small positive correlation with all other measures however the correlations with the AIV and Hostile Sexism subscale did not reach statistical significance.

These findings did not support hypothesis four, which proposed that there would be a strong positive correlation between the RP measure with all other measures, with the exception of the CMS.

Hypothesis 3

The hypothesis that the CMS would not correlate strongly with any other measure was supported.

The CMSS did not correlate strongly with any other measure, supporting hypothesis three. There was a small negative correlation with the ASA and the Arousal subscale of the proclivity scenarios however only the later reached statistical significance at the 0.05 level. There was a small positive correlation (significant to the 0.05 level) with the Arousal subscale of the Rape Proclivity scale but no other correlations of note.

These results suggest that the sample did not tend towards (or away from) socially desirable responding, suggesting minimal impression management.

Hypothesis 4

The hypothesis that there would be a strong positive correlation between both the Attraction to Sexual Assault (ASA) measure and the Rape Proclivity (RP) measure with all other measures – including each other - with the exception of the CMS, was not supported.

Attraction to Sexual Assault Scale Correlations. As detailed in the results pertaining to Hypothesis 2, the ASA demonstrated a moderately strong positive correlation with Rape Proclivity but only a small positive correlation with the ASI total, the Hostile Sexism subscale of the ASI, the ASB, the AIV and the Arousal subscale of the Rape Proclivity measure. There was no relationship between the ASA and Benevolent sexism.

Rape Proclivity Scenario Correlations. As detailed in the results pertaining to Hypothesis 2, Rape Proclivity showed a small positive correlation with the AIV and Benevolent Sexism, and a moderately strong

positive correlation with the ASI total, the Hostile Sexism subscale, the AMMSA scale, the ASA scale, and the ASB scale.

Hypothesis 5

The hypothesis that the mean scores of men indicating some proclivity for rape (as measured by the ASA and RP measures) would be higher on all other measures excluding the CMS, than those of men indicating no likelihood of rape, was supported.

As explained, participants were divided into two groups according to their responses on the ASA and their Rape Proclivity score. For both measures men who rated themselves a 1 (no likelihood of rape/force in the ASA, and no likelihood of behaving the same/no enjoyment in the Rape Proclivity measure) were considered to be qualitatively different to those providing a rating of 2 or more. Men scoring 1 were retained in one group and men scoring 2 or more were collapsed into another group giving two groups: Score = 1, and Score = 2. The non-parametric Mann-Whitney U Test was then used to compare men for both measures.

Rape Proclivity Scenarios. As summarised in Table 6, the two groups (score = 1; score = 2 or more) provided significantly different responses on the ASI total ($p = .000$; $z = -4.47$), the Hostile Sexism subscale of the ASI ($p = .000$; $z = -3.78$), the Benevolent Sexism subscale of the ASI ($p = .001$; $z = -3.19$), the AMMSA ($p = .000$; $z = -5.05$), the ASB ($p = .000$; $z = -4.61$), and all three subscales contained within the Rape Proclivity measure, all with a significant level of 0.000. For all measures the Score = 2 group for Rape Proclivity produced higher mean ranks on the other measures.

There was no difference between the two groups on the CMSS or the AIV. These findings from supported hypothesis five, which suggested that the mean scores of men indicating some proclivity for rape would be higher on all other measures, excluding the CMS, than those of men indicating no likelihood of rape.

Table 6
Between Group Differences – Rape Scenarios

Measure	Group	n	Median	p.	z
ASI	1	49	2.91	0.000	-4.47
	2	69	3.72		
Hostile Sexism	1	49	2.91	0.000	-3.78
	2	69	3.73		
Benevolent Sexism	1	49	2.91	0.001	-3.19
	2	69	3.55		
AMMSA	1	49	2.67	0.000	-5.05
	2	69	3.43		
ASB	1	49	18.00	0.000	-4.61
	2	69	29.00		
ASA	1	49	1.00	0.001	-3.19
	2	69	1.00		

Attraction to Sexual Assault Scale. The two groups (no proclivity, score = 1; some proclivity, score = 2) responded differently on the AMMSA ($p = 0.001$; $z = -3.45$), the ASB ($p = 0.003$; $z = -3.02$), the AIV ($p = 0.001$; $z = -3.71$) and Rape Proclivity ($p = 0.000$; $z = -4.25$) including the Arousal subscale ($p = 0.007$; $z = -2.72$), the Behavioural Intent subscale ($p = 0.000$; $z = -3.83$) and the Enjoyment subscale ($p = .000$; $z = -4.14$). For all measures the Score = 2 group scored higher than the Score = 1 group, as detailed in Table 7. There was no significant difference in responding on the CMSS or the ASI, including both subscales.

The between group differences for scores on the ASA measure supported hypothesis five, which suggested that the mean scores of men indicating some proclivity for rape would be higher on all other measures, excluding the CMS, than those of men indicating no likelihood of rape. Scores on the ASA failed to differentiate between men who reported some proclivity and men who reported no proclivity with regards to their responding on the ASI.

Table 7
Between Group Differences – Attraction to Sexual Assault Measure

Measure	Group	n	Median	p.	z
AMMSA	1	98	3.13	0.001	-3.45
	2	20	3.83		
ASB	1	98	24.00	0.003	-3.02
	2	20	31.00		
AIV	1	98	12.00	0.001	-3.71
	2	20	16.00		
Rape Proclivity	1	98	1.10	0.000	-4.25
	2	20	2.40		
Arousal subscale	1	98	2.00	0.007	-2.72
	2	20	3.90		
Intent subscale	1	98	1.00	0.000	-3.83
	2	20	1.70		
Enjoyment subscale	1	98	1.10	0.000	-4.14
	2	20	2.90		

Chapter Four: Discussion

The purpose and aim of this research was to explore self-reported propensity for rape among a New Zealand community sample of men. A second aim was to identify relevant attitudinal correlates of self-reported rape proclivity.

This discussion will first explain whether the expectations presented were supported or not. Second, it will focus on the triad of measures with the strongest correlations: the AMMSA scale, the ASB scale and the Hostile Sexism scale of the ASI and their relationship with both the Rape Proclivity measure and ASA Scale. Third, attitudinal differences between men who reported they were not at all likely to rape and those who reported some likelihood of rape will be examined. Finally, the implications of this research will be discussed.

Discussion of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Prevalence of self-reported rape proclivity. The hypothesis that the sample would provide a rate of self-reported likelihood of rape similar to those found in previous studies was somewhat supported. As explained in the literature review, rates of self-reported rape proclivity have ranged from 10.3% to 38%, as per Table 1. The data yielded by the current study found that when responding to the ASA, 7.6% of men believed they would be somewhat likely to commit rape, 13.6% of men believed it was somewhat likely that they would force a woman into unwanted sexual activity, and 16.9% of men overall believed that they would engage in one or both behaviours.

The lower rates found in the current study possibly reflect the bluntness of the instrument. Although rates have remained relatively unchanged through the decades of research, public awareness of the problem of rape has grown due to increased coverage by the media. It is possible that due to this increased awareness, men are somewhat reluctant to report their interest in rape. This is a plausible explanation; when men's self-reported rape proclivity was measured using scenarios based on behavioural descriptors of rape depicting various levels of force,

quite a different picture emerged. Across all five scenarios 38.1% of men believed that there was some likelihood they would commit rape in similar circumstances, while 56.8% of men believed that they would enjoy getting their own way during at least one of the rapes described. A number of other studies have found a greater proportion of men indicated that they believed there was some likelihood of using sexual force than admitting to some likelihood of rape (Briere and Malamuth 1983; Stille, Malamuth and Schallow, 1987, in Osland, Fitch & Willis, 1996; Malamuth 1989b) – it appears that the word rape is so semantically loaded that it reduces self-reported proclivity rates when compared to terms such as ‘sexual force’, which could cover a range of sexually assaultive behaviours, or behavioural descriptors devoid of such judgement laden terms.

Although the arousal subscale was described as a filler scale in the original research (Bohner, Pina, Viki, & Siebler, 2010; Eyssel, Bohner & Siebler, 2006), it is interesting to note that 78.8% of respondents believed that they would be at least somewhat aroused in at least one of the scenarios presented. Chiroro, Bohner, Viki and Jarvis (2004) found that anticipated enjoyment of sexual dominance mediated the relationship between rape myth acceptance and rape proclivity whereas anticipated sexual arousal did not, however other research has suggested a relationship between sexually coercive fantasy and sexual aggression (Bouffard & Exum, 2003; Carroll, 1978; Davis, Norris, George Martell and Heiman, 2006; Dean & Malamuth, 1997; Greendlinger & Byrne, 1987; Gold & Clegg, 1990; Zurbriggen & Yorst, 2004). Suggested mechanisms for this effect include desensitisation to sexual aggression (Gold & Clegg, 1990), heightened expectation of or intention to engage in sexual aggression (Anderson 1983, Carroll, 1978), or indirectly by increasing arousal to cues of sexual aggression (Bouffard & Exum, 2003)

Self-reported arousal, enjoyment and behavioural inclination dropped drastically for scenario five, which depicted forceful rape. The data indicates that overall, participants rated scenarios involving intoxication, prior sexual activity between characters and no or minimal resistance as being potentially more enjoyable, more arousing and more likely to be behaviour that they would engage in than coercion in the context of an

employment relationship or violent rape. This finding is supported by previous research that has identified onset of victim refusal (Yescavage, 1999), prior sexual activity (Whatley, 1996), victim-perpetrator acquaintance (Frese, Moya, & Megías, 2004; Pollard, 1992), minimal resistance (Ong & Ward, 1999), and alcohol consumption as factors that result in greater blame being attributed to victims (Norris & Cubbins, 1992; Grubb & Turner, 2012).

Hypothesis 2: Correlations between all measures except the CMSS. The hypothesis that there would be a positive correlation between all measures and their subscales and all other measures with the exception of the CMS was supported. Although correlations did not all meet the test for statistical significance, the correlations were in a positive direction. The majority of correlations were small to medium however there was a strong positive correlation between the AMMSA and total ASI, and a stronger correlation still between the Hostile Sexism subscale of the ASI and the AMMSA. Both of these scales/subscales also had a strong positive correlation with the ASB.

This finding is supported by Burt (1980) who found that greater adherence to traditional gender roles – those that are described by the AMMSA – were predictive of rape myth acceptance and higher levels of rape proclivity. Similarly, Suarez and Gandala (2010) found an association between hostile attitudes towards women and RMA, as did Glick and Fisk (1996).

Hypothesis 3: Lack of correlation between the CMSS and other measures. The hypothesis that the CMS would not correlate strongly with any other measure was supported. While there was a small positive correlation with all scales and subscales except the RP total, which was negatively correlated with the CMS, only the correlation with the Arousal subscale of the RP measure reached significance at the 0.05 level (2 tailed). This finding was expected; the online format provided a high degree of anonymity intended to reduce participant perceptions of judgement and socially desirable responding. This finding suggests that

respondents were not responding in a socially desirable manner, which supports the veracity of the rest of the findings in this study.

Hypothesis 4: Strong positive correlation between the RP Scale and the ASA Scale with all other measures. The hypothesis that the ASA and the RP measures would have a strong positive correlation with all other measures with the exception of the CMS was not supported. Surprisingly the ASA demonstrated a moderately strong positive correlation with only the RP scale and a small positive correlation with the ASI total and the Hostile Sexism scale contained therein (but not with the Benevolent Sexism subscale), the ASB, and the AIV.

Edwards et al. (2014) found that men were more likely to admit to having coerced someone to engage in sexual intercourse by holding them down than they were to admit to having raped somebody. Men who had used such coercion were differentiated by their scores for hypermasculinity and hostility towards women when compared to men who had not. This pattern is the same as that found in the current study and thus supports current findings; men were more likely to disclose a proclivity to rape when considering behavioural descriptions of rape than when they were asked about their inclination to rape directly. The RP scenarios fared better having a moderately strong positive correlation with the ASI total and the HS scale contained therein, the AMMSA scale, the ASA scale and the ASB scale. A small positive correlation was found with the AIV and the BS scale of the ASI. This finding is supported by Abrams and colleagues (2003) who also found that hostile sexism was significantly associated with acquaintance rape proclivity, and mediated by adversarial sexual beliefs. Malamuth (1989b) and Suarez and Gadala (2010) also found an association between RMA and hostility towards women and sexual aggression respectively. The findings of the current study regarding the relationship between RP and RMA is in line with previous research; a large body of evidence has found that greater rape myth acceptance is associated with greater rape proclivity (Abbey et al., 1998; Burt, 1980; Bohner et al., 2005; De Gue & Di Lillo, 2004; Eyssel et al., 2006; Loh et al., 2005; Widman & Olson, 2013).

Interestingly, the strongest correlation between the RP subscales was between the enjoyment and behavioural inclination subscales. The Arousal subscale was originally intended to be a filler (Bohner et al., 2010; Eyssel et al., 2006) with greater weight placed on the Enjoyment and Behavioural Inclination subscales. Previous research has found the strongest relationship to be between sexual arousal to sexual arousal and sexual aggression or rape proclivity (Davis et al., 2006; Malamuth, 1981; Malamuth, 1986; Malamuth, 1989b), however as Chiroro and colleagues (Chiroro et al, 2004) note, arousal may be confounded with the enjoyment of dominance.

Hypothesis 5: Mean scores on all measures greater for men with some self-reported likelihood of rape than men with no self-reported likelihood of raping. The hypothesis that the scores of men indicating some proclivity for rape (as measured by the ASA and RP measure) would be statistically different from men professing no likelihood of rape was supported. Men who professed some proclivity had higher mean scores on all other measures excluding the CMS than men indicating there was no likelihood of rape.

The measures with the strongest relationship were the AMMSA, the Hostile Sexism subscale of the ASI and the ASB scale. This data suggests that men who tend to hold negative beliefs of women and endorse traditional gender roles also tend to view sexual relationships between men and women as adversarial, and also to have a stronger belief in rape myths. This triad also had a moderately strong positive correlation with RP – men who hold the pattern of belief described are more likely to believe they would commit or enjoy rape. This is supported by Anderson and colleagues (1997) meta-analysis which found traditional gender role beliefs, negative attitudes towards male-female relationship and hostile attitudes towards women to predict RMA. It is also supported by Burt (1980) who found that stronger belief in traditional gender roles was predictive of rape myth acceptance and associated with higher levels of rape proclivity.

The ASB scale describes a view of sexual relationships as a battle, in which one party is victor and one is conquered. As Malamuth (1989b)

noted, attraction to sexual aggression is related to a dominance motive, with the association between sex and power well documented in previous research (Chiroro et al., 2004; Malamuth, 1989b; Malamuth et al., 1995; Zurbriggen 2000).

Other authors have framed sexual aggression and rape as an extension of a relatively unquestioned pattern of interaction between men and women that is further supported and perpetuated by the media, in which men are rewarded for aggression and hostility towards women, and women are expected to submissively accept men's demands, (Brinson, 1992; Cuklanz 2000; Franiuk, Seeflet, & Vandello, 2008; Los & Chamard, 1997; Zaleski et al., 2016), demands based on gender based structural inequalities within the patriarchal culture within the patriarchal culture (Anderson et al., 1997; Whatley, 1996).

The findings of the current study regarding the strongest triad of measures suggest that men who endorse such adversarial beliefs regarding intimate relations also view women – particularly those violating gender norms and refusing to remain in a subservient, passive position thus becoming more difficult to dominate – with hostility and also endorse explicitly rape supportive beliefs, and that these beliefs are, in turn, related to rape proclivity. This finding is also supported by Polaschek and Ward (2006) who suggested that rape supportive cognitions include the belief that male sexuality is uncontrollable and that consequently women must act as gatekeepers, placing women in a position where they may be viewed as inviting or provoking rape should they not fulfil that function successfully.

The construct of sexual entitlement – the belief that men are entitled to have their sexual needs met and that women whose conduct is outside of the proscribed norms are deserving of punishment – is also congruent with this finding as the dichotomy between recipient and provider of sexual pleasure, between holding the power to punish and being the recipient of punishment, clearly describes the hostility found to be associated with rape proclivity in this study. The AMMSA describes a range of beliefs regarding rape victims and perpetrators that provide the cognitive underpinnings for positioning women as adversaries and deserving of

hostility should they step out of their proscribed role. It is also unsurprising that men holding these views are more likely to believe themselves likely to rape in given scenarios

The final scale of the triad is the HS subscale of the ASI. Again, it is perhaps unsurprising that men who view women as adversaries also tend to view women through a hostile lens, expecting them to both be chaste and sexually available. It is possible that the belief that women are sexual adversaries increases rape proclivity because hostile sexist attitudes emphasise the importance of women behaving in accordance with traditional gender roles lest they risk punishment. Traditional gender roles position women as subservient to and sexually submissive to men, objects of men's pleasure, who must be conquered if they refuse to act accordingly. The attitudes described by HS also position women who violate traditional gender norms as deserving of punishment, or "asking for it". Hostile sexism describes attitudes that place women in a double bind. If women meet traditional gender norms they are expected to be sexually available to men despite the conflicting requirement to be chaste and sexually unresponsive. The alternative is that they are viewed as deserving of sexual assault or rape in the service of "putting them in their place" and forcing them to ascribe to the role of traditional womanhood including sexual availability. In the current study, adversarial and hostile beliefs correlated in a strong positive direction – and these beliefs are associated with a greater self-reported likelihood of rape. HS describes a sense of entitlement regarding sexual access to women with rape being instrumental in facilitating this. As Polaschek and Ward pointed out, sexual violence is facilitated by a view of women as fundamentally unknowable and therefore assignable to the category of "nice girls or whores" (Polaschek & Ward, 2002, p. 394). Interestingly, it has been suggested that rape does indeed function to encourage women to maintain the appearance of being subservient and modest, unwilling to venture out at night, restricting their mobility in society (Anderson, 2016; Day, 1995; Griffin, 1979; Riger & Gordon, 1981; Warr, 1985).

The attitude of sexual entitlement suggested by the Hostile Sexism and Adversarial Sexual Beliefs measures was mirrored in the data

gleaned from the rape scenarios: men believed they were more aroused, more likely to behave similarly, and more likely to enjoy getting their own way when there was minimal resistance and they were able to dominate despite verbal non-consent. Men higher in RP were more likely to ascribe to beliefs that supported their enacting of their perceived rights and having a woman submit rather than using outright force, violence, brute strength to obtain sex.

The data regarding benevolent sexism also deserves considering. Benevolent sexism is moderately correlated with AMMSA but only shows a small correlation with RP. It is possible that benevolent sexism is more strongly associated with acceptance of broader rape myth beliefs, which in turn influences rape proclivity. It seems likely that benevolent sexism is a moderating variable that impacts on the strength of belief in rape myths, which then directly influence rape proclivity. This is supported by Viki et al. (2004) and Abrams et al. (2003) who found benevolent sexism to be predictive for attributions of victim blame – a component of the AMMSA measure.

Between Group Differences

The two groups (score = 1; score = 2 or more) as defined by the Rape Proclivity measure were significantly different on the ASI, the Hostile Sexism subscale of the ASI, the AMMSA, the ASB, and all three subscales of the Rape Proclivity measure, all with a significant level of 0.000. There was also a difference between the way the two groups responded on the Benevolent Sexism subscale of the ASI, the ASA, with a 0.001 significance. This finding is supported by research (Edwards et al., 2014) that found men who endorsed forceful intercourse, a behavioural descriptor of rape, were more inclined to believe that men should dominate women, who were seen as objects for their pleasure. Quakenbush (1989) also found greater rape proclivity among men exposed to an acquaintance rape stimulus compared to those exposed to a stranger rape stimulus; in all five scenarios presented in the RP measure there was some prior association between the victim and the rapist. Bouffard and Bouffard (2011) concluded that stronger RMA was the key

factor that differentiated men who reported they would force intercourse with a woman from those who indicated that they would not.

The findings regarding between group differences were also supported by Murphy and colleagues (1986) who suggested that both sociocultural factors including rape myth acceptance and sex role stereotyping, and individual factors such as arousal to rape and hostility have an impact on rape proclivity. Men in the current study who responded that there was some likelihood that they would rape did indeed appear to be different to men expressing no proclivity for rape, with differences in RMS and hostility contributing to differential rape proclivity. Bohner and colleagues (Bohner et al., 1998) suggested that men who endorsed a high level of RMA trivialise or justify sexual violence towards women to enable them to consider that they too may perpetuate such violence. Many studies lend credence to the finding that a stronger endorsement of rape myths is associated with a greater self-reported rape proclivity (Abbey, McAuslan, & Ross, 1998; Burt, 1980; Bohner et al., 2005; De Gue & Di Lillo, 2004; Eyssel et al., 2006; Loh et al., 2005; Widman & Olson, 2013).

In line with research by Quakenbush (1989), the current research found rape myths to be associated with adversarial sexual beliefs and sex role stereotyping, however, whereas Quakenbush found an association between rape myth acceptance and the AIV scale, this research did not find the AIV to be associated with rape proclivity.

The two groups (score = 1; score = 2) as defined by the ASA measure responded differently on the AMMSA ($p=0.001$), the ASB ($p = 0.003$), the AIV ($p = 0.001$) and Rape Proclivity ($p = 0.000$) including the Arousal subscale ($p = 0.007$) and the Enjoyment and Behavioural Intent subscale (both $p = 0.000$) (and the ASA). For all measures, the score = 2 group scored higher than the score = 1 group. Scenario 2 had more men fall into the score = 2 category for behaviour, enjoyment and similarity than any other scenario. Scenario 4 ranked second for likely behaviour and arousal, and third for enjoyment while scenario 1 ranked third for likely behaviour and arousal and second for enjoyment. These results are perhaps unsurprising given that victims are apportioned more blame when the victim is acquainted with the perpetrator (Frese et al., 2004), offers no

resistance, (Ong & Ward, 1999), has engaged in previous sexual activity with the perpetrator (Yescavage 1999; Whatley 1996), and has been drinking alcohol (Norris & Cubbins, 1992; Scronce & Corcoran, 1995), all factors present in one or more of the top three rated scenarios. Men's initial perception of a woman's intent to engage in sex is also a predictor of acquaintance rape (Willan & Pollard, 2003), possibly contributing to more men indicating that they would enjoy or behave similarly to scenario two than any other scenario – scenario two depicts a man raping a woman who he believed would have sex with him after a holiday and who provided little resistance. Men who indicated some likelihood of rape also scored significantly higher on hostility towards women and acceptance of rape myths, factors also found to be predictive of self-reported likelihood of acquaintance rape by Willan and Pollard (2003).

Scenario 5 was the only scenario depicting very forceful rape; overall fewer men believed they would act similarly, would enjoy getting their own way or would feel aroused in the same situation than in any other scenario. This finding is supported by Franiuk, Seefeldt and Vandello (2008) who noted that rape perpetrators receive more leniency and victims less sympathy when a rape deviates from the stereotyped violent rape with less benefit of the doubt given to perpetrators whose behaviour fits the violent rape script. Another possibility is that as the first four scenarios may have been perceived as somewhat ambiguous, compared to a forceful rape as in scenario five, and that a depiction of forceful rape caused participants attitudes towards women and rape to become more salient, and therefore more likely to guide self-report.

Implications

A 1996 article by Osland and colleagues stated that rape “proclivities appear to be stable in spite of the increased awareness of the problem of sexual coercion of women by men since the early 1980s”. Twenty years later, the current study has resulted in the same conclusion. Despite several decades of effort in the area of rape awareness, the number of men reporting some proclivity to rape remains relatively unchanged. It is possible that this rate remains stable because they are independent of

awareness, reflecting instead the underlying variables such individual differences in empathy, hostility and numerous other intrapersonal variables that affect interpersonal behaviour in many spheres of life, not only the sexual.

It is also possible that such culturally entrenched attitudes are not amenable to being changed by awareness alone. Hamilton and Yee (1990) suggest that it is not a lack of awareness about rape per se that has contributed to the stable levels of self-reported rape proclivity, but a lack of awareness about the traumatic consequences for victims of rape. Their study found that greater knowledge about rape trauma and perceptions of rape as an aversive act were associated with lower self-reported likelihood of rape and fewer rape supportive attitudes.

Another implication of the current research is that rape supportive attitudes are still widely held. These beliefs contribute to rape proclivity among males and this proclivity contributes to rape and sexual assault (DeGue & DiLillo 2004; Edwards et al., 2014; Malamuth et al., 1991; Murnan et al., 2002; Murphy et al., 1986). Dean and Malamuth (1997) found a significant correlation between rape supportive attitudes, self-reported likelihood of rape and actual sexual aggression in college aged men. In

Interestingly, both sexually aggressive behaviour and rape supportive attitudes have been found to independently predict future sexual aggression (Demare & Briere, 1988; Malamuth, 1993b; Muehlenhard & Falcon, 1990; Widman & Olson, 2013).

Rape myths have also been found to be more strongly endorsed by men who have admitted to engaging in past sexual coercion than non-coercive men (White et al., 1996). Rates of sexual assault perpetration are high – Suarez and Gadalla's 2010 meta-analysis found a 33% prevalence rate for rape and/or sexual assault. Widman and Olsen (2013) found that 60% of a community sample of men admitted to perpetrating at least one sexual assault with 26% reporting five or more, and 12% admitting to rape. Koss and Oros (1982) found that 23% of college aged males in their sample admitted to rape. Rape supportive attitudes appear to be necessary but not sufficient for the commission of rape. Quite simply, "the

more rape myths are used, the harder it is to eliminate sexual assault” (Franiuk, Seefeldt & Vandello, 2008, p. 791). It is not unreasonable to suggest that the attitudes revealed in the current research are likely predictive of sexually coercive or aggressive behaviour among some participants. It is also not unreasonable to suggest that these findings could be extrapolated to the wider community, drawn as the sample was, from the community.

A further implication concerns the triad of beliefs found to be most strongly correlated – that of rape myth acceptance, adversarial sexual beliefs and hostile sexism. Rape myth acceptance has consistently been found to be associated with self-reported rape proclivity and perpetration of sexual assault (Abbey et al., 1998; Burt, 1980; Bohner et al., 2005; De Gue & Di Lillo, 2004; Eyssele et al., 2006; Loh et al., 2005; Widman & Olson, 2013), as have adversarial sexual beliefs (Grubb & Turner, 2012; Rapaport & Burkhart, 1984) and hostility and sexist attitudes towards women are associated with higher rates of self-reported sexual assault (Good et al., 1995; Grubb & Turner, 2012; Locke & Mahalik, 2005; Malamuth et al., 1996; Malamuth et al., 1991; Muehlenhard & Falcon, 1990; Tieger, 1981; Truman et al., 1996; White et al., 1996; Widman & Olson, 2013). While these attitudes and beliefs have all been found to be associated with self-reported sexual assault, the current study has demonstrated that there is a strong relationship between them. It is unclear whether an individual is more likely to sexually aggress if they strongly ascribe to this triad of beliefs – it is possible that the whole is more than the sum of its parts in this instance. As Hockett and colleagues (2009) pointed out, the number of men who accept rape myths outweighs the number of men who aggress sexually against women. Much earlier in the history of rape proclivity research, Malamuth et al. (1980) concluded that these attitudes would only be potentially predictive of sexual aggression if they occurred in combination with other factors with rape proclivity measures dealing with potential only – a relatively likelihood for behaviour that may or may not occur under specific conditions - with “people have the potential to engage in virtually any behaviour” (Malamuth, 1981, p. 139). Furthermore, research by Süssenbach and

colleagues (2013) suggests that the strength of rape myth acceptance may moderate the effect of such beliefs; belief strength was not examined in the current study. A direction for future research would be to explore whether this triad of beliefs is associated with perpetration of sexual assault or rape, and which additional factors contributed to men moving from belief to action. A further area for exploration is whether the triad has predictive validity.

One further implication involves the impact of rape supportive attitudes in wider society. Rape myths are often depicted in the media – they are implicit and ubiquitous attitudes that men share and they may perceive that other men also share such attitudes. As Bandura (1977) posited, sexual aggression is learned via the same learning processes as other behaviours – rape supportive attitudes reflect an enculturation process that positions men as sexually dominant and aggressive, and women as submissive and passive; the conqueror and the conquered. Margolis (1998, in Lev-Wiesel, 2004) identified a positive correlation between peer support for rape and self-reported propensity to rape – rape supportive beliefs both shape and are shaped by the media.

Men who are informed by such exposure are frequently in positions of power over victims through their disproportional representation in the justice system. It is possible that these men will also act in accordance with rape myth schema, revictimising and increasing the likelihood of negative outcomes for women. It may also reduce the likelihood of conviction yet as Yescavage (1999) points out, perpetration accountability is essential in reducing the incidence of rape. Furthermore, exposure to rape myths may narrow an individual's definition of rape to the prototypical violent stranger rape, thus reducing the willingness and ability of victims to identify their own sexual assault and of perpetrators to identify their behaviour as aggressive (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994; Margolis, 1998, in Lev-Wiesel, 2004). More broadly, rape myths reinforce sexist attitudes. As Gavey (2016) argues, the rise of post-feminist discourse in response to widening social, sexual and legal liberation has made it hard to identify and challenge everyday sexism and continuing structural inequalities that

disadvantage women with vocal feminists criticised as pedantic, bitter or self-serving.

Limitations

Several limitations may affect the degree to which the findings of the current study may be generalised to the wider community.

The sample was self-selected; it is possible that men chose to engage due to their strong feelings about rape, these being either positive or negative. It is possible that men with a strong aversion or a strong interest in rape were more likely to participate, skewing results. However, given that results were in line with the findings of similar research with other populations this seems unlikely.

The sample was likely not proportional relative to New Zealand society as a whole with regards to ethnicity, age, area of occupation, level of education or any other personal characteristics. Due to time and resource constraints it was not possible to recruit a large enough sample to achieve proportional representation. Furthermore, although the sample size was sufficient to provide a robust statistical analysis, the sample size was still relatively small if findings are to be generalised to the wider community as a whole.

Participants were required to have access to a computer and the internet. This is a limiting factor because men without access to such technology may have different characteristics and attitudes to those of the sample utilised. It is possible that men who are more economically deprived may have less access to a computer and the internet; it is also possible that these men may have fundamentally different attitudes towards women and rape.

There are also a number of disadvantages related to the use of online surveys such as the difficulty gaining a representative sample due to differing levels of internet use and computer access between various societal groups (Breakwell, Hammond, Fife-Schaw, & Smith, 2006), also the inherent self-selection bias and high drop-out rate. It is possible that men who dropped out of the survey having started it differ from those who completed the survey. The use of internet-based surveys also prohibits the

researcher from providing clarification to respondents regarding questions they do not understand and seeking clarification regarding participant responses (Mitchell & Jolley, 2013). Conversely, there is possibly less scope for interviewer bias when using survey data as all participants are administered the same questions in the same order.

The method of collecting information also posed some limitations. First, there was no way for participants to seek clarification about the process or answering questionnaires or the content therein. Furthermore, the forced choice format may have caused participants to select an answer that they did not feel was correct for lack of the ability to clarify their own responses. Another limitation of the computer administered format is that there was no way to ascertain the levels of engagement of participants. The survey was rather long so it is possible that questions presented later in the survey may have been affected by participant fatigue. Although the CMSS results indicated that social desirability was unlikely to be an issue for the sample overall, it is also possible that a tendency towards socially desirable responding developed during the survey as more personal and sensitive questions were asked of participants.

Directions for Future Research

The current research has provided an overview of the prevalence of rape proclivity and associated attitudes in a community sample of New Zealand men. There are three main suggested directions for future research.

First, it would be of great benefit to learn how to change these attitudes. As the current research has demonstrated, rape is seen as a possible behaviour by a large minority of men, with even more men revealing that they believe that it would be a somewhat enjoyable experience. Given the links between rape supportive beliefs and sexual assault perpetration, researching ways in which these underlying attitudes and beliefs can be prevented, in the first instance, or changed in the second, is a worthwhile endeavour.

Second, it would be beneficial to learn at what point rape proclivity and underlying rape supportive attitudes coalesce into attempted or completed sexual assault and rape. While this overview of the landscape of rape supportive attitudes and rape proclivity among New Zealand men provides a unique knowledge base, it does not shine light on potential preventative actions. Knowing more about the individual and contextual factors that contribute to these thoughts and desires being translated into action may enhance preventative education and treatment planning.

Third, it would be beneficial to examine the relationship between rape proclivity and associated attitudes, and past sexual assault and rape perpetration. It is possible that these attitudes and beliefs, indeed rape proclivity itself, are linked more strongly to past behaviour. As past behaviour is predictive of future behaviour, knowing the strength and direction of this relationship may provide guidance as to points of intervention to reduce the incidence of sexual assault and rape.

Conclusion

A large body of literature spanning several decades has found that a subset of men believe that they have some proclivity for rape, that a proclivity for rape is associated with certain attitudes, and that men who believe they may possibly commit rape tend to endorse these attitudes more strongly.

The purpose of this research was to gain some measure of rape proclivity among a community sample of men from New Zealand and to explore associated and contributory attitudes and beliefs. The results of the research were consistent with international findings with regards to the proportion of men who believed that there was some likelihood that they would enact or enjoy rape under certain conditions and if they could be assured that they would avoid punishment. The findings of this study suggest that there is a particularly strong relationship between hostile sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs and the acceptance of rape myths. This triad of attitudes also appears to be associated with greater rape proclivity. Men with a proclivity for rape responded significantly differently when asked how much they endorsed hostile and benevolent sexist beliefs, rape

myths, adversarial sexual beliefs and an acceptance of interpersonal violence.

It is imperative to remember that research into rape proclivity often reflects one potential behaviour out of an almost endless number of possible behaviours; there is no accurate way of predicting rape. Rape proclivity research does not imply that men who report some inclination for rape have been, are, or will be rapists – it only confirms that some men believe they have the capacity to rape under specific circumstances. However, given the association between self-reported rape proclivity and past sexual assault perpetration, and the axiom “past behaviour predicts future behaviour”, self-reported rape proclivity still represents a concerning belief. It is particularly concerning given that a large minority of men believe that they are somewhat likely to commit rape, and the majority of men believe that raping a woman would be an at least somewhat enjoyable experience.

Clearly, wider societal exposure to and awareness of the issue of sexual assault and rape perpetration has not resulted in any significant change in rape supportive attitudes and beliefs, nor men’s own assessment that they would engage in such behaviour. Research suggests that increasing men’s awareness of the negative and distressing impact of rape on victims is a potential avenue for effecting attitudinal change, however more research is needed.

This study has provided an overview of men’s rape-supportive attitudes and beliefs, and their own potential to be a rapist. Given the prevalence of rape and sexual assault in New Zealand and the resistance of these attitudes to change over time, research into how to address this important societal ill may provide avenues for increasing the safety of women in New Zealand and decreasing the likelihood of victimisation by men who act on these inclinations and beliefs.

References

- Abbey, A., Mcauslan, P., & Ross, L. (1998). The role of alcohol, misperception of sexual intent, and sexual beliefs and experiences. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 17*(2), 167-195.
- Abrams, D., Viki, G., Masser, B., & Bohner, G. (2003). Perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape proclivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(1), 111-125.
- Alleyne, E., Gannon, T., Ó Ciardha, C., & Wood, J. (2014). Community males show multiple-perpetrator rape proclivity: Development and preliminary validation of an interest scale. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 26*(1), 82-104.
- Anderson, C. (1983). Imagination and expectation: The effect of imagining behavioral scripts on personal intentions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*(2) :293-305.
- Anderson, I., & Doherty, K. (1997). Psychology, sexuality, and power: Constructing sex and violence. *Feminism and Psychology, 7*(4), 547-552.
- Anderson, K., Cooper, H., & Okamura, L. (1997). Individual differences and attitudes toward rape: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*(3), 295-315.
- Anderson, S. (2016). Conceptualising rape as coerced sex. *Ethics: An International Journal of Social, Political and Legal Philosophy, 127*(1), 50-87.
- Anderson, V., Simpson-Taylor, D., & Herrmann, D. (2004). Gender, age, and rape-supportive rules. *Sex Roles, 50*(1-2), 77-90.
- Aosved, A., & Long, P. (2006). Co-occurrence of rape myth acceptance, sexism, racism, homophobia, ageism, classism, and religious intolerance. *Sex Roles, 55*(7), 481–492.
- Bachman, R., & Paternoster, R. (1993). A contemporary look at the effects of rape law reform: How far have we really come? *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 84*(3), 554-574.

- Bandura, A. (1977). *A social learning theory*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Barnes, G., Malamuth, N., & Check, J. (1984). Psychoticism and sexual arousal to rape depictions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 5(3), 273-279.
- Ben-David, S., & Schneider, O. (2005). Rape perceptions, gender role attitudes, and victim-perpetrator acquaintance. *Sex Roles*, 53(5/6), 385-399.
- Bergen, R. (1996). *Wife rape: Understanding the response of survivors and service providers*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Bohner, G., Eyssel, F., Pina, A., Siebler, F., & Viki, G. T. (2009). Rape myth acceptance: Cognitive, affective, and behavioural effects of beliefs that blame the victim and exonerate the perpetrator. In M. Horvath & J. Brown (Eds.), *Rape: Challenging contemporary thinking* (p. 17-45). Cullompton, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Bohner, G., Jarvis, C., Eyssel, F., & Siebler, F. (2005). The causal impact of rape myth acceptance on men's rape proclivity: Comparing sexually coercive and noncoercive men. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35(6), 819-828.
- Bohner, G., Pina, A., Viki, G., & Siebler, F. (2010). Using social norms to reduce men's rape proclivity: Perceived rape myth acceptance of out-groups may be more influential than that of in-groups. *Psychology, Crime, and Law*, 16(8), 671-693.
- Bohner, G., Reinhard, M., Rutz, S., Sturm, S., Kerschbaum, B., & Effler, D. (1998). Rape myths as neutralizing cognitions: Evidence for a causal impact of anti-victim attitudes on men's self-reported likelihood of raping. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28(2), 257-268.
- Bohner G., Siebler F, Schmelcher J. 2006. Social norms and the likelihood of raping: Perceived rape myth acceptance of others affects men's rape proclivity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(3), 286–297.
- Boone, H & Boone, D. (2012). Analyzing Likert Data. *Journal of Extension*, 50(2), 1-5.

- Bouffard, J. (2002). The influence of emotion on rational decision making in sexual aggression. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 30*(2), 121-134.
- Bouffard, J., & Exum, L. (2003). Attitudinal and situational factors as predictors of self-reported likelihood of sexual assault. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 26*(1), 71-94.
- Bouffard, L., & Bouffard, J. (2011). Understanding men's perceptions of risks and rewards in a date rape scenario. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and comparative Criminology, 55*(4), 626-645.
- Breakwell, G., Hammond, S., Fife-Schaw, C., & Smith, J. (2006). *Research methods in psychology* (3rd ed.). London, United Kingdom: SAGE Publications.
- Briere, J., & Malamuth, N. (1983). Self-reported likelihood of sexually aggressive behaviour: Attitudinal versus sexual explanations. *Journal of Research in Personality, 17*(3), 315-323.
- Briggs, S., & Cheek, J. (1986). The role of factor analysis in the development and evaluation of personality scales. *Journal of Personality, 54*(1), 106-148.
- Brinson, S. (1992). The use and opposition of rape myths in prime-time television dramas. *Sex Roles, 27*(7) 359-375.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: Men, women and rape*. New York, NY: The Ballentine Publishing Group.
- Burt, M. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(2), 217-230.
- Burt, M. (1983). Justifying personal violence: A comparison of rapists and the general public. *Victimology: An International Journal, 8*(3-4), 131-150.
- Byers, E., & O'Sullivan, L. (1996). *Sexual coercion in dating relationships*. New York, NY: Haworth Press.
- Cassidy, L., & Hurrell, R. (1995). The influence of victim's attire on adolescents' judgements of date rape. *Adolescence, 30*(118), 319-323.
- Carifio, J., & Perla, R. (2009). Resolving the 50-year debate around using and misusing Likert scales. *Medical Education, 42*(12), 1150-1152.

- Carroll, J. (1978). The effect of imagining an event on expectations for the event: An interpretation in terms of the availability heuristic. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 14(1), 88-96.
- Casey, D., & Murphy, K. (2009). Issues in using methodological triangulation in research. *Nurse Researcher*, 16(4), 40-55.
- Chapleau, K. & Oswald, D. (2010). Power, sex, and rape myth acceptance: Testing two models of rape proclivity. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 47(1), 66-78.
- Check, J. & Malamuth, N. (1983). Sex role stereotyping and reactions to depictions of stranger versus acquaintance rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(2), 344-356.
- Chiroro, P., Bohner, G., Viki, G., & Jarvis, C. (2004). Rape myth acceptance and rape proclivity: Expected dominance versus expected arousal as mediators in acquaintance-rape situations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(4), 427-442.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2000). *Influence: Science and practice* (4th ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
- Costin, F. (1985). Beliefs about rape and women's social roles. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 14(4), 319-325.
- Crimes Act. (1961). Retrieved from <http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1961/0043/latest/whole.html>
- Crome, S., & McCabe, M. (2001). Adult rape scripting within a victimological perspective. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 6(4), 395-413.
- Crowne, D., & Marlowe, D. (1960). Marlowe-Crowne Scale. In M. Johnston, S. Wright, & J. Weinman, J. (Eds.). *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Individual and demographic differences* (p. 17-21). Windsor, Great Britain: Nfer-Nelson.
- Crowne, D., & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The approval motive: Studies in evaluative dependence*. New York: Wiley.
- Cuklanz, L. (2010). *Rape on prime time: Television, masculinity, and sexual violence*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press Inc.

- Culp-Ressler, T. (2015). *1 in 3 men in survey say they would rape a woman if they could get away with it*. Retrieved from <http://thinkprogress.org/health/2015/01/11/3610327/college-men-forcible-sex-study/>
- Davis, K., Norris, J., George, W., Martell, J., & Heiman, J. (2006). Men's likelihood of sexual aggression: The influence of alcohol, sexual arousal, and violent pornography. *Aggressive Behaviour, 32*(6), 581-589.
- Day, K. (1995). Assault prevention as social control: Women and sexual assault prevention on urban college campuses. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 15*(4), 261–281.
- Dean, K., & Malamuth, N. (1997). Characteristics of men who aggress sexually and of men who imagine aggressing: Risk and moderating variables. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(2), 449–455.
- De Gue, S., & De Lillo, D. (2004). Understanding perpetrators of nonphysical sexual coercion: Characteristics of those who cross the line. *Violence and Victims, 19*(6), 673-688.
- Demaré, D., Briere, J., & Lips, H. (1988). Violent pornography and self-reported likelihood of sexual aggression. *Journal of Research in Personality, 22*(2), 140-153.
- Diamond, I. (1980). Pornography and repression. *Signs, 5*(4), 686-701.
- Edwards, S., Bradshaw, K., & Hinsz, V. (2014). Denying rape but endorsing forceful intercourse: Exploring differences among responders. *Violence and Gender, 1*(4), 188-193.
- Emmers-Sommer, T. (2014). Adversarial sexual attitudes toward women: The relationship with gender and traditionalism. *Sexuality and Culture, 18*(4), 804-817.
- Estrich, S. (1987). *Real rape*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

- Eyssel FA, Bohner G, Siebler F (2006). Perceived rape myth acceptance of others predicts rape proclivity: Social norm or judgemental anchoring? *Swiss Journal of Psychology* 65(2): 93-99.
- Fenton, K., Johnson, A., McMaus, S., & Erens, B. (2001). Measuring sexual behaviour: Methodological challenges in survey research. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*, 77(2), 84-92.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). London, Britian: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Filipovic, J. (2015). *Study: 1 in 3 men would rape if they wouldn't get caught or face consequences*. Retrieved from <http://www.cosmopolitan.com/politics/news/a35207/study-one-in-three-men-would-rape-if-they-could/>
- Finkelhor, D. & Yllo, K. (1985). *License to rape: Sexual abuse of wives*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Forbes, G., Adam-Curtis, L., & White, K. (2004). First- and second-generation measures of sexism, rape myths and related beliefs, and hostility toward women. *Violence Against Women*, 10(3), 236-261.
- Franiuk, R., Seefeldt, J., Cepress, S., & Vandello, J. (2008). Prevalence and effects of rape myths in print journalism: The Kobe Bryant case. *Violence Against Women*, 14(3), 287-309.
- Franiuk, R., Seefeldt, J., & Vandello, J. (2008). Prevalence of rape myths in headlines and their effects on attitude toward rape. *Sex Roles*, 58(11-12), 790-801.
- Frese, B., Moya, M., & Megías, J. (2004). Social perception of rape: How rape myth acceptance modulates the influence of situational factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(2), 143-161.
- Gavey, N. (2016). Making sense of everyday sexism: Young people and the gendered contours of sexism. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 55, 1-9.
- Gerger, H., Kley, H., Bohner, G., & Siebler, F. (2007). The Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression (AMMSA) Scale: Development and validation in German and English. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 33(5), 422-440.

- Gidycz, C., Warkentin, J., Orchowski, L., & Edwards, K. (2011). College men's perceived likelihood to perpetrate sexual aggression. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma, 20*(3), 260-279.
- Glick, P., & Diebold, J., Bailey-Werner, B., & Zhu, L. (1997). The two faces of Adam: Ambivalent sexism and polarized attitudes towards women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*(12), 1323-1334.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (1996). Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 491-512.
- Glick, P., Fiske, S., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J., Abrams, D., Masser, B., ...Lopez, W. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(5), 763-775
- Gold, S., & Clegg, G. (1990). Sexual fantasies of college students with coercive sexual experiences and coercive attitudes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5*(4), 464-473.
- Good, G., Hepper, M., Hillenbrand-Gunn, T., & Wang, L. (1995). Sexual and psychological violence: An exploratory study of predictors in college men. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 4*(1), 59-71.
- Greendlinger, V., & Byrne, D. (1987). Coercive sexual fantasies of college men as predictors of self-reported likelihood to rape and overt sexual aggression. *The Journal of Sex Research, 23*(1), 1-11.
- Griffin, S. (1979). *Rape: The power of consciousness*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Grubb, A., & Turner, E. (2012). Attribution of blame in rape cases: A review of the impact of rape myth acceptance, gender role conformity and substance use on victim blaming. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour, 17*(5), 443-452.
- Hamilton, M., & Yee, J. (1990). Rape knowledge and propensity to rape. *Journal of Research in Personality, 24*(1), 111-122.
- Hantzi, A., Lampridis, E., Tsantila, K., & Bohner, G. (2015). Validation of the Greek Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression (AMMSA) Scale: Examining its relationships with sexist and

- conservative political beliefs. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 9(1), 122-133.
- Helmke S., Kobusch P., Rees J., Meyer T., & Bohner G. (2014). Beliefs about the Strauss-Kahn case in France and Germany: Political orientation and sexual aggression myths as local versus global predictors. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 8(1), 171-186.
- Hockett, J., Saucier, D., Hoffman, B., Smith, S., & Craig, A. (2009). Oppression through acceptance? Predicting rape myth acceptance and attitudes towards rape victims. *Violence Against Women*, 15(8), 877-897.
- Impett, E., & Peplau, L. (2003). Sexual compliance: Gender, motivational, and relationship perspectives. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 40(1), 87-100.
- Jensen, R. (2017). *The end of patriarchy: Radical feminism for men*. Melbourne, Australia: Spiniflex Press.
- Johnston, M., Wright, S., & Weinman, J. (1995). *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Individual and demographic differences*. Windsor, Great Britain: Nfer-Nelson.
- Kanin, E. (1967). An examination of sexual aggression as a response to sexual frustration. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 29(3), 428-433.
- Koss, M., & Oros, C. (1982). Sexual Experiences Survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimisation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 50(3), 455-457.
- Krahe, B. (1991). Police officers' definitions of rape: A prototype study. *Journal of Community and Applied Psychology*, 1(3), 223-224.
- Krathwohl, D. (1993). *Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach*. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing Group.
- Lee, D. (1997). Interviewing men: Vulnerabilities and dilemmas. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 20(4), 553-564.
- Lev-Wiesel, R. (2004). Male university students' attitudes towards rape and rapists. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 21(3), 199-210.

- Littleton, H. (2001). *When is it rape? The role of rape and seduction scripts*. Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Blacksburg, Virginia.
- Locke, B., & Mahalik, J. (2005). Examining masculinity norms, problem drinking, and athletic involvement as predictors of sexual aggression in college men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(3), 279-283.
- Loh, C., Gidycz, C., Lolo, T., & Luthra, R. (2005). A prospective analysis of sexual assault perpetration: Risk factors related to perpetrator characteristics. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*(10), 1325-1348.
- Loo, R., & Thorpe, K. (2000). Confirmatory factor analyses of the full and short versions of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 140*(5), 628-635.
- Lonsway, K., & Fitzgerald, L. (1995). Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: A theoretical and empirical re-examination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*(4), 704-711.
- Lonsway, K., & Fitzgerald, L. (1994). Rape myths: In review. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18*(2), 133-164.
- Los, M., & Chamard, S. (1997). Selling newspapers or educating the public? Sexual violence in the media. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 39*(3), 293-328.
- Malacad, B., & Hess, G. (2011). Sexual behaviour research using the survey method: A critique of the literature over the last six years. *The European Journal of Contraception and Reproductive Health Care, 16*(5), 328-335.
- Malamuth, N. (1981). Rape proclivity among males. *Journal of Social Issues, 37*(4), 138-157.
- Malamuth, N. (1983). Factors associated with rape as predictors of laboratory aggression against women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*(2), 432-442.
- Malamuth, N. (1986). Predictors of naturalistic sexual aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*(5), 953-962.
- Malamuth, N. (1989a). The Attraction to Sexual Aggression Scale: Part one. *The Journal of Sex Research, 26*(1), 26-49.

- Malamuth, N. (1989b). The Attraction to Sexual Aggression Scale: Part two. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 26(3), 324-354.
- Malamuth, N., & Ceniti, J. (1986). Repeated exposure to violent and nonviolent pornography: Likelihood of raping ratings and laboratory aggression against women. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 12(2), 129-137.
- Malamuth, N., & Check, J. (1983). Sexual arousal to rape depictions: Individual differences. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 92(1), 55-67.
- Malamuth, N., Haber, S., & Feshbach, S. (1980). Testing hypotheses regarding rape: Exposure to sexual violence, sex differences, and the 'normality' of rapists. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 14(1), 121-137.
- Malamuth, N., Heavey, C., & Linz, D. (1996). The confluence model of sexual aggression: Combining hostile masculinity and impersonal sex. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 23(3-4), 13-37.
- Malamuth, N., Linz, D., Heavey, C., Barnes, G., & Acker, M. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men's conflicts with women: A 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(2), 353-369.
- Malamuth, N., Sockloski, R., Koss, M., & Tanaka, J. (1991). Characteristics of aggressors against women: Testing a model using a national sample of college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 59(5), 670-681.
- Maruna, S., & Mann, R. (2006). A fundamental attribution error? Rethinking cognitive distortions. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 11(2), 155-177.
- Masser, B., Viki, G., & Power, C. (2006). Hostile sexism and rape proclivity amongst men. *Sex Roles*, 54(7), 565-574.
- Megías J., Romero-Sánchez M., Durán M., Moya M., Bohner G. (2011) Spanish validation of the acceptance of modern myths about sexual aggression scale (AMMSA). *Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 14(2), 912-925.
- Miller, B., & Marshall, J. (1987). Coercive sex on the university campus. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 28(1), 38-47.

- Mitchell, M., & Jolley, J. (2013). *Research design explained*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., Powch, I. G., Phelps, J. L., & Giusti, L. M. (1992). Definitions of rape: Scientific and political implications. *Journal of Social Issues, 48*(1), 23–44.
- Muehlenhard, C., & Falcon, P. (1990). Men's heterosocial skill and attitudes toward women as predictors of verbal sexual coercion and forceful rape. *Sex Roles, 23*(5), 241-259.
- Muehlenhard, C., & Linton, M. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*(2), 186-196.
- Muehlenhard, C., Powch, I., Phelps, J., & Giusti, L. (1992). Definitions of rape: Scientific and political implications. *Journal of Social Issues, 48*(1), 23-44.
- Murnen, S., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If 'boys will be boys' then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex roles, 46*(11), 359-375.
- Murphy, W., Coleman, E., & Haynes, M. (1986). Factors related to coercive sexual behaviour in a nonclinical sample of males. *Violence and Victims, 1*(4), 255-278.
- Näher, A., & Krumpal, I. (2012). Asking sensitive questions: The impact of forgiving wording and question context on social desirability bias. *Quality & Quantity, 46*(5), 1601-1616.
- Norman, G. (2010). Likert scales, levels of measurement, and the "laws" of statistics. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 15*(5), 525-632.
- Norris, J., & Cubbins, L. (1992). Dating, drinking, and rape: Effects of victim's and assailant's alcohol consumption on judgements of their behaviour and traits. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16*(2), 179-191.
- Nunes, K., Herrman, C., & Ratcliffe, K. (2013). Implicit and explicit attitudes towards rape are associated with sexual aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*(13), 2656-2675.

- O'Donohue, W., McKay, S., & Schewe, P. (1996). Rape: The roles of outcome expectancies and hypermasculinity. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 8*(2), 133-141.
- Ogle, R., Noel, N., & Maisto, S. (2009). Assessing acceptance of violence toward women: a factor analysis of Burt's Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scale. *Violence Against Women, 15*(7), 799-809.
- Ong, A., & Ward, C. (1999). The effect of sex and power schemas, attitudes toward women, and victim resistance on rape attributions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29*(2), 362–376.
- Osland, J., Fitch, M., & Willis, E. (1996). Likelihood to rape in college males. *Sex Roles, 35*(3-4), 171-183.
- Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Open University Press.
- Pearson, A. (2000). Rape culture: It's all around us. *Off Our Backs, 30*(8), 12-14.
- Peterson, Z., & Muehlenhard, C. (2004). Was it rape? The function of women's rape myth acceptance and definitions of sex in labelling their own experience. *Sex Roles, 51*(3/4), 129-144.
- Polaschek, D., & Ward, T. (2002). The implicit theories of potential rapists: What our questionnaires tell us. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour, 7*(4), 385-406.
- Pollard, P. (1993). Judgments about victims and attackers in depicted rapes: A review. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 31*(4), 307-26.
- Quackenbush, R. (1989). A comparison of androgynous, masculine sex-typed and undifferentiated males on dimensions of attitudes towards rape. *Journal of Research in Personality, 23*(3), 318-342.
- Rapaport, K., & Burkhart, B. (1984). Personality and attitudinal characteristics of sexually aggressive college males. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 93*(2), 216-221.
- Reynolds, W. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38*(1), 119-125.

- Richlin, A. (1992). *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humour*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Riger, S., & Gordon, M. (1981). The fear of rape: A study in social control. *Journal of Social Issues*, 37(4) 71–92.
- Robinette, R. (1991). The relationship between the Marlowe-Crowne Form C and the validity scales of the MMPI. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 47(3), 396-399.
- Ryan, K. (2004). Further evidence for a cognitive component of rape. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 9(6), 579-604.
- Ryan, K. (2011). The relationship between rape myths and sexual scripts: The social construction of rape. *Sex Roles*, 65(11), 774-782.
- Ryan, K., & Kanjorski, J. (1998). The enjoyment of sexist humour, rape attitudes, and relationship aggression in college students. *Sex Roles*, 38(9-10), 743-756.
- Sârbescu, P., Rusu, S., Costea, I. (2012). The Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale in Romania: The development of a 13 item short form. *Romanian Journal of Experimental Applied Psychology*, 3(2), 37-44.
- Schewe, P., Adam, N., & Ryan, K. (2009). A qualitative analysis of the temptation to use force in sexual relationships. *Violence and Victims*, 24(2), 219-31.
- Schwartz, M., & De Keseredy, W. (1997). *Sexual assault on the college campus: The role of male peer support*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Scronce, C., & Corcoran, K. (1995). The influence of the victim's consumption of alcohol on perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape. *Violence Against Women*, 1(3), 241-253.
- Scully, D. (1990). *Understanding sexual violence: A study of convicted rapists*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Seal, D., & Ehrhardt, A. (2003). Masculinity and urban men: Perceived scripts for courtship, romantic, and sexual interactions with women. *Culture, Health, and Sexuality*, 5(4), 295-319.
- Sills, S., Pickens, C., Beach, K., Jones, L., Calder-Dawe, O., Benton-Greig, P., & Gavey, N. (2016). Rape culture and social media: Young

- critics and a feminist counterpublic. *Feminist Media Studies*, 16(6), 935-951.
- Smith, S., Martin, L., & Kerwin, J. (2001). Inhibition and disinhibition of male aggression against females: A personality moderator approach. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31(1), 170-190.
- Strang, E., & Peterson, Z. (2013). The relationship among perceived peer acceptance of sexual aggression, punishment certainty, and sexually aggressive behaviour. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(18), 3369-3385.
- Suarez, E., & Gadalla, T. (2010). Stop blaming the victim: A meta-analysis on rape myths. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(11), 2010-2035.
- Sullivan, G., Artino, A. (2013) Analyzing and interpreting data from Likert-type scales. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 5(4), 541-542.
- Süssenbach, P., Eyssel, F., & Böhner, G. (2013). Metacognitive aspects of rape myths: Subjective strength of rape myth acceptance moderates its effects on information processing and behavioural intentions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(11), 2250-2272.
- Tieger, T. (1981). Self-rated likelihood of raping and the social perception of rape. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 15(2), 147-158.
- Tourangeau, R., & Yan, T. (2007). Sensitive questions in surveys. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(5), 859-883.
- Truman, D., Tokar, D., & Fischer, A. (1996). Dimensions of masculinity: Relations to date rape supportive attitudes and sexual aggression in dating situations. *Journal of Counselling and Development*, 74(6), 555-562.
- United Nations Committee Against Torture (2015). *Concluding observations on the sixth periodic report of New Zealand*. Retrieved from https://www.hrc.co.nz/files/2814/3192/5666/CAT_Report_May_2015.pdf
- Viki, G. T., Abrams, D., & Masser, B. (2004). Evaluating stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent sexism in perpetrator blame and recommended sentence length. *Law and Human Behavior*, 28(3), 295-303.

- Voller, E., & Long, P. (2010). Sexual assault and rape perpetration by college men: The role of the Big Five personality traits. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(3), 457-480.
- Warr, M. (1985). Fear of rape among urban women. *Social Problems, 32*(3), 238-250.
- Warren, R. (2015). *A third of male students say they'd rape a woman if there were no consequences, a study reveals*. Retrieved from <http://www.buzzfeed.com/rossalynwarren/a-third-of-male-students-in-a-new-study-say-theyd-rape-a-wom>
- Whatley, M. (1996). Victim characteristics influencing attributions of responsibility to rape victims: A meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour, 1*(2), 81-95.
- White, J., Donat, P., & Humphrey, J. (1996). An examination of the attitudes underlying sexual coercion among acquaintances. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 8*(1-2), 27-48.
- Widman, L., & Olson, M. (2013). On the relationship between automatic attitudes and self-reported sexual assault in men. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour, 42*(5), 813-823.
- Widman, L., Olson, M., & Bolen, R. (2013). Self-reported sexual assault in convicted sex offenders and community men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*(7), 1519-1536.
- Willan, V., & Pollard, P. (2003). Likelihood of acquaintance rape as a function of males' sexual expectations, disappointment, and adherence to rape-conducive attitudes. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 20*(5), 637-661.
- Wilson, B., Holm, J., Bishop, K., & Borowiak, D. (2002). Predicting responses to sexually aggressive stories: The role of consent, interest in sexual aggression, and overall sexual interest. *The Journal of Sex Research, 39*(4), 275-283.
- Wolf, N. (1990). *The beauty myth: How images of beauty are used against women*. London, Great Britain: Vintage.
- Yassour-Borochowitz, D. (2012). Only if she is sexy: An autoethnography of female researcher-male participant relations. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal, 31*(5/6), 402-417.

- Yates, E., Barbaree, H., & Marshall, W. (1984). Anger and deviant sexual arousal. *Behaviour Therapy, 15*(3), 287-294.
- Yescavage, K. (1999). Teaching women a lesson: Sexually aggressive and sexually nonaggressive men's perceptions of acquaintance and date rape. *Violence Against Women, 5*(7), 796-812.
- Zakrisson, I., Anderzén, M., Lenell, F., & Sandelin, H. (2012). Ambivalent sexism: A tool for understanding and improving gender relations in organizations. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 53*(1), 64-70.
- Zaleski, K., Gundersen, K., Baes, J., Estupinian, E., & Verara, A. (2016). Exploring rape culture in social media forums. *Computers in Human Behaviour, 63*, 922-927.
- Zook, A., & Sipps, G. (1985). Cross-validation of a short form of the Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 41*(2), 236-238.
- Zurbriggen, E., & Yorst, M. (2004). Power, desire, and pleasure in sexual fantasies. *Journal of Sex Research, 41*(3), 288-300.

Appendix A – Informed Consent

Information Provided for Participants

My name is Ann Tapara and I am a student of the University of Waikato. Thanks for participating in this survey! It is designed to assess the way in which New Zealand men think about women, relationships and sexuality. This survey takes approximately 10-15 minutes.

While no images are displayed in the survey, there are textual descriptions of forceful sexual activities with women. Some of the description may be upsetting so please do not volunteer to take part in if you feel you do not wish to be exposed to this topic.

Much research has been conducted with men from other countries but there is very little information about how New Zealand men think.

Your participation is voluntary. Your responses are **entirely confidential with no identifying details required.**

You can withdraw your consent to participate at any time by closing the webpage.

This survey is **totally anonymous** – no identifying details or IP addresses are collected. At the end of the survey you can choose whether to provide a phone number to enter into the prize draw for petrol vouchers. If you are a student you can elect to receive a 1% course credit by submitting your ID number instead. These details do NOT identify you personally.

A summary of results of the study will be made available on the Psychology Cafe page on Moodle and the Waikato Psychology Students Association Facebook page.

If participation in this study raises personal issues which you wish to discuss, there are a number of potential sources of support, below.

This information will be repeated at the end of the survey.

Lifeline: 0800 543 354.

**

University of Waikato Student Counselling Services for students of the University. For an appointment: 07 838 4037.

**

SAFE Network - the largest community-based specialist clinical assessment and treatment service in Aotearoa New Zealand for those with concerning and harmful sexual behaviour.

TAMAKI MAKAUROU (Greater Auckland Region): 09 377 9898

TE TAI TOKERAU (Northern Region): 09 408 1991

WAIKATO (Midlands Region, including Bay of Plenty): 07 847 0555 or email help@safenetwork.org.nz

**

Male Survivors of Sexual Abuse

Phone/Fax: +64 (03) 377 6747

Email mssat@survivor.org.nz

Website: <http://survivor.org.nz/>

If you have any questions about the survey you can email me at mrstapara@outlook.com

This research project has been approved by the School of Psychology Ethics Committee.

If you have any concerns about this project, you may contact the convenor of the School of Psychology Ethics Committee (Dr James McEwan, Tel: 0800 924 528 ext 8295, email: jmcewan@waikato.ac.nz).

Alternatively you can contact either of my supervisors:

Armon Tamatea, Tel: 0800 924 528 ext 5157, email:

tamatea@waikato.ac.nz

Jo Thakker, Tel: 0800 924 528 ext 9232, email: jthakker@waikato.ac.nz

Forced Choice Informed Consent Questions

I have been given sufficient time to consider whether or not to participate in this study.

I am satisfied with the information I have been given regarding the study.

I understand that taking part in this study is voluntary and that I may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

I understand I have the right to decline to participate in any part of the research activity.

I know who to contact if I have any questions or concerns about the study.

I understand that my participation in this study is confidential and that no material that could identify me personally will be used in any reports on this study.

I agree to participate in this research project and I understand that I may withdraw at any time. If I have any concerns about this project, I may contact the convenor of the School of Psychology Ethics Committee (Dr James McEwan, Tel: 07 838 4466 ext 8295, email: jmcewan@waikato.ac.nz).

Clicking 'Agree' represents an electronic signature.

Appendix B – Rape Scenarios

Situation One

You have gone out a few times with a woman you met recently. One weekend you go to a film together and then back to your place. You have a few beers, listen to music and do a bit of petting. At a certain point your friend realises she has had too much to drink to be able to drive home. You say she can stay over with you, no problem. You are keen to grab this opportunity and sleep with her. She objects, saying you are rushing her and anyway she is too drunk. You don't let that put you off, you lie down on her and just do it.

Situation Two

A while back, you met an attractive woman in a disco and you would like to take things a bit further with her. Friends of yours have a holiday home, so you invite her to share a weekend there. You have a great time together. On the last evening you are ready to sleep with her, but she says no. You try to persuade her, insisting it's all part of a nice weekend. You invited her, after all, and she did accept. At that she repeats that she doesn't want to have sex, but then puts up hardly any resistance when you simply undress her and have sex with her.

Situation Three

Imagine you are a firm's Personnel Manager. You get on especially well with a new female member of staff. At the end of a busy week, you invite her out to dinner and take her home afterwards. As you want to spend some more time in her company, you suggest she might ask you in for a coffee. Next to her on the sofa, you start fondling her and kissing her. She tries to move out of reach, but you tell her that her career prospects stand to be enhanced by her being on good terms with her boss. In due course she seems to have accepted this, and she doesn't resist when you have sex with her.

Situation Four

You are at a party and meet a good-looking and interesting woman. You chat, dance together and flirt. After the party you give her a lift home in your car, and she invites you in. You both sit down on the floor, then your new friend kisses you and starts to fondle you. That's absolutely fine by you, and now you want more. When you start to undress her in order to sleep with her, she suddenly pushes you off and says she wants to stop now. Her resistance only turns you on more, and, using some force, you press her down to the floor and then penetrate her.

Situation Five

You helped a young woman recently when her car broke down. She invites you to supper in her flat as a way of saying thank you. It's a very pleasant evening, and you have the impression she likes you. When your hostess indicates she is beginning to feel rather tired, you are not at all ready to leave. You would rather you finished the evening in bed together, and you try to kiss her. At that the woman gets mad and tells you to clear out. Instead, you grab her arms and drag her into the bedroom. You throw the woman on to the bed and force her to have sex with you.