Title Page w/ ALL Author Contact Info

Students' Perceptions of Justice:

Application of Sanctions, Guilt, and Responsibility in Campus Sexual Assault Cases

Diane R. Follingstad, Caihong R. Li, Jaspreet K. Chahal, & Claire M. Renzetti

University of Kentucky

Corresponding Author: Diane R. Follingstad, Ph.D.

Address: Director and Endowed Chair, Center for Research on Violence Against Women/ University of Kentucky/ Lexington, KY 40506

ORCID No: 0000-0002-0169-0336

Email: Follingstad@uky.edu Phone: 859-533-2757

Author: Caihong R. Li, Ph.D.

Address: Center for Research on Violence Against Women/ University of Kentucky/ Lexington, KY 40506

ORCID No: 0000-0002-7790-5436

Author: Jaspreet K. Chahal, M.S.

Address: Center for Research on Violence Against Women/ University of Kentucky/ Lexington, KY 40506

ORCID No: 000-0002-6355-0435

Author: Claire M. Renzetti, Ph.D.

Address: Chair, Department of Sociology/ 1501 Patterson Office Tower/ University of Kentucky/ Lexington, KY 40506-0027

Running Head: Students' Perceptions of Justice

Students' Perceptions of Justice:

Application of Sanctions, Guilt, and Responsibility in Campus Sexual Assault Cases

Abstract

Purpose: Despite growing attention to adjudication of campus sexual assault cases, little is known how students perceive "justice" for such cases. The present study examined whether victim, perpetrator, and assault characteristics influenced students' perceptions of: whether a sanctionable violation occurred; the type of sanction to be applied; perceived severity of the sanction; proportion of guilt attributable to the victim and perpetrator; and level of responsibility of the victim and perpetrator. **Method**: Fourteen factors pertaining to potential negative evaluation of rape victims were derived; thus, a non-factorial vignette survey design focusing only on each main effect was employed. 846 college students responded to one of four versions of a randomly distributed survey each containing eight vignettes that varied to represent all levels of the 14 factors. **Results**: Students were not consistent in their application of sanctions or assignment of guilt or responsibility for the sexual assault vignettes, but rather were influenced in their ratings for 10 of the 14 factors. Students responded differentially to levels of the following factors: psychological impact on the victim, victim's medical consequences, reason for the victim's incapacitation leading to assault, consistency of victim's and perpetrator's accounts of the assault, sexual orientation of the victim, type of forced sex, number of perpetrators involved, fraternity membership of the perpetrator, gender of the perpetrator, and victim's initial display of sexual interest in the perpetrator. **Conclusion**: Cases consistent with rape myths appear to influence students' perceptions of justice. Findings are discussed in terms of implications for research and prevention programming.

Keywords: Sexual assault; Campus sexual violence; Perceptions of justice in sexual assault cases; Sanctions for sexual assault; Violence against women

Students' Perceptions of Justice:

Application of Sanctions, Guilt, and Responsibility in Campus Sexual Assault Cases

Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) across the United States have spent several decades implementing legislation and Department of Education Title IX guidelines as a response to the problem of sexual assault on campuses (Dunn, 2013). Specifically, they have developed policies and procedures for investigation of such cases and subsequent adjudication of them. There appears to be a relatively similar focus across campuses on the issues of identification, prevention, and adjudication of sexual assault cases due to this recent national spotlight on sexual misconduct that is often furthered by students' on-campus efforts. However, in the process, there has been very little investigation as to how students perceive "justice" in these cases. At the same time, (IHEs) have variously retained or removed college students from panels hearing cases of sexual misconduct (e.g., Brown, 2018) without much empirical knowledge of their perceptions of justice for these cases. Information of this nature would seem important for IHEs deciding how to adjudicate these cases and for understanding students' perspectives.

Varying definitions of *consent* to sexual activity for student codes of conduct (Gruber, 2016) IHEs' definitions for "sexual assault" (Krause, et al., 2018) suggests that individuals on hearing panels may not have one "rape" scenario in mind and may not view just one sanction as appropriate to apply to all cases of reported sexual assault. Universities historically have responded in drastically different ways when applying sanctions, sending the message that factors other than the occurrence of an assault may be influential. However, in the current climate of no tolerance for campus sexual assault, we do not know whether college students view all sexual assault cases through a narrow lens deserving of severe sanctions or whether they identify significantly with peers who are victims and perpetrators, creating greater angst for

decision-making in these cases.

Researchers have yet to explore college students' perspectives on what constitutes appropriate and just responses from their universities' panoply of sanction options for campus sexual assault cases. Different from studies of community samples making judgments about rape victims within the framework of the criminal system is the fact that college students are less likely to be reacting to distantly imagined, unrealistic, or stereotypical rape cases (e.g., Maier, 2008; Williams, 1984). Rather, descriptions of sexual assaults on their age mates and by their peers involving scenarios of college life (e.g., drinking at a party) likely produces closer identification with the parties involved and an awareness that one could be a potential victim or even a perpetrator. Knowing whether students' perceptions are influenced by aspects of sexual misconduct cases (i.e., descriptive details of the victims, perpetrators, and the sexual assault) would be important for determinations whether to include students on hearing panels. However, this knowledge may also be highly significant for understanding students' reactions to cases on campuses, for understanding victims' reactions to disciplinary proceedings and outcomes, and for educating students regarding sexual assault. Supporting this, two studies have suggested that students' perceptions of procedural fairness in these cases are strongly linked to their acceptance of the outcomes (Mackey, Berger, Kulvey, Silbert, & Sparks, 2017) and to the educational value received from the disciplinary process (King, 2012). Findings from this study may provide exceptions to prior literature regarding perceptions of sexual assault cases in criminal justice arenas due to participants feeling more aligned with the actors in the cases on which they make their judgments. Although students' perceptions must be filtered through campus disciplinary systems rather than the criminal justice system, we have yet to learn how sanctions for assault cases are viewed by college students within these academic realms and disciplinary limitations.

University Justice for Sexual Assault Cases

An ongoing debate has been whether disciplinary systems in IHEs should be viewed as "legal" systems with attendant requirements and protections of the criminal justice system (DeMatteo, Galloway, Arnold, & Patel, 2015) or whether the purpose of a university's disciplinary system is educational even though sanctions/restitution are applied (Karp & Conrad, 2005; Lake, 2009). Until recently, expulsion was considered the rare option due to IHEs' emphasis on educational/reparative approaches as paramount for both perpetrators and victims of campus violations. But with the spotlight on infamous campus cases where perpetrators received minor or no sanctions, IHEs have tightened their regulations and procedures because of the severity of this violation. Whether students' attitudes parallel this shift by institutions' is unknown. The only study we identified as examining students' perceptions of university sanctions for campus sexual assaults (Ayenibiowo, 2014) employed a small African sample to rate the applicability of two sanctions, thus bolstering the need for investigating students' approach to these cases.

Perceptions of Justice for Sexual Assault

While justice, as a philosophical principle, may be generally agreed upon by a cultural group, its application in specific settings is likely to be highly debated. Individuals' concepts of justice are typically an amalgam of personal learned experiences overlaid on indoctrinated principles by major social institutions, thus providing an explanatory structure involving external and internal factors. This study, however, focuses on external factors to determine whether students' perception of justice for sexual assault cases involving peers is influenced by characteristics of the persons involved (i.e., victim and perpetrator) as well as characteristics of the assault to evaluate more clearly the effect of these.

With that intentional delimitation, whether person and contextual factors will produce similar impacts on college students assigning sanctions to perpetrators on campus with community sample reactions toward sexual perpetrators (not in college) is unknown. McFatter (1982) found that the general public prioritized retribution and punishment for sexual assault cases, suggesting their goal was to keep sexual perpetrators off the streets and that they believed this violation deserved a serious outcome. But sexual assault cases in IHE disciplinary systems are subject to potential sanctions that fall far short of losing one's civil liberties for a period of time. Even being found in violation of the code of conduct for rape does not imply which of the widely ranging IHE sanctions might be applied. Campus assault cases frequently have discrepant characteristics from what is viewed as constituting a "stereotypical" rape or "real" rape (i.e., assault by a stranger outside in the dark on a sober victim who physically fights back). Campus cases which often involve contexts that seem normative to students (e.g., drinking, being in a student's room, a basic acquaintance between perpetrator and victim) might lead them to reject claims of sexual assault, leading to lowered sanctions.

Literature on perceptions of sexual assault. A recent meta-analysis on perceptions of rape victims conceptually organized the approach to findings in the literature based on whether the manipulated factors were consistent or inconsistent with rape myths (Hockett, Smith, Klausing, & Saucier, 2016). [Rape myths are beliefs that reject reports of sexual assault by maintaining that victims (or their behavior) are responsible for the occurrence of the rape. General concepts for rape myths include: "she asked for it;" he didn't mean to;" it wasn't really rape;" "she lied;" and "rape isn't as big a problem as women suggest" (McMahon & Farmer, 2011)] This approach allowed the researchers to consider the wide range of factors tested in this

literature according to whether they were inconsistent compared to the stereotype of a 'real rape' as commonly viewed by the general public (Hockett, et al., 2016) with the expectation that perceptions toward rape victims would be negative when descriptions of sexual assaults seemed consistent with rape myths. The meta-analysis included 40 studies that found significance and/or gender differences in perceptions toward the victim when the following factors were examined:

> "(a) …prior physical relationship between the victim and perpetrator, (b) how provocative the victim's dress was, (c) the forcefulness of the victim's verbal protest, (d) the forcefulness of the victim's physical protest, (e) the extent of coercion used by the perpetrator, (f) the sexual suggestiveness of the victim's pre-rape behavior, (g) the victim's relationship status, (h) the perpetrator's relationship status, (i) the victim's socioeconomic status (SES/class, (j) the extent to which the victim and perpetrator knew each other in date/acquaintance rape scenarios, (k) the stranger's appearance in stranger rape scenarios, (l) the extent of the victim's apparent alcohol consumption, (m) the extent of the perpetrator's apparent alcohol consumption, (n) the privacy of the rape location, (o) the rape time of day, and (p) the types of sex utilized by the perpetrator…" (Hockett et al., 2016, p. 146).

Factors from other studies consistent with rape myths were also included, specifically (q) an invitation to the apartment by either party, and, (r) a promiscuous reputation of the victim. Factors that might negatively affect an observer's view of a rape victim has extended beyond these variables over time, but this conceptual organization evaluating the factors as consistent or inconsistent with rape myths appears to hold as a framework.

Utilizing this conceptual framework to organize this body of research suggests we do not

have to approach it piecemeal. Specifically, Pollard (1992) concluded from studies assessing victim characteristics (e.g., behavior prior to the rape; what they wore) that rape victims are considered more responsible for what happens the more they engage in what appear to be "incautious" behaviors (i.e., consistent with rape myths). Similarly, Whatley's (1996) analysis of observers' perceptions suggested victims were considered more responsible for events if their dress or actions could be construed as less "respectable" (i.e., again, consistent with rape myths).

Literature was thus reviewed to identify factors pertaining to negative evaluation of rape victims because students' assignment of sanctions might reasonably be influenced by previously identified factors where victims were considered at least partially responsible. These factors were, in turn, expected to mitigate assigned sanctions to perpetrators. However, we also recognized that our focus on sexual assaults of college-aged students occurring in conjunction with college life activities would render some of the identified factors inapplicable to this study. Most demographics were not investigated (except race) because of the anticipated greater homogeneity of college students, e.g., age range, primary relationship status (single), and educational, and to some extent SES, level of students. Factors not highly relevant to sexual assaults on college campuses were excluded (e.g., college sexual misconduct occurs more with acquaintances rather than strangers). Factors considered potentially unique for campus cases were included: a) high status of the perpetrator was modified to depict a star athlete rather than manipulating social class, b) a range of discrepant reactions by the perpetrator to the victim's claim of sexual assault, c) perpetrator affiliation as a fraternity member, d) attractiveness of the victim, and e) gender of the perpetrator in heterosexual assault. Although studying the impact of multiple factors on perceptions can seem daunting, both Pollard (1992) and Whatley (1996) stated the importance of investigating victim, perpetrator, *and* sexual assault characteristics to

best understand perceptions of victims.

Guilt vs. responsibility. Because characteristics of many campus sexual assaults do not fit stereotypical cases representative of rape myths (Maier; 2008; Williams, 1984), students may view victims in these cases as at least partially responsible for the rape while still placing more guilt/blame on the perpetrator. This may, in turn, affect their assignment of sanctions for the sexual assault. The distinction between "blame" (i.e., guilt) versus "responsibility" was investigated conceptually in the 1980s (e.g., Brewin & Antaki, 1987; Hamilton, 1980; Shaver & Drown, 1986) and remains significant for assessments by observers for sexual assault cases. Bradbury and Fincham (1990) concluded that blame/guilt distinctly implies liability for a person's actions and could be assessed by intentionality, motivation, voluntariness, knowledge of consequences, understanding the wrongfulness, and ability to have done otherwise. In contrast, a judgment of responsibility determines whether an individual had a role or was accountable in some way for an event's occurrence. Hockett, Smith, Klausing & Saucier (2016) concluded that observers use different case information for determining guilt versus responsibility. Thus, this study also endeavored to understand students' assignments of guilt and responsibility for cases with varying factors.

Purpose of the study

This study was designed to explore whether variations in victim, perpetrator, and assault characteristics in depictions of campus sexual assault cases affected college students' perceptions of a) whether they believed a sanctionable violation had occurred, b) which, if any, sanction should be applied, c) their perception of the seriousness of the sanction they applied, d) guilt attributable to the victim and the perpetrator, and e) the level of responsibility of the victim and the perpetrator. The findings were expected to contribute to understanding what constitutes

"just" outcomes for these cases from the perspective of peers that could inform IHEs deciding whether to include students on disciplinary panels or could be used for educational and prevention efforts on campus. However, the findings have broader implications for guiding sexual assault prevention and programming on campuses. When students might act or not to intervene in potential sexual assaults, when students assign some guilt or responsibility to the victim, and when students believe that victims would not be believed or protected, all are findings with the potential to inform campus intervention and prevention programming.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Students presented with varying scenarios of campus sexual assault will not consistently apply strong sanctions or assign total guilt and responsibility to the perpetrator.

Hypothesis 2: Characteristics (victim, perpetrator, or sexual assault) of campus sexual assault scenarios consistent with rape myths will result in college students assigning less serious sanctions to the perpetrator, assigning a portion of blame to the victim, and assigning more responsibility to the victim than for scenarios not consistent with rape myths.

Method

Participants

Students at a large Southern university participated in this study to fulfill a research course requirement. The sample consisted of 846 completed surveys with 248 male students (29%) and 597 female students (71%). The age range was 18-46, with a median age of 19. The sample was 80% Caucasian (African American = 10%; Hispanic = 5%; Asian = 2%; Other = 3%). Approximately 1% were international students, and approximately 2/3 were raised in the Southern United States. Most students were raised in suburban areas or small cities/towns with approximately 19% coming from urban environments and 8% coming from rural areas. Almost

2/3 of the participants were first year students (21% = sophomores; 14% = juniors or seniors).

Experimental Conditions

Factors expected to impact students' determinations of appropriate sanctions for campus cases of sexual assault were identified 1) from extant literature using criminal justice frameworks, 2) from recent infamous campus cases where salient factors were raised as the reasons for potential "injustice," e.g., athletes not investigated, and 3) from descriptive literature on campus sexual assault identifying unique college life factors (e.g., Bennett & Jones, 2018) that included victim, perpetrator, and sexual assault characteristics. For each factor, a series of vignettes was developed for which the only difference was the language used to describe the levels for that factor. To reduce the chance for differences in responses based on the various scenarios presented, vignettes included the same generic information to eliminate potential confounding variables: "[Victim name] was invited to a party off campus at the house of some students who [her/his] friends knew. During the party, a guy named [Perpetrator name], who seemed interested in [her/him]…" This language indicated that the victim thought s/he was going to a safe environment to avoid faulting the victim for initial poor judgment and to indicate that initial contact with the perpetrator was relatively benign. All vignettes stated that the victim reported the incident to the Resident Advisor the next day to prevent participants from questioning the legitimacy of the claim due to time delays in reporting. All vignettes clearly described a sexual assault without the victim's consent except for the factor in which the male's response to the woman's claim of sexual assault was intentionally varied as the variable to be manipulated. Sample vignettes are found in Appendix A.

The 14 factors assessed in this project are detailed in Table 1 with the number and description of levels for each factor along with citations for prior studies investigating the factor

or suggesting that factor as relevant to victimization. Based on recommendations by Pollard (1992) and Whatley (1996), four of the factors depicted victim characteristics, four depicted perpetrator characteristics, and six depicted characteristics of the sexual assault or its impact.

[Table 1 about here]

A factorial design was not considered because permutations of the vignette population that would include all levels of the factors (N = 331,776) was too large to be presented to respondents. Instead, a non-factorial (i.e., a main effects) design focusing on the *main effect* of factors, rather than interactions, was used to capture the influence of victim, perpetrator, and sexual assault characteristics on students' perceptions of justice. Across the 14 factors, a total of 32 vignettes (see Table 1) were generated which were then assigned to four versions (i.e., 8 vignettes per version) with the intention that half in each version represented rape myth consistent scenarios likely to produce lighter sanctions/lesser guilt assigned to perpetrators, while the other half represented rape myth inconsistent scenarios. To avoid an interaction effect among the factors and between survey versions and factors, the surveys did not overlap. More than 200 students completed each version.

Dependent variables

The focus of this study on students' assignment of "justice" in the form of IHE sanctions required some dependent variables to be devised due to no prior study providing prototypical items. Dependent variables are listed below in the order participants received them for rating.

Should the Perpetrator Be Punished? Participants determined the degree to which they believed the perpetrator in each vignette should be punished (**Attitude about Sanction**) using a 4-point Likert scale (4=Strongly Agree; 1=Strongly Disagree) as a general assessment of whether the perpetrator's actions warranted sanctioning.

Choice of Sanction. Participants chose from among a range of sanctions (**Type of Sanction**) available at most IHEs which one they considered most appropriate for the perpetrator in each vignette. Participants could choose "No punishment at all" as well as choosing from a hierarchical list of sanctions, from least to most severe, provided to them.

Pilot testing. The list of sanctions used for assigning sanctions was pilot tested to determine a hierarchical ranking based on severity. An introductory sociology course that fulfills general educational requirements was utilized because students from a large range of majors and across class rankings attend. Students scored (1= Very mild punishment to 10=Very severe punishment) 12 possible sanctions used for campus disciplinary hearings as to their impression of severity of each sanction. Students in the pilot testing did not participate in the current study.

Mean scores representing the students' ratings for the disciplinary sanctions (in order from lowest to highest) are as follows: Verbal Warning=1.7; Written Assignment about the Violation=3.0; Community Service=3.1; Written Disciplinary Reprimand in Record=3.3; Educational Program about the Violation=3.6; Mandatory Psychological Counseling=3.7; Fines and/or Restitution for Damages=4.3; Mediation Sessions following a Restorative Justice Model=4.7; Social Suspension from Campus and Campus Activities (excluding attending classes)=5.6; Withholding One's Degree until a given sanction is completed=6.5; Admission or Degree Revocation=7.9; and Expulsion from the University=8.8.

Scoring. Rank ordering of sanctions by severity allowed two scores to be devised. First, the numbered ranking of the sanction across a student's choices determined the modal sanction selected for the eight vignettes (Type of Sanction Mode). Second, the sanction scores yielded a mean score (Type of Sanction Mean) for the eight cases a participant read. Descriptive statistics showed that for all four survey versions, Type of Sanction Mode equaled 13, thereby limiting

statistical analyses using mode score. Thus, Type of Sanction Mean scores were used for analyses because means could be treated as continuous.

Student assessment of the severity of the chosen sanction (Level of Sanction). Even though the hierarchical structuring of the sanction list implies a level of seriousness, students made a subjective assessment whether their choice for each scenario was mild (=1), moderate (=2), or severe (=3). Mean scores across the eight cases were used.

Assignment of guilt. Participants assigned a proportional level of guilt for the sexual assault to the victim (**Guilt of the Victim**) and the perpetrator (**Guilt of the Perpetrator**) in each case that had to total 100%. A sliding scale from 0 to 100 was provided with a readout showing the percentages they were assigning to the victim and the perpetrator. The survey platform signaled participants whose total did not equal 100% to modify their responses accordingly.

Assignment of responsibility for the sexual assault. To assess whether students may view victims in these cases as at least partially responsible for the rape occurring while still placing more guilt/blame for the assault on the perpetrator, participants next designated responsibility for the incident to the victim (**Victim Responsibility**) and to the perpetrator (**Perpetrator Responsibility)**. The item was phrased "…to what extent overall do you think [victim name] could have influenced or changed the likelihood of the situation happening as it did?" and was repeated a second time using the perpetrator's name. Response options constituted a 5-point Likert scale (Total responsibility=5; No responsibility at all=1).

Procedures

Procedures for this study were approved by the University's IRB committee for protocol 16-0678-P2H. Student volunteers were given a link to the project survey on the Qualtrics platform located behind University firewalls. Students opted to participate after reading the

Informed Consent. Using either a personal computer or a mobile devise, those agreeing to participate were directed randomly to one of the four versions of the survey. Identifying data (i.e., IP address) were removed to ensure anonymity of the dataset.

After opting to participate, students read the first scenario in the version they received and answered seven outcome items about the vignette. This process continued for the next seven vignettes. Last, they reported demographics including gender, age, year in school, race/ethnicity, domestic vs. international, and region of U.S. and type of area (i.e., urban vs. rural) reared in.

Data Analytic Strategy

To assess college students' application of sanctions to varying scenarios of sexual assault, MANOVAs were conducted separately on each of the 14 factors to examine whether the seven dependent variables as a set were affected by each designated factor. Significant findings were subjected to *post hoc* ANOVAs to determine which dependent variable(s) differed by levels of that factor. A Bonferroni correction ($p = .05/7 = .007$) was used to account for Type I error of seven ANOVAs being conducted at the same time. Multiple comparisons finally established which students' assignments of sanctions, guilt, and responsibility were statistically different between levels of each factor.

Results

Data Screening

The random assignment of college student participants to the four survey versions resulted in relatively equal distribution (Version 1=219; Version 2=215; Version 3=206; Version 4=206). Because four versions were constructed to prevent participants from receiving more than one level of a factor and to prevent fatigue, we tested for statistical differences across participants in the four versions. Chi-square dependency tests indicated that across surveys,

participants did not differ significantly (*p* values ranged from .24 to .62) due to categorical demographics (Gender χ^2=1.76; Race χ^2=9.95; Race/ethnicity χ^2=4.24; Area raised in χ^2=13.70; Class level χ^2=11.50), and an ANOVA conducted to compare participants' ages indicated no differences across versions, $F(3, 842) = 0.90$, $p = .443$. Thus, no statistical adjustments based on participant demographics were made on subsequent analyses (See Appendix B for these data),

A correlation table (see Table 2) of the seven dependent variables indicated they were all significantly correlated with each other. Most correlations were low to medium in strength. Higher correlations between assignments of guilt and responsibility for victims and perpetrators are a function of their dependence, i.e., lower scores assigned to victims would result in higher scores to perpetrators. Of note, participants' perception of the severity of the sanction they applied showed the lowest correlations with the other variables and participants' assignments of responsibility to the perpetrator and victim were more highly correlated with the actual sanction they applied than the participants' assignment of guilt to the victim and perpetrator.

[Table 2 about here]

Primary Results

Hypothesis 1. Participants selected sanctions from the full range of options (1=No punishment at all; 2-13=hierarchical list of sanctions) for the perpetrators in the vignettes, even though all but one factor clearly indicated that a sexual assault had occurred (V1:3-13; V2:1-13; V3:1-13; V4:2-13). Therefore, we examined whether college students applied similar sanctions to all 32 cases resulting from the 14 factors using MANOVA and Bonferroni corrections and found Wilks' $\Lambda = .719$, $F(217, 45{,}276) = 10.302$, $p < .001$. Post hoc ANOVAs indicated that, overall, students' applied sanctions differently across cases at $p < .001$.

Table 2 provides descriptive information for the outcome variables by factor. Students tended to strongly agree that perpetrators in these scenarios should receive *some* type of sanction. Notably, most students assigned sanctions at the medium to severe range of the possible sanctions (see Table 2). The mode choice of sanction for 10 of the 14 factors was the most severe option of permanent expulsion (i.e., score of 13), and mean scores for chosen sanctions ranged from 8.29 to 11.77. Students were less likely to select the most severe sanction options for particular levels of the following factors: Amount of Discrepancy of Accused's Reaction with the Victim's Account; Type of Forced Sex; Initial Level of Sexual Interest indicated by the Victim; and Gender of the Assaulting Perpetrator (See factor details below).

Employing the Bonferroni correction, post hoc ANOVAs indicated whether differences existed in students' responses when assigning guilt and responsibility at $p < .001$. Mean guilt scores assigned to the victim and the perpetrator are listed by factor in Table 2 and, added together, equal 100 because assignment of guilt was proportional between the two parties. Mean guilt assigned to victims across the 14 factors ranged from 8.05% to 26.99%, with converse mean assignment of guilt to perpetrators of 91.95% to 73.01%. Independent ratings of responsibility for victim and perpetrator, indicated students assigned mean responsibility ratings for victims ranging from 1.30 to 2.15, while mean responsibility assigned to perpetrators ranged from 3.91 to 4.76.

Hypothesis 2. Table 3 provides means and SDs for dependent variables for all levels of factors, and Table 4 indicates that 10 of the 14 factors demonstrated overall significance in the choice of sanctions and/or assignment of guilt/responsibility using Wilks' Lambda tests of significance. Four factors that did *not* result in different ratings by participants were Victim Level of Attractiveness, Perpetrator as High Status Campus Figure, Physical Injury Resulting

from Sexual Assault, and Race of Victim and Perpetrator.

[Tables 3 and 4 about here]

Factors demonstrating significant differences across all or almost all outcome variables included: *Victim characteristics* -- Reason for Victim's Incapacitation leading to Sexual Assault, Initial Level of Sexual Interest by the Victim; *Perpetrator characteristics* – Amount of Discrepancy of Accused's Reaction with Victim's Account, Perpetrator was Fraternity Member, Gender of the Assaulting Perpetrator (Heterosexual sexual assault); *Sexual assault characteristics* -- Type of Forced Sex, Individual vs. Multiple Perpetrator Sexual Assault.

One factor varying the victim's sexual orientation in the sexual assault of a male by a male did not demonstrate post-hoc significant differences in the students' choices of sanctions, but did indicate that students were assigning guilt and/or responsibility to the two parties differently dependent on the level of the factor they received. Two other factors were characterized by the participants choosing different severity of sanctions for corresponding levels of that factor, but not assigning different levels of guilt or responsibility for the victim and perpetrator, i.e., Psychological Sequelae Resulting from the Sexual Assault and Type of Forced Sex. Means and SDs for factor levels are in Table 3 and post-hoc comparisons are in Table 5.

[Table 5 about here]

Victim Characteristics Factors.

Reason for Victim's Incapacitation leading to Sexual Assault. The overall MANOVA test was significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .878$, $F(12, 1226) = 6.883$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta 2 = .063$. If the victim was voluntarily drinking heavily leading up to her incapacitation and subsequent victimization, the perpetrator was less likely to be thought to deserve sanctions at all and participants believed they were assigning less severe punishments, although the actual level of sanctions across the

three levels was not significantly different. Being slipped a drug which led to incapacitation resulted in significantly less responsibility being assigned to the victim than the other two levels of the factor, with conversely more responsibility assigned to the perpetrator.

Sexual Orientation of Male Victim. The overall MANOVA test was significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .963$, $F(12,1234) = 1.963$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta 2 = .019$. Although sanctions were not different for levels of this factor, participants assigned less responsibility to the straight man sexually assaulted by a gay man compared with a gay virgin or a gay man who was sexually assaulted. A gay male perpetrator who assaulted a straight man was assigned greater responsibility compared with the gay perpetrator who sexually assaulted either the gay virgin or a gay man.

Level of Attractiveness of Victim. The overall MANOVA test was not significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .987$, $F(6,418) = 0.936$, $p = .469$. No differences were identified regarding participants' ratings based on the victim's attractiveness.

Initial Level of Sexual Interest indicated by the Victim. The overall MANOVA test was significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .905$, $F(6,409) = 7.135$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta 2 = .095$. All outcome variables demonstrated significant differences between the two conditions of this factor except for the participants' perceptions of the level of sanction they were applying. If a perpetrator forced sex on a highly flirtatious and sexual woman who decided not to have intercourse, he received less severe sanctions and was perceived as less likely to have engaged in a violation. Participants also assigned less guilt and less responsibility to the perpetrator whose victim had initially acted sexually toward him compared with the perpetrator who forced sex on a woman who only demonstrated mild sexual interest prior to making the same decision not to proceed to sex.

Perpetrator Characteristics Factors.

Accused's Reaction Varied as to Discrepancy with the Victim's Account. The overall

MANOVA test was significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .644$, $F(12,1160) = 23.784$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta 2 = .197$. All three levels of this factor produced significant differences across all outcome variables. The perpetrator who admitted the rape was assigned more serious punishment than perpetrators who reported surprise or who claimed consensual sex, but not at the highest levels of punishment (i.e., 10.09 vs. highest score = 13). The perpetrator who admitted the assault also received a higher percentage of guilt and a higher level of responsibility than a perpetrator who challenged the victim's account. The perpetrator claiming surprise at the woman's claim and expressed being sorry for "misinterpreting" her intentions was assigned less severe sanctions (in the moderate range 8.68), and significantly lower guilt/responsibility than the perpetrator who admitted the rape, but significantly more than the perpetrator who claimed consensual sex. Thus, the least severe sanctions (7.32) and lowest ratings of guilt/responsibility were applied to the perpetrator who directly contradicted the woman's account. In this condition, significantly higher ratings of guilt were assigned to the woman, and the mean punishment for the perpetrator was in the range of requiring him to attend an educational program.

Perpetrator as High Status Student on Campus. The overall MANOVA test was not significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .995$, $F(6,412) = 0.367$, $p = .90$. Ratings were not different when the perpetrator was a star basketball player versus someone who was just a friend with the team.

Greek Status of Sexual Assault Perpetrator. The overall MANOVA test was significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .962$, $F(6,404) = 2.690$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta 2 = .038$. Students thought they were assigning a more serious sanction to a frat member than a nonmember, although the assignment of sanctions was not statistically different. Students' ratings of guilt were not different, but the victim of a fraternity member was rated as having less responsibility than a victim of a perpetrator who did not belong to a Greek organization.

Gender of the Assaulting Perpetrator in Heterosexual Sexual Assault. The overall MANOVA test was significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .962$, $F(6,407) = 2.694$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta 2 = .038$. Scenarios only varied the gender of the victim and perpetrator for forced oral heterosexual contact. A man forcing oral sex on a woman was more likely to be perceived as deserving of punishment than a woman forcing oral sex on a man. In addition, more responsibility was assigned to a male than a female victim experiencing forced oral sex.

Sexual Assault Characteristics Factors.

Physical Injury Resulting from Sexual Assault. The overall MANOVA test was not significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .974$, $F(6, 418) = 1.862$, $p = .086$. No significant differences emerged for this factor, either for assigned sanctions or assignment of guilt/responsibility.

Medical Consequences from the Sexual Assault. The overall MANOVA test was significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .945$, $F(12, 1260) = 2.986$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta 2 = .028$. Fairly severe sanctions were applied similarly across the three levels of this factor. However, more guilt was assigned to the victim if pregnancy resulted compared with contracting an STI, and more responsibility was assigned to the victim who became pregnant compared to a victim who contracted a STI or a victim experiencing no medical consequences.

Psychological Sequelae Resulting from the Sexual Assault. The overall MANOVA test was significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .965$, $F(6,411) = 2.476$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta 2 = .035$. Participants who received the scenario in which the sexual assault victim experienced psychological sequelae subsequent to the sexual assault selected more severe sanctions and also believed they were assigning more serious punishment to the perpetrator, although no differences in assignment of guilt or responsibility occurred in response to the different levels of this factor.

Type of Forced Sex. The overall MANOVA test was significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .959$,

$F(18,2328) = 1.917$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta 2 = .014$. Perpetrators who forced anal sex were given more severe sanctions than perpetrators who forced the victim to receive oral sex. For perpetrators who forced cunnilingus versus those who forced fellatio, participants believed they were assigning a more serious sanction to the man forcing the woman to perform oral sex on him. There were no differences across levels on guilt or responsibility ratings.

Individual versus Multiple Perpetrator Sexual Assault. The overall MANOVA test was significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .870$, $F(7,397) = 8.488$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta 2 = .130$. Participants significantly rated every outcome variable for this factor differently, with more severe punishment assigned to a sexual assault with multiple perpetrators as well as less guilt and less responsibility assigned to the victim of the multiple perpetrator sexual assault.

Race of Victim and Perpetrator. The overall MANOVA test was not significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .977$, $F(18,2322) = 1.050$. Severity of assigned sanctions and guilt or responsibility ratings did not differ across the varied vignettes manipulating race of victim and perpetrator.

Discussion

Even though this study presented scenarios that described sexual assaults and participants were highly likely to mete out more serious disciplinary outcomes available at universities, it is apparent that victim, perpetrator, and context characteristics still influenced assignment of sanctions, guilt and responsibility. The authors did not expect to find large effect sizes given the planned limitation that the scenarios described a sexual assault, so the fact that 10 of the 14 factors still influenced students' perceptions of justice for these cases is noteworthy.

Our initial research question asking whether college students apply similar sanctions across sexual assault cases appears answered. Sanctions assigned by college students tended to be severe which seems in line with the general public's prioritization of punishment (Lake, 2009)

over an educational response to such a severe action. But, when comparing levels of factors and when contrasting factors, sanctions are not consistently applied, reinforcing the idea that case characteristics can influence perceptions of whether a sexual assault occurred or what sanctions are deserved (Krause et al., 2018) . This was especially true for factors assessing psychological sequelae, consistency of the perpetrator's story with the victim's story, type of forced sex, number of assaulters, and the victim's initial sexual interest. Scenarios that appeared to mirror beliefs consistent with rape myths produced more severe sanctions than other levels, i.e., if a version of a factor reflected commonplace ideas of what "real" rapes are like, students assigned stronger punishments. This finding suggests more of a parallel than expected to prior sexul assault literature utilizing community members which found that cases with characteristics consistent with rape myths were more likely to be viewed as more lenient toward the perpetrator (Hockett et al., 2016).

To obtain a broader conceptual view of students' perceptions, this project assessed their designations of guilt and responsibility of the victim and the perpetrator as suggested by Hockett et al., 2016). Similar to the variation in application of sanctions, assignments of guilt and responsibility were not always consistent whether they differed within an individual factor or across factors. For example, students assigned higher sanctions to a perpetrator who drugged his victim versus one whose victim drank voluntarily to incapacitation, but the perpetrator who drugged the victim was not rated higher in proportional guilt than the perpetrator who violated a women without actively contributing to her incapacitation. Consistent with rape myths, victims whose incapacitation was due to voluntary drinking were assigned more responsibility for being in a situation that resulted in sexual assault. These findings are in line with Maier's (2008) and Williams' (1984) contention that rape cases not fitting the stereotypical view of the elements

necessary to be a "real" rape place greater judgments on the victims as being partially to blame.

Only two factors demonstrated consistent differences across levels for all dependent variables – a) consistency of the perpetrator's story with the victim's report of events (when there was no definitive statement that sexual assault had occurred); and b) the initial level of sexual interest by the victim – strongly suggesting that rape myths appear to be active ingredients in these judgments. Specifically, the perpetrator who admitted raping the woman was sanctioned more harshly and assigned more guilt/responsibility than the perpetrator who reported he misunderstood the victim's intentions, who in turn was treated more harshly than the perpetrator who contradicted the victim's report. The perpetrator who immediately contradicted the victim's report was given significant latitude rather than being viewed with skepticism, and the victim's account was immediately placed in doubt based on the perpetrator's contradictory response.

For the second factor, although student codes of conduct state that individuals have the right to stop sexual activity at any point, rape myths promote ideas that women tease men beyond their ability to contain themselves and that if women allow sexual activity to progress to certain stages they do not have the right to stop. Contrasting scenarios of two victims who differed in their initial sexual interest resulted in starkly different assignments of guilt and responsibility. The young woman who acted sexually, but decided not to engage in intercourse was assigned significantly greater responsibility/guilt for the assault that subsequently happened compared with the woman who only seemed mildly interested in sex. Consistent with those views, the perpetrator whose victim was more overtly sexual received less severe sanctions.

Gender and sexual orientation were variables that proved significant for perceptions of justice. More responsibility was assigned to gay men who were sexually assaulted by a man (whether a gay virgin or gay man) than to a heterosexual man,

supporting prior research (e.g., Davies, Pollard & Archer, 2001). All three scenarios indicated the male victims were clear they did not want sex, so it is difficult to know why being gay would result in more responsibility placed on those victims than on a straight man. Possibly rape myths that have been used to place responsibility on women for sexual assaults are also placed onto gay victims, assuming they "should have known not to go anywhere with a potential attacker" or "likely gave the wrong signals to the perpetrator."

Gender was also an important factor for scenarios of heterosexual forced oral sex. A different "double standard" appeared to arise, in that students viewed the male as more culpable than the female, suggesting, similar to findings in parallel literature (e.g., Follingstad, DeHart, & Green, 2004), woman are deemed at times to be less deserving of sanctions for similar actions. Possibly, observers believe less fear is engendered if a woman sexually assaults a man, e.g., men do not expect threats of bodily harm or death to accompany a woman's violation of his body. The myth that healthy heterosexual men always welcome sexual advances from women may also account for these findings.

When a factor not only demonstrated different assignment of sanctions for its levels, but also differences in guilt and responsibility ratings, these ratings appeared useful in explaining the sanctions that were applied. When the students' ratings were not consistent over the dependent variables, interesting questions are raised. For example, when sanctions are similar, but guilt and/or responsibility are rated differently, it is possible that the occurrence of a sexual assault is, in and of itself, the most significant issue resulting in sanction assignment, such that different views of guilt or responsibility do not change the application of sanctions. For example, students assigned similar sanctions for cases in which different medical consequences resulted from sexual assault, but placed more responsibility on the woman who became pregnant. We are also

left with less explanatory power where sanctions were applied differently, but no differences in ratings of guilt or responsibility occurred. For example, different types of sex forced on a woman resulted in different sanctions applied to the perpetrator, but guilt and responsibility were not rated differently. Because a perpetrator forcing oral sex on a woman (cunnilingus) was assigned lighter sanctions than a perpetrator forcing intercourse or anal sex, it is possible that forced cunnilingus was viewed differently due to lack of vaginal penetration by the perpetrator and possibly some sense that the perpetrator is less hostile. These issues are raised to suggest further research into students' perceptions that appear more complex than initially thought.

Implications of findings. Currently, we have mostly anecdotal information about students' reactions to investigations and hearings of sexual assault cases on their campuses which have included victims' visual representations of their perception of injustice for their own cases up to campus protests. Knowing that students who are involved in the disciplinary process are more likely to accept the outcomes if they believe procedures were fairly conducted (King, 2012; Mackey et al., 2017), understanding how students view these cases is important at all levels of campus functioning. Administrators who are aware of the potential biases we found for particular characteristics of campus cases can ensure that hearing panels are well trained in understanding extraneous factors that bias decision-making as well as rape myths. Campus personnel and advocates can use these findings for educational programs and campaigns to address the existence of these biasing factors. Developing awareness that personal or situational contexts do not negate the fact that a sexual assault occurred should empower women on campuses to identify nonconsensual sex as well as reduce their exposure to risky situations. As a result of policy and programming changes and additions, evaluations should occur to determine

whether changes in perceptions that justice is done on a campus affects the general campus culture regarding relationships with college officials as well as students' perceptions of safety.

Limitations. This project was only administered at one large university, although the sample was quite large, and we determined that pertinent demographics did not affect results. However, conducting this study with a more diverse sample, as well as in different regions of the country and different size IHEs, will be important for identifying potential differences not readily discernible with this mostly female Caucasian sample.

Vignette-based research always raises concerns about the generalizability of the findings to "real life" situations, such as actual decision-making at a campus hearing. Judgments about actual cases are also likely to involve a variety of factors which make decision-making more complex, which cannot be represented by assessment of vignettes that vary only one aspect of a case to maintain control over the experimental conditions. Thus, using these exploratory findings, factorial vignette investigations would be an appropriate next step.

Because this study only investigated main effects of a number of factors that potentially influence judgments of campus sexual assault cases, further research could determine whether interactions of combinations of the significant variables would provide increasingly nuanced findings to enhance our understandingof students' perceptions.

The decision to state clearly that a sexual assault had occurred in the vignettes was important for controlling demand characteristics, but smaller effect sizes resulted. Future studies could test whether the hypothesized factors are more influential if the degree of certainty that a sexual assault had occurred was also experimentally manipulated.

Conclusion

While college students fairly consistently deem a sexual assault to warrant serious and

consequential campus sanctions for the perpetrator, this study suggests that at least a portion of students are more variable in their view of justice as evidenced by their assignment of sanctions, guilt and responsibility. More importantly, perhaps, is the finding that particular victim, perpetrator, and/or contextual factors result in greater variability of applied sanctions. Students' perceptions of proportional guilt for a rape and their view of a victim's responsibility also differ due to factors that frequently are present in campus sexual assault cases. Awareness of the characteristics of cases to which students respond in line with rape myths appears important for educational purposes for students in general, and specifically for students on hearing panels for campus sexual assault cases.

Appendix A

Sample Vignettes

Sample Vignette #1 (Victim Characteristic)

Emily was invited to a party off campus at the house of some students who her friends knew. During the party, a guy named Josh, who seemed interested in her, kept pouring liquor into Emily's glass when she was not looking. She became so intoxicated that her friends later said that she could no longer talk to them and they thought she would probably pass out. At this point, Josh took her to his room upstairs where he took off her clothes and had intercourse with her. She reported the incident to her Resident Advisor the next day.

Sample Vignette #2 (Perpetrator Characteristic)

Christa was invited to a party off campus at the house of some students who her friends knew. She was excited to go because the basketball team, including the star player, were supposed to show up at the party. Later in the evening, the star player, Trent, seemed very interested in her and convinced Christa to leave the party and go to his room a block away to get some liquor. In his room, Trent became very aggressive, pushed her on to the bed where he held her down and proceeded to have intercourse with her. Christa reported the incident to her Resident Advisor the next day.

Sample Vignette #3 (Sexual Assault Characteristic)

Courtney was invited to a party off campus at the house of some students who her friends knew. One guy at the party, Charlie, seemed very interested in her and they spent time together

during the evening. Later, Charlie convinced Courtney to come upstairs to his room because he said he had some liquor. In the room, there were two other guys waiting who, along with Charlie, became very aggressive, pushed her onto the bed where they held her down and each proceeded to have intercourse with her. Courtney reported the incident the next day to her Resident Advisor.

Note. The full list of the vignettes can be obtained by contacting the first author.

Appendix B

Chi-square Dependency Test Results on the Invariance of Students' Demographics Across Four Versions of the Survey

Types of Variables	df	χ^2	*p*
Gender	3	1.764	.623
Race	12	9.949	.620
Nationality	3	4.235	.237
City	15	13.699	.548
Year Level	9	11.502	.243

References

Angelone, D.J., Mitchell, D., & Pilafova, A. (2007). Club drug use and intentionality in perceptions of rape victims. *Sex Roles, 57,* 283-292.

Ayenibiowo, K.O. (2014). The influence of gender on assessment of rape and proposition of sanctions for perpetrators. *Gender and Behavior, 12(*1), 6247-6255.

Ballman, A.D., Leheney, E.K., Miller, K.E., Simmons, B.L., & Wilson, L.C. (2016). Bystander perceptions of same-gender versus mixed-gender rape: A pilot study. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 25*(10), 1079-1096.

Bennett, J., & Jones, D. (May 10, 2018). 45 stories of sex and consent on campus. NY Times.

Bradbury, T.N., & Fincham, F.D. (1990). Attributions in marriage: Review and critique. *Psychological Bulletin, 107,* 3-33.

Brewin, C., & Antaki, C. (1987). An analysis of ordinary explanations in clinical attribution research. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 5,* 79-98.

Brown, S. (2018). Making sexual-assault hearing fair: How colleges train and choose those who serve on Title IX panels is changing. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, Feb.,* 5-35.

Calhoun, L.G., Selby, J.W., Cann, A., & Keller, G.T. (1978). The effects of victim attractiveness and sex of respondent on social reactions to victims of rape. British *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 17,* 191-192.

Cohn, E.S., Dupuis, E.C., & Brown, T.M. (2009). In the eye of the beholder: Do behavior and character affect victim and perpetrator responsibility for acquaintance rape? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(7), 1513-1535.

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

DeMatteo, D., Galloway, M., Arnold, S., & Patel, U. (2015). Sexual assault on college campuses: A 50-state survey of criminal sexual assault statutes and their relevance to campus sexual assault. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 21*(3), 227-238.

Dunn, L. L. (2013). Addressing sexual violence in higher education: Ensuring compliance with the Clery Act, Title IX and VAWA. *Georgetown Journal of Gender & the Law, 15,* 563-584.

Follingstad, D.R., DeHart, D.D., & Green, E.P. (2004). Psychologists' judgments of psychologically aggressive actions when perpetrated by a husband versus a wife. *Violence and Victims, 19*(4), 435-452.

George, W.H., & Martinez, L.J. (2002). Victim blaming in rape: Effects of victim and perpetrator race, type of rape, and participant racism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*, 110-119.

Girard, A.L., & Senn, C.Y. (2008). The role of the new "date rape drugs" in attributions about date rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23*, 3-20.

Gruber, A. (2016). Consent confusion. *Cardoza Law Review, 38*, 415-458.

Hamilton, V.L. (1980). Intuitive psychologist or intuitive lawyer? Alternative models of the attribution process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*, 767-772.

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

Hockett, J.M., Smith, S.J., Klausing C.D., & Saucier, D.A. (2016). Rape myth consistency and gender differences in perceiving rape victims: A meta-analysis. *Violence Against Women, 22*(2), 139-167.

Jozkowski, K.N., & Wiersma-Mosley, J.D. (2017). The Greek system: How gender inequality and class privilege perpetuate rape culture. *Family Relations, 66*(1), 89-103.

Karp, D., & Conrad, S. (2005). Restorative justice and college student misconduct. *Public Organization Review: A Global Journal, 5*, 315-333.

King, R.H. (2012). Student conduct administration: How students perceive the educational value and procedural fairness of their disciplinary experiences. *Journal of College Student Development, 53*(4), 563-580.

Kowalski, R.M. (1992). Nonverbal behaviors and perceptions of sexual intentions: Effects of sexual connotativeness, verbal response, and rape outcome. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 13*, 427-445.

Krause, K. H., Woofter, R., Haardörfer, R., Windle, M., Sales, J. M., & Yount, K. M. (2018). Measuring campus sexual assault and culture: A systematic review of campus climate surveys. *Psychology of Violence.* Advance online publication.

Lake, Peter F. (2009). Student discipline: The case against legalistic approaches. *Chronical of Higher Education, 55*(32), A31-A32.

Mackey, P.R., Berger, R.E., Mulvey, E.N., Silbert, E.J., Sparks, A.G., & American College of Trial Lawyers. (2017). White paper on campus sexual assault investigations. Irvine, CA.

Maier, S.L. (2008). "I have heard horrible stories…" Rape victim advocates' perceptions of the revictimization of rape victims by the police and medical system. *Violence Against Women, 14*, 786-808.

McFatter, R. M. (1982). Purposes of punishment: Effects of utilities of criminal sanctions on perceived appropriateness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67(*3), 255-267.

McMahon, S., & Farmer, G.L. (2011). An updated measure for assessing subtle sexual assault myths. *Social Work Research, 35*(2), 71-80.

Omata, K. (2013). Factors affecting bystanders' blame of a sex-crime victim and assessment of psychological damage: Reputation of victims and prejudice about women's desire for violent sex. *The Japanese Journal of Social Psychology, 29*(1), 1-10.

Pickel, K.L., & Gentry, R.H. (2017). Mock jurors' expectations regarding the psychological harm experienced by rape victims as a function of rape prototypicality. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *23*(3), 254-273.

Pollard, P. (1992). Judgments about victims and attackers in depicted rapes: A review. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 31*, 307-326.

Ryckman, R.M., Graham, S.S., Thornton, B., Gold, J.A., & Linder, M.A. (1998). Physical size stereotyping as a mediator of attributions of responsibility in an alleged date-rape situation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28*, 1876-1888.

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

Shackelford, T.K. (2002). Risk of multiple-perpetrator rape-murder varies with female age. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 30*(2), 135-141.

Shaver, K.G., & Drown, D. (1986). On causality, responsibility, and self-blame: A theoretical note. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 697-702.

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

Wakelin, A., & Long, K.M. (2003). Effects of victim gender and sexuality on attributions of blame to rape victims. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 49*(9-10), 477-487.

Whatley, M.A. (1996). Victim characteristics influencing attributions of responsibility to rape victims: A meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 1*, 81-95.

White, B.H., & Kurpius, S.E.R. (2002). Effects of victim sex and sexual orientation on perceptions of rape. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, *46*(5-6), 191-200.

Williams, J.E. (1984). Secondary victimization: Confronting public attitudes about rape. *Victimology, 9*(1), 66-81.

Table 1
Factor Descriptions and Levels

	Name of Factor	Levels	Description of each level and version of survey on which it appeared
Victim Characteristics	Reason for Victim's Incapacitation leading to Sexual Assault *Angelone, Mitchell, & Pilafova, 2007; Girard & Senn, 2008; Hammock & Richardson, 1997*	3	1. Victim slipped a drug without her knowledge (V3) 2. Victim slipped extra liquor without her knowledge (V2) 3. Victim was voluntarily drinking a lot (V4)
	Sexual Orientation of Male Victim *Sleath & Bull, 2010; Wakelin & Long, 2003; White & Kurpius, 2002*	3	1. Straight man sexually assaulted by gay man (V1) 2. Gay virgin man sexually assaulted by gay man (V3) 3. Gay man sexually assaulted by gay man (V4)
	Level of Attractiveness of Victim *Calhoun, Selby, Cann, & Keller, 1978; Ryckman, Graham et al., 1998*	2	1. Small and cute victim (V1) 2. Larger and less attractive victim (V2)
	Initial Level of Sexual Interest indicated by the Victim *Kowalski, 1992; Schult & Schneider, 1991*	2	1. Woman very interested in sexual activity initially but then decides she does not want to have intercourse (V2) 2. Woman only mildly responsive to man and states at the onset she does not want to have intercourse (V4)
Perpetrator Characteristics	Accused's Reaction Varied as to Discrepancy with the Victim's Account	3	1. Accused admits to sexual assault (V1) 2. Accused reported surprise and said he must have misunderstood victim's reactions (V4) 3. Accused had a very discrepant story from victim claiming her consent (V3)
	Perpetrator as High-Status Student on Campus	2	1. Intercourse forced on woman by star basketball player (V4) 2. Intercourse forced on woman by student with no status (V1)
	Greek Status of Sexual Assault Perpetrator *Jozkowski & Wiersma-Mosley, 2017*	2	1. Forced intercourse by a member of a fraternity (V2) 2. Forced intercourse by an individual with no fraternity membership (V4)
	Gender of the Assaulting Perpetrator in Heterosexual Sexual Assault *Ballman, Leheney, Miller, Simmons & Wilson, 2016*	2	1. Female forces oral sex on male (V3) 2. Male forces oral sex on woman (V1)

Name of Factor		Levels	Description of each level and number of survey on which it appeared
Sexual Assault Characteristics	Physical Injury Resulting from Sexual Assault *Cohn, Dupuis, & Brown, 2009*	2	1. Physical injuries resulted from the sexual assault. (V4) 2. Victim did not incur any physical injuries from the sexual assault (V1)
	Medical Consequences from the Sexual Assault	3	1. Victim contracted a STI from the sexual assault (V1) 2. Victim became pregnant from the sexual assault(V4) 3. No STI or pregnancy occurred (V2)
	Psychological Sequelae Resulting from the Sexual Assault *Pickel & Gentry, 2017; Omata, 2013*	2	1. Victim had serious psychological sequelae from the sexual assault (V2) 2. Victim did not have psychological sequelae from the sexual assault (V4)
	Type of Forced Sex	4	1. Man forces oral sex (cunnilingus) on woman (V1) 2. Man forces woman to perform oral sex (fellatio) on him (V2) 3. Man forces anal sex on woman (V3) 4. Man forces vaginal intercourse on woman (V4)
	Individual versus Multiple Perpetrator Sexual Assault *Shackelford, 2002*	2	1. Forced intercourse by man on a woman (V3) 2. Three men force intercourse on a woman (V4)
	Race of Victim and Perpetrator *George & Martinez, 2002*	4	1. Both victim and perpetrator are African American (V1) 2. Victim is African American and perpetrator is Caucasian (V2) 3. Victim is Caucasian and perpetrator is African American (V3) 4. Both victim and perpetrator are Caucasian (V4)

Table 2

Means of the Outcome Variables Across Factors and Mean, SD, and Correlations Among the Outcome Variables for the Whole Sample

Factors	1.Attitude about sanction Mean (1-4)	2[†] Type of sanction Median (1-13)	2. Type of sanction Mean (1-13)	3. Level of sanction Mean (1-4)	4. Guilt of the victim Mean (0-100)	5. Guilt of the perpetrator Mean (0-100)	6. Victim's responsibility Mean (1-5)	7. Perpetrator's responsibility Mean (1-5)
Victim Characteristics								
Reason for victim's incapacitation	3.84	13	11.2	2.61	13.39	86.61	1.57	4.66
Sexual Orientation of Male Victim	3.87	13	11.56	2.6	8.05	91.95	1.3	4.78
Level of attractiveness of victim	3.85	13	11.32	2.58	8.18	91.82	1.34	4.73
Initial level of sexual interest indicated by the victim	3.67	12	10.49	2.4	19.15	80.85	1.86	4.29
Perpetrator Characteristics Factors								
Accused's reaction varied	3.25	9	8.29	2.04	26.99	73.01	2.15	3.91
Perpetrator as high-status student on campus	3.77	13	11.11	2.53	11.48	88.52	1.53	4.56
Greek status of Perpetrator	3.81	13	11.2	2.57	9.42	90.58	1.44	4.63
Gender of the perpetrator (Heterosexual)	3.66	11	10.01	2.33	12.4	87.6	1.57	4.54
Sexual Assault Characteristics Factors								
Physical injury	3.89	13	11.59	2.63	8.22	91.78	1.34	4.76
Medical consequences	3.93	13	11.63	2.66	9.31	90.69	1.40	4.75
Psychological sequelae	3.83	13	11.38	2.56	9.54	90.46	1.37	4.72
Type of forced sex	3.79	12	10.93	2.5	9.44	90.56	1.45	4.64
Individual vs. multi-perpetrator sexual assault	3.83	13	11.77	2.59	8.54	91.35	1.39	4.71
Race of victim and perpetrator	3.81	13	11.16	2.56	9.68	90.32	1.42	4.66
Whole Sample (*N* = 846)								
Mean	3.77	11.42	2.5	11.89	88.1	1.51	4.6	3.77
SD	0.29	2.33	0.52	16.49	16.49	0.47	0.44	0.29

Correlations of the Outcome Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Attitude about sanction						
2. Type of sanction	.32**					
3. Level of sanction	.16**	.33**				
4. Guilt of the victim	-.29**	-.20**	-.11**			
5. Guilt of the perpetrator	.29**	.20**	.11**	-1.00**		
6. Victim's responsibility	-.46**	-.35**	-.15**	.42**	-.41**	
7. Perpetrator's responsibility	.47**	.37**	.18**	-.43**	.43**	-.81**

Note. The upper panel presents the mean values of the outcome variables across factors and of the whole sample. The lower panel presents the correlations among the outcome variables.

2[†] = Because the variable Type of Sanction used a 13-category response system, median values are also reported. Given that 10 out of 14 factors have a median of 13, median is not a good representation of central tendency. Therefore, mean values were used to represent this variable.

** $p < .01$.

Table 3

Means for different levels of factors of the dependent variables

Factors		1.Attitude about sanction	2.Type of sanction	3.Level of sanction	4.Guilt of victim	5.Guilt of perpetrator	6.Victim's responsibility	7.Perpetrator's responsibility
Victim Characteristics Factors								
Reason for victim's incapacitation								
Slipped extra liquor	*M*	3.87	11.11	2.69	15.48	84.52	1.62	4.64
(*n* = 213)	*SD*	0.42	2.64	0.54	23.79	23.79	0.61	0.53
Slipped a drug	*M*	3.96	11.58	2.62	9.40	90.60	1.36	4.86
(*n* = 205)	*SD*	0.26	2.31	0.62	21.49	21.49	0.52	0.34
Voluntarily drinking	*M*	3.70	11.16	2.46	14.66	85.34	1.70	4.50
(*n* = 203)	*SD*	0.65	2.68	0.69	21.17	21.17	0.70	0.75
F (*2,624*)		*15.58**	*2.08*	*7.12**	*4.56*	*4.56*	*17.08**	*21.65**
Sexual orientation of male victim								
Straight man raped by gay	*M*	3.90	11.54	2.61	6.74	93.26	1.17	4.91
man (n = 217)	*SD*	0.48	2.13	0.62	20.40	20.40	0.43	0.35
Gay virgin raped by gay man	*M*	3.89	11.62	2.59	9.13	90.87	1.34	4.73
(*n* = 205)	*SD*	0.47	2.22	0.66	21.58	21.58	0.64	0.67
Gay man raped by gay man	*M*	3.85	11.69	2.58	8.26	91.74	1.40	4.71
(*n* = 203)	*SD*	0.48	2.17	0.62	18.13	18.13	0.73	0.64
F (2,622)		*0.54*	*0.25*	*0.13*	*0.77*	*0.77*	*8.68**	*7.82**
Level of attractiveness of victim								
Small and cute victim	*M*	3.89	11.32	2.54	7.67	92.33	1.36	4.74
(*n* = 215)	*SD*	0.44	2.47	0.67	18.98	18.98	0.63	0.60
Not small or cute victim	*M*	3.84	11.51	2.62	8.16	91.84	1.30	4.76
(*n* = 210)	*SD*	0.48	2.43	0.63	18.72	18.72	0.56	0.57
F (*1,423*)		*1.04*	*0.66*	*1.41*	*0.07*	*0.07*	*1.35*	*0.10*
Initial level of sexual interest indicated by the victim								
Highly sexual woman	*M*	3.56	10.01	2.30	24.63	75.37	2.08	4.08
(*n* = 212)	*SD*	0.62	3.14	0.74	22.18	22.18	0.86	0.86
Mildly sexual woman	*M*	3.79	11.16	2.47	13.18	86.82	1.61	4.52
(*n* = 204)	*SD*	0.54	2.72	0.73	22.12	22.12	0.83	0.85
F (*1,414*)		*17.38**	*15.69**	*5.22*	*27.77**	*27.77**	*32.41**	*28.77**
Perpetrator Characteristics Factors								
Accused's reaction varied								
Admit rape	*M*	3.81	10.09	2.35	14.53	85.47	1.71	4.47
(*n* = 214)	*SD*	0.43	2.83	0.66	18.38	18.38	0.60	0.60
Discrepant story	*M*	2.90	7.32	1.66	37.07	62.93	2.50	3.48
(*n* = 174)	*SD*	0.59	3.27	0.67	20.64	20.64	0.84	0.85
Surprised sorry	*M*	3.19	8.68	1.92	25.40	74.61	2.14	3.95
(*n* = 200)	*SD*	0.68	3.43	0.73	23.47	23.47	0.90	0.89
F (2, 585)		*130.44**	*36.85**	*50.72**	*55.97**	*55.97**	*49.31**	*77.64**
Perpetrator as high-status student on campus								
No status	*M*	3.80	11.24	2.55	10.78	89.22	1.52	4.61
(*n* = 217)	*SD*	0.58	2.50	0.64	20.20	20.20	0.65	0.67
Star basketball player	*M*	3.79	11.22	2.51	11.33	88.67	1.51	4.56
(*n* = 202)	*SD*	0.48	2.60	0.65	19.70	19.70	0.67	0.70
F (1,417)		*.01*	*.01*	*.38*	*.079*	*.08*	*.01*	*.43*
Greek status of perpetrator								
Raped by frat member	*M*	3.89	11.47	2.64	7.51	92.49	1.32	4.74
(*n* = 211)	*SD*	0.41	2.50	0.60	17.21	17.21	0.62	0.64
Raped not by frat member	*M*	3.78	11.16	2.47	10.30	89.70	1.53	4.57
(*n* = 200)	*SD*	0.52	2.57	0.66	19.68	19.68	0.77	0.77
F (1,409)		*5.29*	*1.58*	*7.79**	*2.35*	*2.35*	*8.72**	*6.20*

Table 3 Continued

Gender of the perpetrator (Heterosexual)								
Male sexually assaults	*M*	3.79	10.47	2.38	9.47	90.53	1.45	4.64
female (*n* = 216)	*SD*	0.57	2.95	0.72	18.93	18.93	0.71	0.72
Female sexually assaults	*M*	3.59	9.87	2.24	14.48	85.52	1.69	4.45
male (*n* = 198)	*SD*	0.66	3.24	0.74	22.07	22.07	0.82	0.80
F (1,412)		*10.49**	*3.87*	*3.42*	*6.18*	*6.18*	*9.56**	*6.39*
Sexual Assault Characteristics Factors								
Physical injury								
No injuries	*M*	3.90	11.41	2.62	7.79	92.21	1.31	4.81
(*n* = 219)	*SD*	0.48	2.28	0.61	18.92	18.92	0.48	0.42
Had injuries	*M*	3.88	11.79	2.63	8.68	91.32	1.36	4.71
(*n* = 206)	*SD*	0.51	2.16	0.60	18.89	18.89	0.51	0.59
F (1,423)		*0.19*	*3.04*	*0.03*	*0.23*	*0.23*	*1.23*	*3.72*
Medical consequences								
Contracted STI	*M*	3.93	11.59	2.60	6.31	93.69	1.31	4.77
(*n* = 217)	*SD*	0.42	2.10	0.66	18.22	18.22	0.64	0.58
No STI, no pregnancy	*M*	3.91	11.62	2.67	9.23	90.77	1.34	4.77
(*n* = 215)	*SD*	0.37	2.21	0.60	21.06	21.06	0.60	0.53
Became pregnant	*M*	3.94	11.67	2.67	12.52	87.48	1.54	4.69
(*n* = 206)	*SD*	0.29	2.13	0.54	21.97	21.97	0.64	0.57
F (2,635)		*.36*	*.07*	*1.00*	*4.88*	*4.88*	*8.53**	*1.40*
Psychological sequelae								
Psychological sequelae	*M*	3.87	11.78	2.64	8.15	91.85	1.31	4.77
(*n* = 213)	*SD*	0.48	1.94	0.63	19.00	19.00	0.66	0.64
No psychological sequelae	*M*	3.81	11.11	2.44	10.61	89.39	1.43	4.69
(*n* = 206)	*SD*	0.57	2.58	0.72	20.26	20.26	0.60	0.58
F (1,416)		*1.28*	*9.12**	*8.76**	*1.65*	*1.65*	*3.74*	*1.47*
Type of forced sex								
Forced oral sex on women	*M*	3.79	10.47	2.38	9.47	90.53	1.45	4.64
(*n* = 216)	*SD*	0.57	2.95	0.72	18.93	18.93	0.71	0.72
Forced woman to perform oral sex (*n* = 212)	*M*	3.85	11.14	2.60	7.78	92.22	1.42	4.70
	SD	0.46	2.37	0.60	17.55	17.55	0.78	0.71
Forced anal sex	*M*	3.82	11.36	2.54	8.66	91.34	1.32	4.75
(*n* = 204)	*SD*	0.56	2.46	0.68	20.50	20.50	0.55	0.58
Forced intercourse	*M*	3.78	11.16	2.47	10.30	89.70	1.53	4.57
(*n* = 200)	*SD*	0.52	2.57	0.66	19.68	19.68	0.77	0.77
F (3,828)		*0.77*	*4.71**	*4.42**	*0.65*	*0.65*	*2.95*	*2.50*
Individual vs. multi-perpetrator sexual assault								
Individual	*M*	3.78	11.16	2.47	10.30	89.70	1.53	4.57
(*n* = 205)	*SD*	0.52	2.57	0.66	19.68	19.68	0.77	0.77
Multi-perpetrator	*M*	3.92	12.58	2.70	6.09	93.70	1.22	4.88
(*n* = 200)	*SD*	0.45	1.22	0.62	19.03	20.11	0.45	0.34
F (1,403)		*7.99**	*51.30**	*12.80*	*4.79*	*4.09*	*23.95**	*28.97**
Race of victim and perpetrator								
V = AA, P =AA	*M*	3.81	11.15	2.54	9.50	90.50	1.38	4.70
(*n* = 218)	*SD*	0.56	2.72	0.67	21.29	21.29	0.69	0.68
V = AA, P=W	*M*	3.85	11.51	2.66	7.22	92.78	1.35	4.75
(*n* = 210)	*SD*	0.47	2.43	0.61	16.69	16.69	0.72	0.59
V = W, P = AA	*M*	3.85	11.31	2.53	9.68	90.32	1.39	4.69
(*n* = 202)	*SD*	0.50	2.42	0.67	20.41	20.41	0.58	0.64
V = W, P = W	*M*	3.78	11.16	2.47	10.30	89.70	1.53	4.57
(*n* = 200)	*SD*	0.52	2.57	0.66	19.68	19.68	0.77	0.77
F (3,826)		*0.97*	*0.93*	*2.97*	*0.98*	*0.98*	*2.54*	*2.74*

Note. V = Victim. P = Perpetrator. AA = African American. W = White. For all F tests, $p = .05/7 \approx .007$ was used to indicated significance given that there are seven dependent variables.
* $p < .007$.

Table 4

Multivariate Results

Factor	Wilks' Λ	*F*	*df*	Error *df*	*p*	partial η2
Victimization Characteristics						
Reason for victim's incapacitation	.878	6.883***	12	1,226	<.001	.063
Sexual orientation of male victim	.963	1.963*	12	1,234	.024	.019
Level of attractiveness of victim	.987	0.936	6	418	.469	.013
Initial level of sexual interest indicated by victim	.905	7.135***	6	409	<.001	.095
Perpetrator Characteristics						
Accused's reaction varied	.644	23.784***	12	1,160	<.001	.197
Perpetrator as high-status student on campus	.995	0.367	6	412	.900	.005
Greek status of perpetrator	.962	2.690*	6	404	.014	.038
Gender of the perpetrator (Heterosexual)	.962	2.694*	6	407	.014	.038
Sexual Assault Characteristics						
Physical injury	.974	1.862	6	418	.086	.026
Medical consequences	.945	2.986***	12	1,260	<.001	.028
Psychological sequelae	.965	2.476*	6	411	.023	.035
Type of forced sex	.959	1.917*	18	2,328	.011	.014
Individual vs. multiple perpetrator sexual assault	.870	8.488***	7	397	<.001	.130
Race of victim and perpetrator	.977	1.050	18	2,322	.398	.008

* $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 5

Multiple Group Comparison Results: Mean Differences and Effect Sizes in the Dependent Variables

Factors	1.Attitude about sanction		2.Type of sanction		3.Level of sanction		4.Victim Guilt		5. Perpetrator Guilt		6. Victim Responsibility		7. Perpetrator Responsibility	
	ΔM	*ES*	*ΔM*	*ES*	*ΔM*	*ES*	*ΔM*	*ES*	*ΔM*	*ES*	*ΔM*	*ES*	*ΔM*	*ES*
Victim Characteristics Factors														
Reason for victim's incapacitation														
Slipped extra liquor - Slipped a drug	-0.09	0.26	-0.47	0.19	0.06	0..10	6.08	0.27	-6.08	0.27	0.26*	0.46	-0.22*	0.49
Slipped extra liquor - Voluntarily drinking a lot	0.17*	0.31	-0.05	0.02	0.22*	0.36	0.82	0.04	-0.82	0.04	-0.08	0.12	0.15	0.23
Slipped a drug - Voluntarily drinking a lot	0.26*	0.53	0.41	0.16	0.16	0.24	-5.26	0.25	5.26	0.25	-0.34*	0.55	0.37*	0.64
Sexual orientation of male victim														
Straight man by gay man - Gay virgin by gay man	0.01	0.02	-0.08	0.04	0.02	0.03	-2.39	0.11	2.39	0.11	-0.18	0.33	0.18*	0.34
Straight man by gay man - Gay man by gay man	0.05	0.10	-0.15	0.07	0.03	0.05	-1.52	0.08	1.52	0.08	-0.24*	0.40	0.19*	0.37
Gay virgin by gay man - Gay man by gay man	0.04	0.08	-0.08	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.88	0.04	-0.88	0.04	-0.06	0.09	0.01	0.02
Level of attractiveness of victim														
Small and cute victim - Not small and cute	0.05	0.11	-0.19	0.08	-0.08	0.12	-0.49	0.03	0.49	0.03	0.06	0.10	-0.02	0.03
Initial level of sexual interest indicated by the victim														
Highly sexual woman - Mildly sexual woman	-0.26*	0.40	-1.20*	0.39	-0.16	0.23	11.95*	0.52	-11.95*	0.52	0.50*	0.56	-0.47*	0.51
Perpetrator Characteristics Factors														
Accused's reaction varied														
Perpetrator admits rape - Very discrepant stories	0.91*	1.76	2.77*	0.91	0.69*	1.04	-22.54*	1.15	22.54*	1.15	-0.79*	1.08	0.99*	1.35
Perpetrator admits rape - Surprised but felt misunderstood	0.62*	1.09	1.41*	0.45	0.44*	0.63	-10.87*	0.52	10.87*	0.52	-0.42*	0.55	0.53*	0.70
Very discrepant stories - Surprised but felt misunderstood	-0.28*	0.44	-1.36*	0.41	-0.25*	0.36	11.67*	0.53	-11.67*	0.53	0.37*	0.43	-0.47*	0.54
Perpetrator as high-status student on campus														
Forced by student with no status - Star basketball player	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.06	-0.55	0.03	0.55	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.07
Greek status of perpetrator														
Raped by frat member – Not Raped by frat member	0.11	0.23	0.31	0.12	0.17*	0.27	-2.79	0.15	2.79	0.15	-0.21*	0.30	0.17	0.24
Gender of the perpetrator (Heterosexual)														
Male sexually assaults female - Female sexually assaults male	0.20*	0.32	0.60	0.19	0.14	0.19	-5.01	0.24	5.01	0.24	-0.24*	0.31	0.19	0.25

Table 5 Continued

Factors	1.Attitude about sanction		2.Type of sanction		3.Level of sanction		4.Victim Guilt		5. Perpetrator Guilt		6. Victim Responsibility		7. Perpetrator Responsibility	
	ΔM	*ES*	*ΔM*	*ES*	*ΔM*	*ES*	*ΔM*	*ES*	*ΔM*	*ES*	*ΔM*	*ES*	*ΔM*	*ES*
Sexual Assault Characteristics Factors														
Physical injury														
No physical injury - With physical injury	0.02	0.04	-0.38	0.17	-0.01	0.02	-0.89	0.05	0.89	0.05	-0.05	0.10	0.10	0.20
Medical consequences														
Contracted STI - No STI or pregnancy	0.01	0.03	-0.03	0.01	-0.08	0.13	-2.92	0.15	2.92	0.15	-0.03	0.05	0.00	0.00
Contracted STI - Became pregnant	-0.02	0.06	-0.08	0.04	-0.07	0.12	-6.21*	0.31	6.21*	0.31	-0.23*	0.36	0.08	0.14
No STI or pregnancy - Became pregnant	-0.03	0.09	-0.04	0.02	0.01	0.02	-3.29	0.15	3.29	0.15	-0.20*	0.32	0.08	0.15
Psychological sequelae														
With psychological sequelae - No psychological sequelae	0.06	0.11	0.67*	0.29	0.20*	0.30	-2.46	0.13	2.46	0.13	-0.12	0.19	0.08	0.13
Type of forced sex														
Forced oral sex on woman - Forced woman to perform oral sex	-0.06	0.12	-0.67	0.25	-0.22*	0.33	1.68	0.09	-1.68	0.09	0.03	0.04	-0.06	0.08
Forced oral sex on woman - Forced anal sex	-0.04	0.07	-0.89*	0.33	-0.16	0.23	0.81	0.04	-0.81	0.04	0.14	0.22	-0.11	0.17
Forced oral sex on woman - Forced intercourse	0.01	0.02	-0.68	0.25	-0.10	0.14	-0.83	0.04	0.83	0.04	-0.07	0.09	0.07	0.09
Forced woman to perform oral sex - Forced anal sex	0.03	0.06	-0.22	0.09	0.06	0.09	-0.88	0.05	0.88	0.05	0.11	0.16	-0.05	0.08
Forced woman to perform oral sex - Forced intercourse	0.07	0.22	-0.01	0.01	0.13	0.31	-2.52	0.20	2.52	0.20	-0.10	0.18	0.13	0.26
Forced anal sex - Forced intercourse	0.04	0.07	0.21	0.08	0.07	0.10	-1.64	0.08	1.64	0.08	-0.21	0.31	0.18	0.26
Individual vs. multi-perpetrator sexual assault														
Individual - Multi-perpetrator	-0.14*	0.29	-1.42*	0.71	-0.23*	0.36	4.21*	0.22	-4.00*	0.20	0.31*	0.49	-0.31*	0.52
Race of victim and perpetrator														
(V = AA, P = AA) - (V = AA, P = W)	-0.05	0.10	-0.36	0.14	-0.12	0.18	2.27	0.11	-2.27	0.11	0.02	0.03	-0.05	0.07
(V = AA, P = AA) - (V= W, P = AA)	-0.04	0.05	-0.16	0.09	0.01	0.00	-0.19	-0.01	0.19	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
(V = AA, P = AA) - (V = W, P = W)	0.03	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.15	-0.80	0.06	0.80	0.06	-0.15	0.37	0.14	0.31
(V = AA, P = W) - (V= W, P = AA)	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.10	0.13	0.06	-2.46	0.18	2.46	0.18	-0.04	0.02	0.06	0.03
(V = AA, P = W) - (V = W, P = W)	0.07	0.19	0.35	0.19	0.19	0.41	-3.08	0.22	3.08	0.22	-0.17	0.31	0.18	0.33
(V= W, P = AA) - (V = W, P = W)	0.07	0.10	0.16	0.24	0.16	0.08	-0.62	0.89	0.62	0.89	-0.13	0.07	0.12	0.06

Note. The "-" sign in the first column means subtraction. *ΔM* = Mean differences. ES = effect size = Cohen's *d*. V = victim. P = perpetrator. AA = African American. W = White. Means and standard deviations of the outcome variables for each factor level are in Table 3. For mean comparisons, *p* = .007/(number of comparisons) was used to determine significance for the comparison of that specific factor