

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313 761 4700 800 521 0600

Order Number 9020783

**Men's ambivalence toward women: Implications for evaluations
of rape victims**

Martin, Andrea Jill, Ph.D.

City University of New York, 1990

Copyright ©1990 by Martin, Andrea Jill. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

MEN'S AMBIVALENCE TOWARD WOMEN:
IMPLICATIONS FOR EVALUATIONS OF RAPE VICTIMS

by

ANDREA JILL MARTIN

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1990

©1990

Andrea Jill Martin

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy.

12/12/89

Date

Samuel Katz

Chair of Examining Committee

December 12, 1989

Date

Robert D. Soltykin

Executive Officer

Professor R. Glen Hess

Professor Florence Denmark

Supervisory Committee

Abstract

MEN'S AMBIVALENCE TOWARD WOMEN:
IMPLICATIONS FOR EVALUATIONS OF RAPE VICTIMS

by

Andree Jill Martin

Advisor: Professor Irwin Katz

This study explored the effects of men's attitudes toward women on their evaluations of female rape victims. It was hypothesized that male attitudes toward women would be ambivalent having both positive as well as negative components, resulting in more extreme evaluations of women, either more positive or more negative, depending upon the woman. To test the hypothesis, two scales were developed which assessed attitudes toward women in the domain of social issues and interpersonal relationships. These scales were internally consistent, functioned independently, and differentiated among known groups. They were given to male undergraduates who subsequently read one of four descriptions of a crime: low blame rape; high blame rape; low blame robbery; and high blame robbery. In the low blame conditions the victim was minimally responsible for her victimization while in the high blame conditions the victim's behavior apparently precipitated the crime. It was predicted that subjects' ambivalence (relatively high scores on both the positive and negative attitude scales) would be related to (a) low attributed victim blame and high victim empathy in the low blame rape condition and (b) high victim blame and low victim empathy in the high blame rape condition, but (c) would not be related to attributed victim blame or victim empathy in the robbery conditions. The separate positive and negative attitude scores were not expected to be related to ratings of culpability or empathy. Finally, neither ambivalence nor the separate pro and anti scores were expected to be correlated

with criminal blame in any of the conditions. Contrary to the hypotheses it was found that the higher the ambivalence score, the more men blamed the low blame rape victim. Additionally, ambivalence was not correlated with either victim blame or empathy in the high blame rape condition. Lastly, it was found that under some conditions the pro scale was more predictive of attitudes while under other conditions the anti score had more predictive power. Explanations for these results include the salience of just world beliefs in the low blame rape condition and differential definitions and perceptions of rape in the high blame rape condition.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A dissertation like any other major project involves not only the work of the author but a whole supporting cast of people as well. I'd like to take this opportunity to give my thanks and appreciation to each of the following people:

First I would like to thank my dissertation sponsor, Dr. Irwin Katz, for his guidance and help not only on my dissertation but throughout my graduate career. Dr. Katz was always available and helpful whenever I needed him especially at those moments when I feared that I was at a dead end. He was always generous with his knowledge, time, and support for my work. It has been a privilege to have known and worked with him over these past years.

I would also like to thank Dr. R. Glen Hass and Dr. Florence Denmark who also served on my dissertation committee. Their incisiveness, creativity, and support have been an enormous help to me.

In addition, my thanks also go to Dr. Vita Rabinowitz and Dr. Alden Wessman for serving as outside readers for my dissertation.

I would also like to thank each of the following people for administering questionnaires: Dr. Bill Askins, Linda Bastone, Ruth Bridges, and Lisa Fernandez.

Special thanks to Dr. Richard DiNardo and Veronica Orsi for their superlative (and multiple) administrations of my questionnaires to their classes.

My thanks and gratitude also go to Dr. Michael Jaworskyj and Celeste Ridgeway Stevens for the use of their classes for my study.

Special thanks to Lois Katz for her help in getting me police reports on current types of con games.

I would also like to thank my dear friend and colleague, Dr. John Jacobs, for not only the use of his class for my study but his continued friendship and support through the years.

Additionally, I would like to thank each of the following people for their love, guidance, and support in my life. They will always have my deepest love and respect.

To my dearest friend, Marie Louise Baker, who was there for me not only in the good times but in the bad times as well. Marie personifies what people strive for when they want to be a friend to someone. She will always have my deepest love and admiration.

To my parents, Muriel and Mel Martin, who have served as the best possible role models for honesty, integrity, and perseverance in the face of obstacles. I love them both dearly.

Lastly, to Moshe Cohen, I can never adequately say how much his love and encouragement has meant to me bringing me more happiness than he can ever know. I love him for many reasons but most of all for the type of man that he is.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Research Aims..... | 1 |
| Ambivalence Toward Blacks and the Disabled..... | 3 |
| Ambivalence Toward Women..... | 3 |
| Gender Stereotypes..... | 4 |
| Areas of Ambivalence Toward Women..... | 6 |
| Values Underlying Ambivalence Toward Women..... | 8 |
| Attitudes Toward Rape Victims..... | 11 |
| Sociological Explanations- "Rape Culture"..... | 12 |
| Victim Characteristics Explanation..... | 14 |
| Characteristics of the Male Perceiver..... | 18 |
| Psychological Explanations..... | 19 |
| The Current Research..... | 23 |
| Overview of Experiment..... | 23 |
| Hypotheses..... | 23 |
| 2. METHOD..... | 25 |
| Construction of Pro and Anti Female Scales..... | 25 |
| Subjects..... | 26 |
| Procedure..... | 26 |
| Factor Analysis..... | 27 |
| Item Analysis and Reliabilities..... | 29 |
| Validity Evidence..... | 29 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Experiment..... | 30 |
| Overview..... | 30 |
| Subjects..... | 30 |
| Procedure..... | 31 |
| Attitude Questionnaire..... | 31 |
| The Crime Scenarios..... | 32 |
| High Blame Rape Condition..... | 33 |
| Low Blame Rape Condition..... | 33 |
| High Blame Robbery Condition..... | 34 |
| Low Blame Robbery Condition..... | 34 |
| Dependent Measures..... | 35 |
| 3. RESULTS..... | 37 |
| Pro and Anti-Women Scale..... | 37 |
| Experimental Results..... | 37 |
| Reliability of Blame and Empathy Measures..... | 37 |
| Perception of Victim Checks..... | 38 |
| Test of Hypothesis 1..... | 41 |
| Other Findings--Low Blame Rape Condition..... | 44 |
| Test of Hypothesis 2..... | 45 |
| Other Findings--High Blame Rape Condition..... | 47 |
| Test of Hypothesis 3..... | 47 |
| Other Findings--Low Blame Robbery Condition..... | 50 |
| Test of Hypothesis 4..... | 50 |
| Other Findings--High Blame Robbery Condition..... | 53 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 4. DISCUSSION..... | 54 |
| Concluding Remarks..... | 64 |
| APPENDIX A-- 50 Item Attitude Questionnaire..... | 66 |
| APPENDIX B-- Revised 29 Item Attitude Questionnaire..... | 71 |
| APPENDIX C-- Item Analysis for Original Sample..... | 75 |
| APPENDIX D-- Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale..... | 79 |
| APPENDIX E-- Attitude Questionnaire With Filler Items..... | 81 |
| APPENDIX F-- High Blame Rape Scenario..... | 87 |
| APPENDIX G-- Low Blame Rape Scenario..... | 90 |
| APPENDIX H-- High Blame Robbery Scenario..... | 93 |
| APPENDIX I-- Low Blame Robbery Scenario..... | 96 |
| APPENDIX J-- Rape Dependent Measure..... | 99 |
| APPENDIX K-- Robbery Dependent Measure..... | 101 |
| APPENDIX L-- Item Analysis for Experimental Sample..... | 103 |
| APPENDIX M--Low Blame Rape Intercorrelations for Scales & Composite Ratings..... | 107 |
| APPENDIX N--High Blame Rape Intercorrelations for Scales & Composite Ratings..... | 109 |
| APPENDIX O--Low Blame Robbery Intercorrelations for Scales & Composite Ratings..... | 111 |
| APPENDIX P--High Blame Robbery Intercorrelations for Scales & Composite Ratings..... | 113 |
| REFERENCES..... | 115 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----|
| TABLE 1. | Item Loadings on Major Factors..... | 28 |
| TABLE 2. | Mean Attribution of Blame & Empathy Ratings..... | 39 |
| TABLE 3. | Low Blame Rape Correlations for Scales & Ratings..... | 42 |
| TABLE 4. | High Blame Rape Correlations for Scales & Ratings..... | 46 |
| TABLE 5. | Low Blame Robbery Correlations for Scales & Ratings..... | 48 |
| TABLE 6. | High Blame Robbery Correlations for Scales & Ratings..... | 51 |
| TABLE 7. | Item-Total Scale Correlations for Pro & Anti Items-Original Sample..... | 76 |
| TABLE 8. | Item-Total Scale Correlations for Pro & Anti Items-Experimental Sample..... | 104 |
| TABLE 9. | Low Blame Rape Intercorrelations for Scales & Composite Ratings..... | 108 |
| TABLE 10. | High Blame Rape Intercorrelations for Scales & Composite Ratings..... | 110 |
| TABLE 11. | Low Blame Robbery Intercorrelations for Scales & Composite Ratings..... | 112 |
| TABLE 12. | High Blame Robbery Intercorrelations for Scales & Composite Ratings..... | 114 |

1. INTRODUCTION

Freud (1920) first saw ambivalence, i.e., having both affectionate and hostile feelings toward another person, as an important phenomenon in understanding both the individual who holds these conflicted attitudes and society. Although Freud was not certain of the origin of this ambivalence, he did believe in its ubiquitousness (Thom, 1983). Recent experimental investigations, as will be discussed later, have shown that ambivalence, the holding of both highly positive as well as very negative attitudes toward groups of people, occurs in whites' views of blacks, the views of the non-handicapped toward the handicapped, and in the views of people toward the mentally ill (Katz & Hass, 1988; Bailey, 1988; Katz, Glass, & Wackenhut, 1986; Dienstbier, 1970; Gergen & Jones, 1963). This ambivalence can result in differential evaluations and/or behavior toward the objects of this ambivalence, either more positive or more negative, contingent upon the particular situation and/or the characteristics of the object of the ambivalence.

Research Aims

The aim of this research is to first develop scales designed to measure men's positive and negative attitudes toward women. Although scales have been developed to explore attitudes toward women, they measure attitudes from a unidimensional perspective, combining social and interpersonal issues (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1973; Benson & Vincent, 1980; Galambos, Peterson, Richards & Gitelson, 1985). The present research employs a new approach to the exploration of attitudes toward women, testing the hypothesis that attitudes toward women can best be conceptualized as two independent dimensions consisting of positive attitudes toward women in the domain of social issues and negative attitudes toward women in the domain of interpersonal relationships. Positive and negative dimensions of attitudes have previously been scaled for both racial attitudes and attitudes toward the handicapped (Katz & Hass, 1988; Bailey, 1988).

Because women as well as minorities and the handicapped are viewed with both scorn and sympathy, ambivalence (the simultaneous possession of both positive and negative attitudes) should be manifested by men toward women. These conflicted positive and negative feelings should become salient in effect-laden situations that arouse the conflict, thereby creating emotional tension within the individual and posing a threat to the person's self-regard. The person wants to see himself or herself as a fair-minded individual who would not reject a disadvantaged other, but also as a discerning individual who does not automatically favor a deviant or undesirable other. This emotional conflict may lead to an extremity in attitude and/or behavior on the part of the perceiver toward the individual who is the source of this ambivalence. The direction of this extremity will depend upon the situation and/or the characteristics of the person activating the ambivalence.

The second aim of this research is to determine whether men's ambivalence (as determined by scores on the newly constructed positive and negative attitude scales) predicts evaluations of female rape victims. Rape was chosen as a domain in which men's ambivalence toward women should be manifested because of the effect-laden nature of the crime and because it is a gender-related crime. It was hypothesized that men's ambivalence toward women should create an emotional tension leading to evaluative extremity toward female rape victims. The direction of the evaluative extremity will be contingent upon the apparent culpability of the rape victim. That is, given an opportunity to evaluate a rape victim, a man who is relatively high on ambivalence toward women will judge an apparently "innocent" female rape victim more positively and blame her less than a man who is not as ambivalent toward women or even than a man who is unambivalently positive toward women. Conversely, a man who is relatively high on ambivalence toward women should evaluate an apparently "culpable" female rape victim more negatively and blame her more than a man who is not as ambivalent toward women or even than a man who is unambivalently negative toward women.

Ambivalence Toward Blacks and the Disabled

Attitudes toward various outgroups have been shown to be complex and not just simply positive or negative in character. Although some individuals have uniformly "anti-Semitic", "racist", or "sexist" attitudes (Adorno, 1950), the majority appear to have more complex attitudes, containing both positive and negative components (Carver, Glass, Snyder, & Katz, 1977; Bigoness, 1976). This has been demonstrated for attitudes toward blacks and the physically and mentally disabled (Katz & Hass, 1988; Bailey, 1988; Katz et al., 1979; Katz et al., 1977; Katz, Glass & Cohen, 1973; Gergen & Jones, 1963). It has also been shown that under certain conditions these conflicted attitudes give rise to efforts to reduce psychic strain, resulting in extreme reactions to black or physically disabled stimulus persons, either positive or negative, depending on the particular situation (Katz, 1981; Hass et al., in press).

According to Katz & Hass (1988), conflicted positive and negative feelings will be elevated in affect-laden situations that arouse the conflict. These situations that activate the conflict create an emotional tension within the individual and pose a threat to the person's self-regard. The person wants to see himself or herself as one who is fair minded and would not respond negatively to a discriminated against or disadvantaged other (a black person). Yet on the other hand, the person wants to see himself or herself as one who is discerning and does not automatically respond favorably to a deviant or undesirable other. This emotional conflict will lead to an extremity in attitude and/or behavior on the part of the individual. The direction of this extremity will depend upon the particular situation. When a person is given an opportunity to aid a stigmatized other, he or she will do so in order to reduce the emotional tension caused by the ambivalence. On the other hand, if a person has the opportunity to denigrate a stigmatized person in order to reduce the emotional tension he or she will do so.

Ambivalence Toward Women

It is reasonable to assume that men should exhibit ambivalence toward women in a way

similar to the way that whites exhibit ambivalence toward blacks or the nondisabled exhibit ambivalence toward the physically or mentally disabled. From the ancient civilizations of Greece and Rome to modern America in the twentieth century, images of women have been mixed. (Hunter, 1976; Cooper, 1985). Women have been perceived as both inferior and evil, responsible for man's downfall. Even though women have been perceived as the sexual temptress they have also been perceived as the virtuous mother, or Madonna (Ruble & Ruble, 1982). Not only has there been ambivalence concerning the characteristics ascribed to women, the results of those attributions are often mixed. Even when women have been viewed as virtuous Madonnas, they have been put on pedestals and relegated to essentially powerless positions in society. These conflicted images and the consequences resulting from these images imply that men and women are different not only in the social roles that they occupy but are also different in their very nature (Hunter, 1976).

Gender Stereotypes

The fact that men and women are perceived to be so different in their very nature reflects the functioning of stereotypes. Although definitions of stereotyping differ according to the investigator's theoretical orientation (Miller, 1981; Ashmore & DelBoca, 1976; Ashmore & DelBoca, 1981; Pettigrew, 1981; Jones, 1982; Adams, Lawrence, & Cook, 1979), most definitions agree that stereotyping involves an act of social perception or judgment on the part of an observer which involves attributing a dispositional quality to another individual or group (Ruble, Cohen, & Ruble, 1984). The stimulus for the stereotype consists of some feature of the individual or group, usually a physiological, social, or ethnic identity quality (Miller, 1981).

One of the problems with stereotypes is that they reflect an overgeneralization that is false to some degree, particularly when applied to each individual member of a group (Adams, Lawrence, & Cook, 1979). Another major problem in the utilization of stereotypes is that they

are virtually immune to correction (Petro & Putnam, 1979). Essentially there is an "hypothesis confirming bias" whereby people tend to remember only information that is consistent with their stereotype and ignore or discount inconsistent information (Darley and Gross, 1983; Cohen, 1981). More specifically, there is selective attention to consistent information along with better retrieval of consistent information. Furthermore, there may be a reinterpretation of ambiguous or inconsistent information to fit the individual's prior beliefs. Information that is inconsistent with an individual's stereotype may be attributed to situational factors and therefore be attributionally discounted (Fiske & Taylor, 1984).

There are well defined notions of what are appropriate behaviors and characteristics for women and men to manifest (Cicone & Ruble, 1978; Vandusen & Sheldon, 1976). Essentially there are two fundamental themes in the sex role literature reflecting the dichotomy between instrumental (task) and expressive (social-emotional) spheres of action (Pleck, 1976). Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz (1972) found that there was a strong consensus about the differing characteristics of men and women across groups of people who differ in age, religion, sex, marital status and educational level. Characteristics ascribed to males formed a "competency" cluster and included such qualities as: independence, objectivity, worldliness and self-confidence. Characteristics ascribed to females, on the other hand, formed a "warmth and expressiveness" cluster and included such descriptions as: tactful, gentle, religious, quiet, and neat. Therefore, women are perceived as relatively less competent, less independent, less objective, and less logical than men. Whereas men are perceived as lacking interpersonal sensitivity, warmth, and expressiveness in comparison to women. Moreover, stereotypically masculine traits are more often perceived to be desirable than are stereotypically feminine characteristics.

Gilbert, Deutsch, & Strehan (1978) found that both male and female subjects agreed that it is more desirable for a man to be masculine (as defined by his score on the Bem Sex Role

Inventory) than it is for a woman to be masculine. Conversely, subjects felt that it was more desirable for a woman to be feminine (also as defined by her score on the Bem Sex Role Inventory) than it is for a man to be feminine. These views of what men and women are and what they should be have implications for the evaluations of women in many spheres of life, including occupational spheres of life (Schein, 1976; Ruble, Cohen, and Ruble, 1984; Messengill & DeMarco, 1979; Dipboye, Arvey, & Terpstra, 1977; Rosen & Jerdee, 1978; Dipboye, Fromkin, & Wibeck, 1975). Furthermore, although there have been some changes over the past two decades in how women are viewed, the images concerning women are still mixed, with women still being seen as more emotional, submissive, and weak than men. On the other hand, women are still seen as more considerate, sincere, unselfish, and cooperative than men (Werner & LeRusse, 1975; Ruble, 1983).

Areas of Ambivalence Toward Women

Ambivalence toward women should manifest itself primarily in two spheres of life. According to Mason, Czejka, & Arber (1976), attitudes toward women are most strongly manifested in men's attitudes toward social issues relating to women (particularly issues relating to labor force participation) and in terms of men's interpersonal relationships with women. There is essentially a split between issues relating to equality in interpersonal relationships (i.e., sharing household tasks, child-rearing responsibility, dating, marriage, etc.) and equality outside the home (i.e., labor market discrimination, images of women in the media, etc.) and this detachment of personal life from social issues can take dramatic form.

Crosby & Herek (1986) interviewed 182 white males between the ages of 25 and 40 on their perceptions of women in the workplace. Half of the males were employed in high prestige occupations (i.e., physician, lawyer, etc.) and half of the males were employed in low prestige professions (i.e., sales clerk, truck driver, etc.). The high prestige and low prestige groups were each further divided according to their marital status. Finally, the married men were

classified as to whether their wives were or were not employed outside the home. All men were asked whether or not their mothers had worked outside the home. The results indicated that whether a man's wife or mother was employed had no effect on his perception of women in the workplace. The subjects in this study kept their sociopolitical attitudes separate from their personal lives. It may be that individuals separate their home life from their work life so completely that it is difficult for them to transfer knowledge from one domain to the other.

Despite the split between men's public and private lives, it is important to note that many men have changed their views concerning social issues relating to women and in particular working women. The growth of the women's movement over the past twenty years has caused many people to accept notions of female equality in the workplace (equal pay for equal or comparable work), in politics, and in the media (Mason, Czajka, & Arber, 1976). Therefore, it is expected that men should be more positive and sympathetic toward social issues relating to women, such as job discrimination, portrayals of women in the media, etc.

On the other hand, attitudes toward interpersonal relationships with women, which may touch on some fundamental values in our society, have been more resistant to change even among what may be considered nontraditional individuals. Denmark, Shew, & Ctell (1985) interviewed twenty middle class couples, ten of whom were married and ten of whom were living together but not married, on the division of household responsibilities in their homes. The results indicated that married women spent a significantly greater number of hours on household chores per week than did married men. However, even unmarried women who were living with men still performed household tasks for almost twice as many hours per week compared to their male counterparts. The sample in this study was too small to permit generalization. However, in another study, Nyquist, Sivken, Spence, & Helmreich (1985) looked at 164 middle class couples and asked the couples questions concerning household activities and tasks. Again the results indicated that only a few women received an appreciable

amount of help from their husbands on a daily basis on routine household tasks (i.e., housekeeping, laundry, and food marketing) even when they were employed full-time outside of the home. A common theme emerging from studies of dual career families is the belief that the employed wife's major responsibility should still be as homemaker and that the husband's major responsibility should still be as breadwinner.

The traditional notion that there should be more maternal than paternal responsibility for child-rearing is still alive and well. Kellerman & Katz (1978) found in their study of 31 parents that mothers were seen as primarily responsible for the physical caretaking and emotional support of the children. Mothers were also seen as being responsible for the assignment of household chores and the development of bedtime schedules for the child. Mothers were rated by the subjects as being ideally responsible for the largest segment of child-rearing activities. However, these findings are merely suggestive, given the small size of the sample.

One can hypothesize that other areas of interpersonal relationships between men and women have also been resistant to change. Although there have been changes in dating patterns and in expressions of female sexuality, interactions in areas that touch on core values and on strong societal, psychological, and religious attitudes are harder to change. In general, men still have more conservative attitudes about roles in dating and marriage and they tend to favor sex role specialization to a greater extent than do women (Kelley, Bersheid, Christensen, Harvey, Huston, & Levinger, 1983). Therefore, it is expected that men should tend to show relatively negative attitudes toward women in the domain of interpersonal relationships and relatively positive attitudes toward women in the domain of social issues.

Values Underlying Ambivalence Toward Women

Two fundamental values, egalitarianism/humanitarianism and the Protestant Ethic, have strongly shaped American attitudes as well as institutions (Lipset, 1963). There has been a complex interplay between these two dominant value orientations often leading to a conflict

between them. Essentially, the hypothesized conflict creating the ambivalence on the part of whites toward blacks is between the positive and negative feelings that many whites have toward blacks which runs counter to one of these two basic value orientations (Katz & Hass, 1988). The Protestant Ethic is a value that stresses the virtue of hard work, self-discipline, and individualism (Feather, 1984). More importantly, in terms of attitudes toward the poor and disadvantaged, those who support Protestant Ethic values are less inclined to support public assistance programs and they place a lower value on equality of outcomes (MacDonald, 1972). On the other hand, the value of egalitarianism/humanitarianism stresses equality, understanding, and sympathy toward all people, especially those who are less fortunate. Therefore, having negative feelings toward one who is less fortunate (i.e., a poor person or a black person) violates the value of egalitarianism. On the other hand, having positive feelings toward a discredited other who is often stereotyped as lazy violates the Protestant Ethic value. These conflicted attitudes and values may give rise to efforts to reduce this strain, resulting sometimes in extreme reactions, either positive or negative, depending upon the particular situation (Katz, Hass, & Wackenhut, 1986).

The sources of ambivalence toward women, however, are different from the sources of ambivalence toward minorities and other stigmatized groups. Although Protestant Ethic values versus egalitarian values may play a role in men's attitudes toward an issue such as affirmative action policies affecting women, it does not adequately explain men's ambivalence toward women regarding other social issues (i.e., how women are portrayed on television and in the movies). Broadly speaking, more general values such as liberalism versus conservatism probably play a larger role in explaining men's ambivalence toward women with regard to most social issues. However, conservatism and Protestant Ethic values have been shown to be positively correlated and to both stress self-control and respect for authority (Feather, 1984). Additionally, both people who are conservative and people who have strong Protestant Ethic values tend to be

ascetic, distrustful of sexual intimacy, and to place their trust in convergent modes of thought in which the rules can be followed (Feather, 1984).

Despite the overlap in beliefs between conservatism versus liberalism values and Protestant Ethic versus egalitarian values, conservatism and liberalism cover a broader range of attitudes and behavior and are more basic than the Protestant Ethic versus egalitarian values. The conservative versus liberal value system covers a broad range of social topics that extends across political, economic, moral, educational, and religious domains and practices (Rambo, 1972). A conservative is typically a person with a right wing political orientation who is proestablishment and supportive of the status quo (Wilson & Patterson, 1968; Wilson, 1973). Liberalism, on the other hand, emphasizes freedom of the individual, social progress and change, discussion and tolerance of different views, egalitarianism and the rights of minorities, and governmental action to remedy social deficiencies (Kerlinger, 1984). Liberalism has been found to be associated with support for various progressive movements including the women's movement (Smith & Kluegel, 1984). Tevris (1973) found that not only political liberalism but religious liberalism (i.e., Unitarianism, atheism) was associated with greater support for the women's movement.

Conservatism and liberalism should not be viewed as merely opposing values. Each is a value system in its own right which is orthogonal to the other system. In other words, liberalism and conservatism are independent of each other (Kerlinger, 1984). An individual can possess both liberal and conservative values which can give rise to ambivalence. For example, a man can hold a liberal value that the rights of women should be protected yet hold a conservative view which objects to governmental intervention to protect the rights of various groups (i.e., affirmative action, ERA). Therefore, it is possible that conservative values versus liberal values give rise to men's ambivalence toward women with regard to attitudes on social issues.

General liberal versus conservative values probably also play a role in relation to men's attitudes toward interpersonal relationships with women. However, other concerns come into play when one examines men's attitudes toward women on a more personal level. Kinder & Sears (1981) discuss what they call "symbolic racism". Symbolic racism is the expression in terms of both ideological symbols and behavior of the feeling that blacks are violating cherished values and making illegitimate demands (Kinder & Sears, 1981). It is the conjunction of both traditional values and antiblack affect. The basis for symbolic racism is not in current racial experiences but in deeply felt feelings concerning morality and values that are learned early in life (Kinder, 1986). Welfare and affirmative action programs, for example, may symbolize to some whites the unfair advances of blacks at the expense of traditional values relating to hard work and individualism (McConahay, 1986).

Perhaps in a similar vein there may exist a "symbolic sexism" which operates in relation to men's attitudes toward women especially with regard to interpersonal relationships with women. Men may see working mothers as threatening an important value like the security and stability of the family or they may see equality in a dating relationship as threatening to the traditional masculine and feminine roles. There is a strong sex role socialization which dictates for men and women appropriate modes of conduct and roles which may currently be threatened. Therefore, many advances that women have made may be threatening to some long established values held by men. Therefore, "symbolic sexism" may be an important source of ambivalence in men's attitudes toward women with regard to interpersonal relationships.

Attitudes Toward Rape Victims

Men's ambivalence toward women should strongly manifest itself in an effect laden area such as rape. Although men do show compassion toward a victim of rape and have been shown to help rape victims (Herari, Herari, & White, 1985), their attitudes have often been unsympathetic toward rape victims. On the one hand, men have mothers, sisters, girlfriends, and wives which

should make them more sensitive to the crime of rape. On the other hand, men are less able than women to identify with victims of rape. There are sociological as well as psychological explanations concerning attitudes toward rape victims.

Sociological Explanations- "Rape Culture"

Although rape is not approved of in our society, popular definitions of what constitutes rape vary. At the more inclusive end of the spectrum, all coerced sex is seen as rape, regardless of whether the coercion is physical, psychological, or economic (Burt & Albin, 1981). At the other end of the spectrum, some men and women believe that it is impossible to force a woman into having sex against her will and they don't acknowledge that rape exists (Burt & Albin, 1981). The definition that most people endorse probably falls somewhere between these two definitions.

People's personal definitions of rape have an important impact on their tolerance of rape and empathy toward rape victims. Their definitions and perceptions of rape may lead to disbelief of the victim's story or to blaming the victims for provoking or precipitating the rape. Lastly, there may be a denial of the seriousness of rape (Hall, Howard, & Boezio, 1986). Brownmiller (1975) makes the point that we live in a culture which is accepting of rape. Many myths surround us concerning rape such as: "All women want to be raped"; "No woman can be raped against her will"; "She was asking for it"; "If you're going to be raped, you might as well relax and enjoy it" (Brownmiller, 1975; Malamuth, 1981).

Rape tolerance, on the part of men as well as some women, is inherent in our culture and our socialization practices. Tolerance of rape has been found to be associated with sexist attitudes toward heterosexual relationships rather than with antisocial tendencies (Hall, Howard, & Boezio, 1986). It is these sexist attitudes which are learned early in our lives and have an impact on our adult existence. These cultural myths regarding rape and sexist attitudes in general restrict and narrow our definitions of what constitutes rape, resulting in attribution

of blame to rape victims (Burt & Albin, 1981).

Not only is rape myth acceptance associated with sexist attitudes but there are other attitudinal correlates of rape myth acceptance. Burt (1980) examined three hypothesized attitudinal correlates of rape myth acceptance in males: sexual conservatism, adversarial sexual beliefs, and acceptance of interpersonal violence. Sexual conservatism refers to a conservative attitude toward sexuality including restrictions concerning the appropriateness of certain sexual acts as well as limitations on when sex should occur. Adversarial sexual beliefs are beliefs that relationships between men and women are exploitative, manipulative and should not be trusted. Lastly, acceptance of interpersonal violence refers to the belief that violence and coercion are legitimate in interpersonal relationships. Burt (1980) found that rape supportive beliefs were related to adversarial sexual beliefs and acceptance of interpersonal violence. More importantly, acceptance of interpersonal violence was the strongest predictor of rape myth acceptance. The data indicated that rape myth acceptance forms part of a larger attitude structure that includes sex-role stereotyping, beliefs about sexuality, and acceptance of interpersonal violence.

In a study that explored the effects of rape myths on perceptions of victims and criminals, Burt & Albin (1981) administered to male subjects a set of rape vignettes that manipulated the victim's reputation, the relationship between the victim and assailant, and the amount of force used during the rape. They also looked at rape supportive attitudes (i.e., rape myth acceptance, adversarial sexual beliefs, and acceptance of interpersonal violence). The results indicated that rape myth acceptance had a direct effect on rape definitions. That is, higher rape myth acceptance reduced the probability that the vignette was labeled a rape. Additionally, acceptance of interpersonal violence reduced willingness to convict the rapist.

The pervasiveness of rape myths not only among rapists but in the general public as well has been documented. Feild (1978) found that rapists were more likely than rape crisis

counselors to endorse various views that may be referred to as rape myths. However, police officers as well as citizens from the general population were found to be more similar to the rapists than to the rape counselors in their views concerning rape. However, it is important to note that there are both gender and racial differences in terms of the acceptance of rape myths. Giacomessi & Dull (1986) found that females were more likely than males to reject beliefs such as the following: victims are to blame for the rape, women want to be raped, and women falsely accuse men of rape. Interestingly, black males were more likely to endorse rape myths than were white males and they were more accepting of rape myths than were any other group. This may be a defensive reaction on the part of black men to often being stereotyped as rapists.

Rape myths have an effect not only on attitudes toward rape victims but also on the attitudes and actions of men toward women. Mosher & Anderson (1986) found that in a group of undergraduate men many of the men, at least sometime in their life, employed forceful or exploitative means in order to have sex with a woman. Seventy-five percent of the men admitted to using drugs or alcohol to convince a woman to have sex with them. Over forty percent of the men admitted using anger to induce an unwilling woman to have sex with them. Thirteen percent threatened to use force, while twenty percent used force in order to have sex with a woman. Malamuth (1981) asked male subjects to indicate the likelihood that they would rape a woman if they could be assured of not being caught and punished. Approximately thirty-five percent of the males indicated some likelihood of raping a woman if they could be assured that they would not be caught and twenty-one percent chose a rating on a level equal to or above the midpoint of the scale. Tieger (1981) replicated the findings of Malamuth and found that thirty-seven percent of the subjects questioned indicated some likelihood of committing a rape if they were guaranteed no punishment with twenty percent indicating a likelihood greater than or equal to the midpoint of the scale.

Victim Characteristics Explanation

Not only do sociological factors influence men's attitudes toward rape victims, the characteristics of the victim also greatly effect men's attitudes toward the victim. The characteristics of the victim have always played a major role in our attitudes toward the rape victim as well as in the punishment meted out to the rapist (Brownmiller, 1975). In particular, the respectability of the victim has always played a key role in our treatment of the rape victim. Even under Babylonian law, over four thousand years ago, the treatment accorded to the rapist and the rape victim varied greatly according to the perceived respectability of the victim (Brownmiller, 1975). A man who raped a virgin was executed. However, if a married woman was raped, the rape would be labeled adultery and both the rape victim and the rapist would be bound and thrown into the river.

Although rape victims are no longer thrown into the river, typically females who are seen as more respectable and less sexually provocative are blamed less for the rape (Weiner & Rinehart, 1986; Kaneker & Kolsowalla, 1981). Unfortunately, this emphasis on the respectability of the victim can have very detrimental consequences for the rape victim. Very often unless the rape victim is an "ideal victim", a woman who has a good reputation and whose actions were beyond reproach, she is not considered a "real victim" of rape (Giacopessi & Dull, 1986).

Respectability is often intertwined with notions of sex role traditionality. It has also been found that if a woman behaves in a nontraditional and/or suggestive way this may affect males' perception of the justifiability of rape. For example, if a woman chooses to go to a man's apartment on a date rather than to a public place (i.e., a restaurant or a movie), this may be perceived as suggestive behavior by men. Another example of nontraditional behavior would be a woman taking the initiative and asking the man out for a date. Muehlenhard, Friedman, & Thomas (1985) presented male undergraduates with written vignettes about two hypothetical characters who were on a date. The vignettes manipulated who initiated the date (the man or

the woman) and where they went (a religious function, a movie, the man's apartment). The results indicated that rape was rated as more justifiable when the couple went to the man's apartment than to a religious function or a movie. Additionally, rape was also rated as more justifiable when the woman rather than the man initiated the date (unless they went to a religious function). Therefore, if a woman engages in certain nontraditional behaviors, such as asking a man out or going to his apartment, a man may see these behaviors as indicative of the woman wanting sex and may therefore see rape as more justifiable.

In addition to respectability, sexual provocativeness, and traditionality, the attractiveness of the victim and how much the woman tries to resist the rape also play a role in perceptions of rape victims. Deltz, Littman, & Bentley (1984) explored the effects of the physical attractiveness and resistance style of the rape victim on male and female mock jurors' social perceptions of the rape victims and rapists. They also investigated the influence of subjects' pretrial empathy toward rape victims and rapists on attributions of responsibility. Subjects were asked to attend experimental sessions in which they were given the Rape Empathy Scale which was designed to measure subjects' empathy toward the rape victim and toward the rapist in a heterosexual rape situation. They were also given one of six written rape vignettes which varied the physical attractiveness (attractive versus unattractive) and resistance style (passive, assertive, or aggressive) of the rape victim.

The results indicated that male subjects rated the psychological impact of the rape for the victim as greater when the victim was described as attractive than when she was described as unattractive. Female subjects did not differ in their ratings of the psychological impact of the rape for attractive and unattractive victims. Additionally, male subjects believed that the victim was more likely to have done something to have encouraged the rape, identified less with the victim, identified more with the rapist, and had less positive feelings about the rape victim than did female subjects. Main effects were also found for rape empathy. Subjects who scored

high on the Rape Empathy Scale experienced greater certainty about the rapist's guilt and attributed greater responsibility to him for the rape than did subjects who scored low on the Rape Empathy Scale. Similarly, high scoring subjects expressed more positive feelings about the rape victim and had greater identification with her and felt that the victim was less likely to have done something to encourage the rape. Additionally, the attributions of responsibility of subjects who empathized with the rape victim were not affected by levels of victim attractiveness or resistance, while subjects who did not empathize with the victim rated the unattractive victim or the woman who passively resisted the rape as more likely to have encouraged the rape than the attractive victim or the woman who aggressively resisted the rape. Therefore, Deitz et al. (1984) found that male subjects and subjects who exhibited low empathy toward the rape victim were more responsive to subtle manipulations of victim attractiveness and resistance than were females and subjects exhibiting high empathy toward the rape victim.

Lastly, the relationship between the victim and her assailant has also been found to have an effect on men's perceptions of rape victims. Krulowitz (1982) examined the effects of the circumstances of the assault and the relationship between the victim and assailant on subjects' perceptions of a rape victim. There were three levels of rape circumstances (outside blitz, home blitz, acquaintance rape). In the outside blitz case report, the victim indicated that she was attacked by a stranger in a parking lot. In the home blitz case report, the victim indicated that she was attacked by a stranger in her own home. Lastly, in the acquaintance rape case report, the victim indicated that she was attacked in her own home by her date. Subjects were then given a questionnaire regarding their perceptions of the victim.

The results indicated that there was a main effect for sex of subject. Women attributed more emotional upset to the victim than did men. Sex of subject was also found to interact with rape circumstances for attributions of victim upset. Men perceived a victim assaulted in her own home by an acquaintance as less upset than victims assaulted under the other two conditions.

Furthermore, men attributed less emotional upset to victims of either the home blitz or acquaintance rape than did women.

The results of the preceding studies indicate that characteristics of the victim such as respectability, sexual provocativeness, sex role traditionality, attractiveness and physical resistance toward the rapist all play an important role in shaping the attitudes of people toward the victim. Additionally, the relationship between the victim and her assailant also influences people's perceptions with a closer relationship between the victim and assailant resulting in more blame toward the rape victim. Unfortunately, many of these characteristics are beyond the victim's control and leave her open to blame and criticism.

Characteristics of the Male Perceiver

Not only do characteristics of the victim play a role in men's attitudes toward the victim, characteristics of the male perceiver also play a role. Some men may be more prone to view a rape victim sympathetically while others may be less sympathetic. For example, men are more likely to adopt the view of rape as violent if they themselves had been attacked or threatened or if they scored higher on the Bem Sex Role Inventory Femininity Scale (Tieger, 1981). Therefore, men who show more sympathy toward rape victims probably have had life experiences which engendered a more empathetic response to rape victims and who feel freer to express the feminine aspects of their own personality.

On the other hand, there is a population of men with favorable attitudes concerning the commission of rape (Tieger, 1981). These men have beliefs which tend to minimize the violent impact of rape on a victim. Additionally, they state a high likelihood of raping if they were assured that they could not get caught. The "high likelihood of rape" men blame the victim and sympathize more with the rapist than do men who would not rape a woman even if they knew they would not be punished (Tieger, 1981). These men may have a "macho personality" consisting of both violent and misogynistic attitudes. Mosher and Anderson (1986) had subjects

fill out a hypermasculinity inventory which is a measure of the macho personality consisting of these three components: callous sexual attitudes, the perception of violence as being manly, and the perception of danger as being exciting. Afterward, subjects listened through headphones to an audiotape of a male voice depicting a realistic rape which the subjects were told to imagine committing. The results indicated that the more macho men as revealed by their scores on the hypermasculinity scale compared to the less macho men were more sexually aroused by and experienced more positive and less negative affect while they imagined committing a rape. The macho men experienced significantly less disgust, anger, fear, distress, shame, and guilt while they imagined committing a rape than did less macho men.

Psychological Explanations

In addition to personality and life experience differences, there are psychological explanations concerning men's attitudes toward rape victims. Perhaps the most frequently cited attributional bias or error is called the fundamental attribution error which is the tendency of persons to underestimate the impact of situational factors and to overestimate the role of dispositional factors in controlling others' behavior (Jones, 1979). Jones and Nisbett (1971) proposed that actors and observers differ in their susceptibility to the fundamental attribution error. In other words, actors attribute their own behavioral choices to situational factors and constraints, while observers are likely to attribute the same choices to the actor's stable personality traits.

Jones and Nisbett (1971) offered several explanations for the actor-observer difference on the attribution of responsibility. They suggested that there are important differences in the perceptual and informational perspectives of the actors and observers. However, the more the observer takes the perspective of the actor, the more likely it is that the observer will make a situational attribution. Taking the perspective of the actor, and thereby making a situational attribution, should be facilitated when the observer empathizes with the actor.

It has been consistently shown that women exhibit greater empathy toward a rape victim than do men (Deltz et al., 1984; Deltz et al., 1984). Additionally, rape empathy correlates significantly with attributions of responsibility in rape situations. Individuals who have high levels of empathy toward rape victims attribute less responsibility for the crime to the victim and greater responsibility to the rapist than individuals who express less empathy toward the victims (Deltz et al., 1982). Furthermore, individuals who exhibit low empathy toward rape victims are more responsive to subtle manipulations of victim resistance and attractiveness than are individuals who exhibit high empathy toward rape victims. It appears that women empathize and identify more with the victim and assume the attributional perspective of the rape victim (the actor) to a greater extent than do men. However, men are less similar to the rape victim than women are and are therefore less likely to take the perspective of the victim. Because men maintain the perspective of the observer and are less empathetic with the female rape victim and since the perspective of the observer produces greater attribution to dispositional factors (Jones & Nisbett, 1976), males should attribute the rape to dispositional factors of the victim to a greater extent than do females. This may result in men blaming the rape victim more than women blame the victim.

From another perspective, males may be more harsh in their judgments of rape victims than females are in their judgments of rape victims due to defensive attribution on the part of males. According to Shaver (1970), defensive attribution is the making of attributions that avoid blame for those with whom we identify. Shaver had subjects listen to a recording of an interview with a stimulus person (perpetrator) who was responsible for an accident resulting in serious consequences for an innocent victim. The perpetrator in the story was either similar or dissimilar to the subjects. The results indicated that the more similar the subject was to the perpetrator the less the subject blamed the perpetrator.

These results have implications for males' and females' reactions toward a rape victim or

rapist. Men are more similar to a male rapist than to a female rape victim not only by virtue of the fact that they are the same sex but also because a male is more likely in the future to find himself in the role of rapist than in the role of rape victim. To defend himself against future blame for an accusation of rape, a man may attribute little blame to the rapist and blame the rape victim (his potential accuser in the future). Conversely, women who are not only the same sex as the rape victim but are also more likely to be in the position of being a rape victim rather than being a rapist, may attribute little blame toward the rape victim and blame the rapist. For a woman to blame a rape victim, she would be admitting the fact that she in the future should be held responsible if she were raped.

In summary, there is an entire constellation of factors that seem to influence men's perceptions and evaluations of rape victims, ranging from psychological biases to victim and perceiver characteristics to sociological explanations regarding our culture. Some of these explanations seem to reflect a more negative attitude toward rape victims, some a more positive attitude, while other explanations reflect the fact that men may have mixed attitudes depending upon their personality or other characteristics.

In any event, an effect-laden situation such as rape is predicted to strongly arouse men's ambivalence toward women as opposed to other less effect-laden situations such as robbery. To the extent that males are ambivalent about women, rape should arouse both sympathy and hostility simultaneously. There will be sympathy for the victim of a heinous crime, but also hostility for the "temptress" who probably maneuvered the man into behaving aggressively, so she could have sex without taking responsibility for the sex. This conflict will create inner tension because the man's self-image as a fair minded and sympathetic individual who is also discerning is under threat. The self-image cannot accommodate the simultaneous feelings of sympathy and hostility because the one feeling discredits the other feeling.

This conflict can lead to a variety of efforts at conflict-reduction (including psychological

withdrawal from the stimulus situation). However, if the situation forces the subject to evaluate the culpability of the victim, he will try to resolve the emotional conflict by reacting extremely sympathetically or extremely critically, depending on whether culpability can be perceived as high or low. Therefore, it is hypothesized that there is a correlation between ambivalence (relatively high scores on both the pro-women and anti-women attitude scales) and extremity of evaluations of a rape victim, when apparent culpability is manipulated experimentally.

Because of evidence demonstrating that issues such as perceived respectability, traditionality, resistance on the part of the victim, amount of force used during the rape, and the relationship between the victim and assailant have an impact on attitudes toward rape victims, these culpability factors were manipulated in the high blame versus low blame rape scenarios. More specifically, women who are perceived as being less respectable, less traditional, put up less physical resistance to the rape, do not receive physical injury, and know their assailant are blamed more for the rape (Weiner & Rinehart, 1986; Kanekar & Kolsawalla, 1981; Muehlenhard, Friedman, & Thomas, 1985; Deitz et al., 1984). Therefore, the high blame rape victim was portrayed in this study as being less respectable, less traditional, putting up less physical resistance to the rape, receiving less physical injury, and knowing her assailant; while the opposite characteristics and factors pertained to the low blame rape victim.

In the high and low blame robbery conditions, a similar strategy was used to develop the scenarios. However, it was hypothesized that intelligence may be as much of a factor if not more in relation to our attributions of blame toward robbery victims than is respectability. Therefore, the high blame robbery victim was portrayed as both less intelligent as well as less respectable compared to the low blame robbery victim. (Although the high blame rape victim was also portrayed as somewhat less intelligent and as less respectable than the low blame rape victim).

The Current Research

Overview of Experiment

In the present study male subjects filled out scales of positive and negative attitudes toward women. Then they were presented with an account of a crime perpetrated by a male against a female victim. The crime was either rape or robbery, and the victim was objectively either high or low in culpability. After reading the crime report, the subjects' rated the culpability of the victim and of the perpetrator, and were asked to indicate their empathy toward the victim.

Hypotheses

1 a) Ambivalence (relatively high scores on both the pro-women and anti-women scales) will be negatively correlated with victim blame and positively correlated with victim empathy in the low blame rape condition. That is, subjects who are relatively high on ambivalence should blame the victim less and empathize with her more in the low apparent blame rape condition than should subjects who are less ambivalent.

b) Neither the pro nor the anti scores alone will be related to subjects' blaming of the victim or empathy for the victim in the low blame rape condition.

c) Neither ambivalence nor the separate pro and anti scores will be correlated with blaming the criminal in the low blame rape condition (because these scores all refer to attitudes about women).

2 a) Ambivalence will be positively correlated with victim blame and negatively correlated with victim empathy in the high blame rape condition.

b) Neither the pro nor the anti scores alone will be related to victim blame or victim empathy in the high blame rape condition.

c) Neither the ambivalence score nor the separate pro and anti scores will be related to criminal blame in the high blame rape condition.

3 a) Ambivalence will not be correlated with victim blame or with victim empathy in the

low blame robbery condition. (No relations are expected because robbery is not as effect-laden a crime as rape and it is not a gender related crime.)

b) Neither the pro nor the anti scores alone will be related to victim blame or victim empathy in the low blame robbery condition.

c) Additionally, neither the ambivalence score nor the separate pro and anti scores will be related to criminal blame in the low blame robbery condition.

4a) Ambivalence will not be correlated with victim blame or with victim empathy in the high blame robbery condition.

b) Neither the pro nor the anti scores alone will be related to victim blame or victim empathy in the high blame robbery condition.

c) Lastly, neither the ambivalence score nor the pro or anti scores alone will be related to criminal blame in the high blame robbery condition.

2. METHOD

Construction of Pro and Anti Female Scales

Subjects were presented with 50 items believed to reflect positive and negative attitudes toward women. Based on the theoretical distinction between attitudes toward women in the domain of social issues and attitudes toward women in the domain of interpersonal relationships, two types of items were developed, profemale and antifemale. Because people are probably more accepting of gender equality in relation to social issues due to the growth of the women's movement than gender equality in relation to interpersonal relationships, which may touch on some fundamental values in our society which are more resistant to change, the items relating to social issues constituted the profemale items while the items relating to interpersonal relationships constituted the antifemale items. Additionally, positive stereotypes of women were incorporated as profemale items and negative stereotypes of women were incorporated as antifemale items.

The twenty-five profemale items consisted of 20 items relating to social issues. Subjects were asked to indicate their agreement and or disagreement regarding such issues as: portrayals of women in the media, job discrimination, employment opportunities for women, affirmative action policies toward women, women's economic power, the judgment accorded to women's work, etc. (see Appendix A). Some of the items relating to women's employment opportunities and affirmative action were adapted from Katz & Hess (1988) Pro-Black and Anti-Black Scales. A six-point response format was used (strongly agree to strongly disagree, with no neutral point), and scored from 1 to 6. All items were scored so that higher scores indicated greater agreement with the statement. Three of the profemale items relating to social issues were reverse coded.

Additionally, five of the 25 profemale items consisted of positive stereotypes concerning women. Subjects were asked to indicate their agreement/disagreement with the following

stereotypes: women are more nurturant than men, men are less tactful than women, women are more expressive than men, men are not as sensitive to others as women are sensitive to others, and women make better parents (see Appendix A).

The twenty-five antifemale items consisted of 15 items relating to interpersonal relationships with women. Subjects were asked to indicate their agreement/disagreement regarding such issues as: the appropriateness of a woman asking a man for a date, a woman's concern with being a wife and mother versus her concern over a career, the sharing of household responsibilities, women desiring not to marry, whether women should be responsible for birth control, etc. (see Appendix A). Three of the antifemale items relating to interpersonal relationships were reverse coded.

Additionally, 10 out of the 25 antifemale items consisted of negative stereotypes of women. Subjects were asked to indicate their agreement/disagreement with such stereotypes as: women are more emotional than men, women are less scientifically oriented than men, women are too demanding, women don't make up their minds easily, etc. (see Appendix A). Two of the antifemale items relating to negative stereotypes of women were reverse coded.

Subjects

Two hundred and fifty-six male undergraduates between the ages of 17 and 33 participated in the first questionnaire study. Ninety-five subjects were from the Brooklyn College subject pool and 161 subjects were canvassed from colleges in the New York area (Hunter, New York University, and Purchase). Subjects at Brooklyn College participated voluntarily in exchange for course credit. Subjects at the other colleges were approached by the experimenter and asked whether they would be willing to volunteer in a questionnaire study.

Procedure

Subjects were told that they would be participating in an anonymous study exploring men's attitudes. They were informed not to put their names or any other identifiable information on

the questionnaire and were then handed the 50 item scale.

Factor analysis

A principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation and internal consistency and item-total correlations strategy was used to cull items from the 50 item domain to represent the profemale and antifemale items. An exploratory principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation was done on the total pool of 50 items. An examination of the latent roots revealed two sizable factors followed by 12 smaller factors (roots= 9.09, 4.91, 1.93, 1.70, 1.66, 1.60, 1.45, 1.39, 1.32, 1.20, 1.17, 1.13, 1.10, 1.07). Using a loading criterion of .35 or higher, it was found that 15 of the 25 antifemale items loaded only on Factor 1 (13 anti items which loaded positively on the first factor & two reverse anti items which loaded negatively on the first factor). Also, two of the reverse pro items uniquely loaded on Factor 1. Factor 1 can best be conceptualized as a traditional sex-role scale (see Table 1).

For the second factor, 15 out of the 25 profemale items loaded on it. No antifemale items loaded on Factor 2. Factor 2 can best be conceptualized as an equal rights scale for women. An examination of the smaller factors revealed that these items also loaded on Factors 1 and 2 and that these factors were uninterpretable. Therefore, the results suggest that the pro and anti items constitute two separate dimensions (See Table 1). Two scales were derived after the factor analytic procedure, a 15 item antifemale/sex-role traditionality scale (the two reverse pro items that loaded on Factor 1 were eliminated) and a 14 item profemale/equal rights scale (a pro item explicitly dealing with rape was also eliminated). See Appendix B.

TABLE 1. Item Loadings on Major Factors

| Item | Factor 1 | Factor 2 |
|---|----------|----------|
| 39. Women are gaining too much economic power too quickly. * | .72 | .06 |
| 34. Women should be more concerned with becoming good wives and mothers than with desiring a professional career. | .71 | .06 |
| 29. Today women are not devoting enough time to their families. | .69 | .10 |
| 40. Because many women are more emotional than men, they are not suitable for certain types of jobs. | .67 | .19 |
| 49. Because women spend too much money, husbands should primarily be responsible for the finances in the family. | .67 | -.01 |
| 35. It is probably better for the relationship if the man is more sexually experienced than the woman. | .65 | .05 |
| 20. In their push for equal rights women have become too demanding. | .65 | .10 |
| 27. Most women are not able to make up their minds easily. | .64 | .14 |
| 13. Women who do not want at least one child are being selfish. | .59 | .06 |
| 46. Most women are too demanding in their relationships with men. | .59 | .19 |
| 24. There is too much media attention being paid to the problems that women face. * | .52 | -.07 |
| 22. Women often do not accept the responsibility that goes along with equality. | .52 | .17 |
| 12. A wife should be willing to move if her husband's job involves relocation to a new place. | .52 | -.01 |
| 21. Most women are not as adventurous as men. | .51 | .28 |
| 23. A preschool child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works full-time. | .46 | .09 |
| 9. A woman can live a full and happy life without ever marrying. | -.44 | .05 |
| 18. Women should not be expected to do the majority of the housework. | -.43 | .13 |
| 30. Too many women still lose out on jobs and promotions because they are women. | -.30 | .66 |
| 19. Women do not have the same employment opportunities that men do. | -.22 | .64 |
| 8. Most women still cannot rise to positions of power in the business world because of discrimination. | -.25 | .60 |
| 28. Most big corporations in America are not really interested in treating their male and female employees equally. | -.13 | .59 |
| 37. Movies often depict women in a negative way. | -.10 | .59 |
| 26. After being held back for so long, women deserve help in catching up. | -.23 | .52 |
| 45. Portrayals of women in the media are not fair to women. | -.31 | .49 |
| 5. Television commercials portray women in a stereotypical way. | -.23 | .49 |
| 10. Today women still do not earn as much money as most men do. | -.25 | .47 |
| 4. Less media attention is paid to female athletes in comparison to male athletes. | -.17 | .45 |
| 14. Most men are not as sensitive as women are to the feelings of others. | .22 | .42 |
| 41. Sometimes female job seekers should be given special consideration in hiring. | .14 | .41 |
| 44. Rape victims are not treated fairly by the criminal justice system. * | -.16 | .40 |
| 2. It's surprising that women do as well as they do, considering all of the obstacles that they face. | .11 | .40 |
| 50. It is likely that an article written by a woman will not be regarded as favorably as a comparable article written by a man. | -.20 | .38 |

*Reverse Pro items and rape item that was eliminated from final scale

Item analysis and reliabilities

The Pearson correlations between scores on each of the 15 individual anti items and the total score on all other antifemale items scale ranged from .42 to .70, all significant beyond the .01 level. Correlations between individual anti items and the total profemale scale ranged from -.02 to -.20. (All 15 items had a significant correlation with the total score on other items of the same type and a lower correlation with the total score on the items of the opposite type.) The item-total scale correlations for the sample are found in Appendix C. Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the resulting 15 item antifemale (sex-role traditionality) scale was .88.

The Pearson correlations between scores on the 14 individual pro items and the total profemale scale ranged from .36 to .67, all significant beyond the .01 level. Correlations between individual pro items and the total antifemale scale ranged from -.01 to .23. The item-total scale correlations for the sample are found in Appendix C. Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the resulting 14 item profemale (equal rights) scale was .81.

Additionally, the correlation between the 14 item profemale scale and the 15 item antifemale scale was -.11 further supporting the independence of these two scales.

Validity evidence

An additional sample of 54 undergraduate males from New York University and St. Peter's College were administered the resulting 29 item scale (15 anti items and 14 pro items) along with the shortened, 16 item version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (see Appendix D). These scales were administered to undergraduate males enrolled in sociology and history classes who were asked by their instructors whether they would like to participate in an anonymous and totally voluntary study. For the Marlowe-Crowne Scale and the profemale scale, $r(54) = -.13$, and for the Marlowe-Crowne and the antifemale scale $r(54) = .10$, indicating that subjects' responses to these two scales were not influenced by their attempt to portray themselves in a socially desirable way.

To establish the construct validity of these two scales the 29 item attitude questionnaire was administered to another sample of 76 undergraduates, 38 of whom were female and 38 of whom were male. Again, these were undergraduates at New York University and St. Peter's College who were enrolled in sociology and history classes who were asked by their instructors whether they would like to participate in an anonymous and totally voluntary study.

If the scales possess "construct validity", one should expect that known groups differ in response to the scales in a theoretically predictable manner. Therefore, women should score significantly higher on the pro scale than men do and women should score significantly lower on the anti scale than men score on the anti scale. The results indicated that women's scores ($M=57.24$) were significantly higher than men's scores ($M=46.84$) on the pro scale ($t(74) = -4.94, p < .001$). Conversely, women's scores ($M=38.71$) were significantly lower than men's scores ($M=50.84$) on the anti scale ($t(74) = 4.72, p < .001$). Therefore, each scale demonstrates the ability to differentiate between two known groups.

Experiment

Overview

In a 2 X 2 factorial design, subjects were first given the attitude questionnaire (along with filler items) and then assigned to one of four experimental conditions. Half of the subjects were randomly assigned to read a report of a rape while the other half of the subjects read a report of a robbery. Half the time the rape or robbery victim was portrayed as "blameworthy" and half the time as not blameworthy. After reading the crime reports, subjects answered questions concerning victim blame, empathy for the victim, and criminal blame.

Subjects

One hundred and twenty male undergraduates participated in the study. Ninety-five of the subjects were students at the City University of New York (Brooklyn College, LaGuardia College, and Hunter College) while twenty-five of the subjects were students at St. Peter's College. The

mean age of the subjects was 20.5 years old. The ethnic breakdown of the subjects was as follows. 65.8% white, 19.2% black, 9.2% Hispanic and 5.8% Asian. Subjects at Brooklyn College participated voluntarily in exchange for course credit. Subjects at the other colleges were enrolled in psychology classes and were asked by their instructors whether they would like to participate in an anonymous and totally voluntary study.

Procedure

Subjects were tested in groups ranging from two to ten (depending upon how many students signed up for the experiment or how many students there were in a class) and were instructed by a female graduate student that they would be participating in two separate studies. The first study was explained to the subjects as funded by the National Science Foundation, and designed to assess college students' attitudes toward various topics and groups. Subjects were told that they would be asked to indicate their agreement/disagreement with a variety of issues. They were also instructed to answer all of the statements and to reply as honestly as possible. The confidentiality of their responses was assured by the experimenter. The experimenter then told the subjects during the same experimental session that the second study was part of the experimenter's dissertation and concerned attitudes toward crime. Subjects were instructed that they were going to read a crime scenario involving a police officer interviewing a crime victim and answer some questions after reading the scenario. After the experimental session was completed, subjects were debriefed and thanked for their participation. Subjects were informed concerning the ambivalence hypothesis and were given an explanation as to why the nature of the study and the hypothesis had to be withheld from them until the end of the experimental session.

Attitude Questionnaire

Subjects were first presented with the 29 item questionnaire on attitudes about women,

along with 35 filler items incorporated into the scale. The filler items were used in an effort to disguise the purpose of the scale and make it appear to be a scale looking at attitudes toward various different issues and groups. Ten of the filler items concerned attitudes toward democrats and republicans. Another ten of the filler items concerned attitudes toward various professionals (doctors, lawyers, teachers). Five of the items asked subjects about attitudes toward Hispanics, while three of the filler items concerned attitudes toward Asians. Seven of the filler items concerned attitudes toward blacks adapted from the Katz and Hass (1988) racial attitude scales (see Appendix E)

Afterward subjects were presented with one out of four possible scenarios: high blame rape, low blame rape, high blame robbery, low blame robbery.

The Crime Scenarios

To insure greater experimental control, the demographic information (i.e., the victim's name, address and date of birth) as well as the name of the police officer and the description of the assailant were made identical in all four scenarios. The victim's name was listed as Nancy T. and her address was deleted. It was decided to give the victim only a last initial and to delete her address in order to make the scenarios appear more realistic and to appear to be protecting the identity of the victim. The victim's date of birth was listed as July 16, 1967 and the police officer interviewing her was named Officer Hartley. The assailant was described as being in his mid-twenties with blondish hair and brown eyes, about five foot ten, and of average build. Additionally, in the high blame robbery and the high blame rape conditions the occupation of the victim (a cashier) was the same, both victims did not resist the rape or robbery, and the victims received no physical bruises or injury. The same held true for the low blame robbery and the low blame rape conditions where the occupation of the victim (a college student) was the same and both received physical injury.

High blame rape condition. In the high blame rape condition the victim, Nancy T., stated that she was a 21 year old cashier at Alexander's Department Store. She proceeded to tell the officer that she went to a party and was sitting around and drinking for a couple of hours. She started talking to a man whom she had just met at the party and went back with him to his apartment. He became sexually aggressive and she told him "No". He then pushed her down on the couch and raped her. She indicated that she did not resist his attack and was "sort of drunk". Additionally, she indicated that there were no bruises on her body. The victim told the officer that the assailant's first name was Steve and she did not know his second name. He was described as being in his mid-twenties with blondish hair and brown eyes, about five foot ten, and of average build (see Appendix F).

Low blame rape condition. The low blame rape victim was portrayed as being more respectable and as exercising better judgment than the high blame rape victim. She was not drunk, not sexually provocative, did not go to a strange man's apartment, did not know her assailant, physically resisted his attack, and received bodily injury. The victim was a college student who was raped in a parking lot and received bodily injury from her assailant.

In the low blame rape condition the victim, Nancy T., stated that she was 21 years old and was a college student at New York University. She stated that she got out of class at nine-thirty at night and was walking to the parking lot when she heard footsteps behind her. She stated that she usually walked to the parking lot with someone else because it was dangerous but she didn't that night. As she approached her car, a man grabbed her from behind and put his hand over her mouth while holding a knife to her throat and told her not to scream. She tried to push his hand away from her throat and get away, but the assailant was stronger and cut her arm with his knife. She stated that she thought that the assailant was going to kill her. He then threw her into the car and her head hit the steering wheel and she could not move. The assailant then raped her

She was lying dazed for awhile but managed to cry out for help and a woman found her and called the police. Ms. T. indicated that in addition to being cut on the arm there were bruises on her head, neck, and shoulders. The victim stated that she did not know her assailant but described him as being in his mid-twenties with blondish hair and brown eyes, about five foot ten, and of average build. (see Appendix G).

High blame robbery condition. In the high blame robbery condition the victim, Nancy T., stated that she was a 21 year old cashier at Alexander's Department Store. She proceeded to tell the officer that she was waiting for a train at Grand Central Station when a man approached her claiming he had found a bag full of money. According to the victim, the man said that he would try to find a police officer and told her to hold the bag. He claimed that if he couldn't find a police officer, he would return and split the money with her. Ms. T. went on to state that she should have known that the story sounded fishy, but the thought of getting half of the money was so "tempting". The victim reported that after the man handed Ms. T. the bag, she put down her purse. He then left and she realized that he had stolen her bag. She also stated that she was not physically hurt. Additionally, she described the robber as being in his mid-twenties with blondish hair and brown eyes, about five foot ten, and of average build (see Appendix H).

Low blame robbery condition. In the low blame robbery condition the victim, Nancy T., stated that she was 21 years old and was a college student at New York University. She stated that she went to the bank to cash a check, and that while at the bank she started to count her money. When she finished counting her money, she had noticed that a man was staring at her. Ms. T. went on to say that she probably shouldn't have counted her money out in the open but did so because she was in a hurry. After she left the bank and started crossing the street, someone knocked her to the ground and stole her purse. She stated that she recognized the man who knocked her down as the man from the bank. Ms. T. claimed that she was physically hurt when

the robber knocked her to the ground. She also bruised her knees badly as she fell. The assailant was described as being in his mid-twenties with blondish hair and brown eyes, about five foot ten, and of average build. (see Appendix I)

Dependent Measures

In order to assess subjects' attributions of blame toward the victim and criminal and empathy toward the victim, a 13 item Likert-type scale was administered to the subjects at the end of the scenario that they had read (see Appendix J & K). The statements were chosen to reflect evaluation along the a priori dimensions of perceived victim blame, perceived criminal blame, empathy, perceived intelligence, and perceived respectability. Each of the items were scored on a six point scale ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 6=strongly agree, with no neutral point. The items used to tap victim blame, criminal blame, victim empathy, perceived intelligence of the victim, and perceived respectability of the victim were as follows:

Item 1. (General victim blame)

The victim is at least partially responsible for what happened to her.

Item 2. (General criminal blame)

The rapist/robber should be given the maximum jail sentence if caught and convicted.

Item 3. (Characterological victim blame 1)

The victim may have prevented the rape/robbery by changing some aspect of her character or personality.

Item 4. (Characterological criminal blame)

The rapist/robber is a cold-blooded criminal.

Item 5. (Behavioral criminal blame)

The rapist/robber behaved in a reckless way.

Item 6. (Behavioral victim blame 1)

The victim may have prevented the rape/robbery by changing some aspect of her behavior.

Item 7. (Characterological victim blame 2)

The victim is a somewhat careless person.

Item 8. (Behavioral victim blame 2)

The victim should have known better than to behave as she did.

Item 9. (Perception of victim's intelligence)

The victim seems like an intelligent person.

Item 10. (Perception of victim's respectability)

The victim seems like a very respectable person.

Item 11. (Victim empathy 1)

I feel sympathy for the victim.

Item 12. (Victim empathy 2)

The victim deserves all the help and understanding that she can get.

Item 13. (Victim empathy 3)

The victim did not deserve what happened to her

3. RESULTS

Pro and Anti-Women Scales

It was hypothesized that attitudes toward women in the domain of social issues would be independent from attitudes toward women in the domain of interpersonal relationships. The Product Moment correlation between the total pro and total anti scores for this sample of 120 subjects was $-.25, p < .01$. However, in the prior administration of this scale using a sample of 256 subjects the pro and anti scales were found to be uncorrelated (the correlation for the prior sample as discussed earlier was $-.11$).

The item-total correlations for this sample are shown in Appendix L. The most notable difference between this pattern of item-total correlations and the pattern found in the earlier sample (see Appendix C) lies with some of the pro items. In this sample, pro items 1 and 2 do not correlate strongly with either scale. Item pro 5 correlates more strongly with the total anti score than with the total pro score. Lastly, item pro 12 correlates about equally well with both the total pro and total anti scores. Apart from these differences, the pattern of correlations for both samples appears to be similar.

Internal consistency as measured by Cronbach's alpha for the profemale scale was $.78$ and for the antifemale scale was $.80$ thus demonstrating internal consistency. (In the original sample discussed earlier, the alpha for the profemale/equal rights scale was $.81$ and for the antifemale/traditionality scale was $.88$).

Experimental Results

Reliability of Blame and Empathy Measures

The reliability of the five statements used to assess subjects' perceptions of victim blame (two characterological measures of victim blame, two behavioral measures of victim blame, and one general measure of victim blame) was $.87$ as measured by Cronbach's coefficient alpha.

Furthermore, the reliability of the three statements used to assess perceptions of criminal blame (one characterological measure of criminal blame, one behavioral measure of criminal blame, and one general measure of criminal blame) was .76. Lastly, the reliability of the three statements used to assess victim empathy was .79. Because the items relating to victim blame, criminal blame, and victim empathy were found to be internally consistent, they were combined to produce three composite scores (a victim blame composite score, a criminal blame composite score, and a victim empathy composite score) to test all of the experimental hypotheses.

Perception of Victim Checks

In order to assess the efficacy of the blame manipulations, the data were analyzed using a 2X2 analysis of variance, with two levels of victim blame (high vs. low) and two types of crime (rape vs. robbery). The results indicated that there was a significant main effect for blame on the perception of the victim's intelligence, $F(1,116)=45.42, p<.000$ (see Table 2). Subjects perceived victims in the high blame conditions as significantly less intelligent than victims in the low blame conditions. Additionally, there was also a significant main effect for blame on the perception of the victim's respectability, $F(1,116)=58.52, p<.000$. Subjects perceived victims in the high blame conditions as significantly less respectable than victims in the low blame conditions. Therefore, the desired perceptions of the victims were achieved in the high and low blame conditions.

Additionally if the manipulations were successful, then subjects should blame the victims more and the criminals less in the high blame conditions (where the victim is less respectable) than in the low blame conditions. These results were found. On all individual measures of victim blame, on a net victim blame score (composed of the standardized victim blame composite score minus the standardized criminal blame composite score), as well as on a combined total victim blame composite measure (composed of two measures of characterological victim blame,

TABLE 2. Mean Attribution of Blame and Empathy Ratings

| Blame & Empathy Ratings | Experimental Conditions | | | | Main Effect- Blame | Main Effect- Crime | Blame X Crime |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | Low Blame Rape | Low Blame Robbery | High Blame Rape | High Blame Robbery | | | |
| Composite Victim Blame | 12.30 | 17.63 | 21.93 | 24.67 | 103.46*** | 24.24*** | 2.52 |
| Net Victim Blame | -3.83 | 4.83 | 8.60 | 14.80 | 114.63*** | 50.49*** | 1.39 |
| Composite Victim Empathy | 17.23 | 14.50 | 14.77 | 11.53 | 33.11*** | 39.93*** | .28 |
| Composite Criminal Blame | 16.13 | 12.80 | 13.33 | 9.87 | 23.78*** | 33.46*** | .01 |
| General Victim Blame | 1.97 | 3.47 | 4.67 | 5.10 | 99.74*** | 19.85*** | 6.04** |
| Character Victim Blame 1 | 1.97 | 2.97 | 3.47 | 4.67 | 40.85*** | 19.31*** | .16 |
| Character Victim Blame 2 | 2.83 | 3.60 | 4.57 | 5.03 | 42.41*** | 6.43*** | .38 |
| Behavior Victim Blame 1 | 3.13 | 4.13 | 4.97 | 5.13 | 40.29*** | 6.83*** | 3.49* |
| Behavior Victim Blame 2 | 2.40 | 3.47 | 4.27 | 4.73 | 43.49*** | 10.42*** | 1.60 |
| Victim Empathy 1 | 5.63 | 4.60 | 4.73 | 3.47 | 20.50*** | 26.22*** | .27 |
| Victim Empathy 2 | 5.73 | 4.80 | 5.00 | 3.80 | 19.58*** | 29.67*** | .46 |
| Victim Empathy 3 | 5.87 | 5.10 | 5.03 | 4.27 | 19.03*** | 16.11*** | .01 |
| General Criminal Blame | 5.60 | 4.77 | 4.43 | 4.07 | 13.55*** | 5.60** | .85 |
| Character Criminal Blame | 5.13 | 3.60 | 3.93 | 2.80 | 13.74*** | 24.42*** | .55 |
| Behavior Criminal Blame | 5.40 | 4.43 | 4.97 | 3.00 | 16.34*** | 40.35*** | 4.69** |
| Intelligence Check | 4.67 | 4.27 | 3.00 | 2.93 | 45.42*** | 1.10 | .56 |
| Respectability Check | 4.47 | 4.47 | 3.10 | 2.83 | 58.52*** | .46 | .46 |

Note: The higher the score, the greater the blame or empathy.

*p<.10; **p<.05; ***p<.01

two measures of behavioral victim blame, and one general victim blame measure), victims were blamed significantly more in the high blame than in the low blame conditions, $F(1,116)=103.46, p<.000$ (see Table 2 for mean scores). Additionally, on all individual measures of criminal blame as well as on a combined total criminal blame composite measure (consisting of one measure of characterological criminal blame, one measure of behavioral criminal blame, and one general criminal blame measure), criminals were blamed significantly less in the high blame conditions (where the victim is less respectable) than in the low blame conditions, $F(1,116)=23.78, p<.000$. Lastly, on all individual measures of victim empathy as well as on a combined total victim empathy composite score, victims were empathized with significantly more in the low blame conditions, $F(1,116)=33.11, p<.000$. Therefore, the manipulations were proven successful in the study.

Additionally, a significant main effect for crime was found on all attributions of blame toward victims and criminals and on all measures of victim empathy. On all individual measures of victim blame, on the net victim blame score, as well as on a combined total victim blame composite score, robbery victims were blamed significantly more than rape victims, $F(1,116)=24.24, p<.000$ as shown in Table 2. On all individual measures of criminal blame as well as on a combined total criminal blame composite score, rapists were blamed significantly more than robbers, $F(1,116)=33.46, p<.000$. Lastly, on all individual measures of empathy as well as on a combined total empathy composite score significantly more empathy was given to the rape than the robbery victims, $F(1,116)=39.93, p<.000$. No interactions between blame and crime were found on attributions of blame toward the victim or criminal or on victim empathy on any of the composite measures. Therefore, it seems that rape victims are viewed less punitively than robbery victims and rapists are held more responsible than robbers for the commission of their crime.

Test of Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 states that ambivalence will be negatively correlated with victim blame and positively correlated with victim empathy in the low blame rape condition. An ambivalence score was computed by converting the pro scale and the anti scale respectively into standardized scales. To make the standardized scores all positive, with a distribution with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10, the Z score for the pro scale and the Z score for the anti scale was multiplied by 10 and a constant (50) was added to this number. Then the transformed pro and anti scores were multiplied to yield an ambivalence score.

As shown in Table 3, Pearson correlations were computed between ambivalence scores and measures of victim blame and victim empathy in the low blame rape condition. The results indicate that ambivalence was significantly positively, not negatively, correlated with the victim blame composite score, $r(30) = .40, p < .03$. That is, subjects who were higher on ambivalence toward women blamed the rape victim more in the low blame rape condition than subjects who were less ambivalent toward women. Looking at the individual measures of victim blame, the correlation between ambivalence and victim blame is much stronger for the general and characterological measures of victim blame than for the behavioral measures of victim blame. The correlations between ambivalence and the general and two characterological measures of victim blame are .53, .41, & .46 respectively (all $p < .05$). Additionally, a net victim blame score was computed (composed of the standardized victim blame composite score minus the standardized criminal blame composite score) indicating that ambivalence was positively correlated with the net victim blame score, $r(30) = .59, p < .001$.

On the other hand, ambivalence was negatively, not positively, correlated with the victim empathy composite score although this correlation did not reach statistical significance. That is, subjects who were more ambivalent tended to empathize less with the low blame rape victim

TABLE 3. Low Blame Rape Correlations for Scales and Ratings^a

| Blame & Empathy Ratings | Ambivalence- Rating Correlation | Pro Scale- Rating Correlation | Anti Scale- Rating Correlation | (Pro-Anti)- Rating Correlation |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Victim Blame Composite Score | .40** | .11 | .42** | -.22 |
| Net Victim Blame | .59*** | .34* | .43** | -.06 |
| Victim Empathy Composite Score | -.19 | -.01 | -.25 | .17 |
| Criminal Blame Composite Score | -.56*** | -.45*** | -.27 | -.13 |
| General Victim Blame | .53*** | .18 | .51*** | -.24 |
| Characterological Victim Blame 1 | .41** | .11 | .49*** | -.27 |
| Characterological Victim Blame 2 | .46*** | .34* | .33* | .01 |
| Behavioral Victim Blame 1 | .02 | -.14 | .11 | -.17 |
| Behavioral Victim Blame 2 | .11 | -.09 | .18 | -.19 |
| Victim Empathy 1 | -.19 | -.04 | -.21 | .12 |
| Victim Empathy 2 | -.06 | .12 | -.23 | .24 |
| Victim Empathy 3 | -.28 | -.14 | -.20 | .04 |
| General Criminal Blame | -.38** | -.31* | -.18 | -.10 |
| Characterological Criminal Blame | -.55*** | -.45*** | -.28 | -.12 |
| Behavioral Criminal Blame | -.55*** | -.44** | -.26 | -.12 |

Note. ^a n=30

*p<.10; **p<.05; ***p<.01 (all tests are two-tailed).

than did subjects who were less ambivalent. Therefore, the ambivalence prediction was disconfirmed in the low blame rape condition with ambivalence being significantly positively correlated with victim blame and somewhat negatively correlated with victim empathy.

Hypothesis 1 b states the neither the pro/equal rights nor the anti/traditionality scores alone will be correlated with victim blame or victim empathy in the low blame rape condition. The results, as shown in Table 3, indicate that the pro/equal rights score was not significantly correlated with the victim blame composite score, nor was it correlated with the victim empathy composite score, although there was a trend for the pro/equal rights score to be positively correlated with the net victim blame score, $r(30) = .34, p < .06$.

However, the anti/traditionality score was significantly positively correlated with the victim blame composite score, $r(30) = .42, p < .02$, and with the net victim blame score, $r(30) = .43, p < .02$. In other words, the higher the subject's anti/traditionality score the more he blamed the low blame rape victim. Examining the individual measures of victim blame, there is a similar pattern of correlations to the correlations between ambivalence and the individual measures of victim blame. That is, the correlation between the anti/traditionality score and victim blame is much stronger for the general and characterological measures of victim blame than for the behavioral measures of victim blame. The correlations between the anti/traditionality score and the general and two characterological measures of victim blame are .51, .49, & .33 respectively as shown in Table 3 (all $p < .10$). Additionally, the anti/traditionality score (like the ambivalence score) shows a low negative correlation with the victim empathy composite score although this correlation did not reach statistical significance. In other words, the higher the subject's anti/traditionality score the less he tended to empathize with the low blame rape victim. Therefore, hypothesis 1 b was only partially confirmed due to the unexpected correlation between the anti/traditionality score and victim blame.

Hypothesis 1 c states that neither ambivalence nor the pro/equal rights or anti/traditionality scores alone will be correlated with criminal blame in the low blame rape condition. The results, as shown in Table 3, indicate that ambivalence was significantly negatively correlated with the criminal blame composite score, $r(30) = -.56, p < .001$. Additionally, the pro/equal rights score was significantly negatively correlated with the criminal blame composite score, $r(30) = -.45, p < .01$. The anti/traditionality score was also slightly negatively correlated with the criminal blame composite score although not significantly so. Therefore, hypothesis 1 c was only partially confirmed due to the unexpected correlation between the ambivalence score and criminal blame and between the pro/equal rights score and criminal blame in the low blame rape condition.

Therefore, the first hypothesis was mostly disconfirmed. Instead of ambivalence being negatively correlated with victim blame and positively correlated with victim empathy, the opposite results occurred. Subjects who were higher on ambivalence blamed the low blame rape victim more and showed a slight tendency to empathize with her less than were subjects who were lower on ambivalence toward women. An unexpected, but similar, pattern of correlations was found between the anti/traditionality score and victim blame and victim empathy (the anti/traditionality score was significantly positively correlated with victim blame and slightly negatively correlated with victim empathy). Lastly, both the ambivalence score and the pro/equal rights score were found to be significantly negatively correlated with criminal blame despite the hypothesis suggesting that they should be uncorrelated.

Other Findings-Low Blame Rape Condition

Correlations were also computed between measures of blame and empathy, respectively, and the additive score (the standardized total pro score minus the standardized total anti score) in the low blame rape condition, although no predictions were made concerning the nature of these

correlations. Correlations were made between the additive score and blame and empathy ratings to test whether a unidimensional net favorability score would be more predictive of evaluations of victims than would be the other attitude scores. The results indicated, as shown in Table 3, that the additive score was not significantly correlated with any measures of victim blame, victim empathy, or criminal blame.

Additionally, the complete matrix of intercorrelations for the scales and the composite and net ratings in the low blame rape condition is found in Appendix M. As shown in Appendix M, the pro/equal rights score was not significantly correlated with the anti/traditionality score in the low blame rape condition, $r(30) = -.02, p < .93$.

Test of Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 a states that ambivalence will be positively correlated with victim blame and negatively correlated with victim empathy in the high blame rape condition. The results, as shown in Table 4, indicate that ambivalence is not significantly correlated with any of the victim blame scores nor with any of the victim empathy scores. Therefore, the ambivalence prediction was disconfirmed in the high blame rape condition.

Hypothesis 2 b states that neither the pro/equal rights nor the anti/traditionality scores alone will be correlated with victim blame or victim empathy in the high blame rape condition. As shown in Table 4, the results confirmed the prediction.

Hypothesis 2 c states that neither the ambivalence score nor the pro/equal rights or anti/traditionality scores alone will be related to attributions of criminal blame in the high blame rape condition. The results were found to confirm this hypothesis.

Therefore, contrary to the hypotheses the results for the high blame rape condition failed to demonstrate any significant correlations between ambivalence, pro/equal rights scores, anti/traditionality scores, and measures of victim blame, victim empathy, and criminal blame.

TABLE 4. High Blame Rape Correlations for Scales and Ratings^a

| Blame & Empathy Ratings | Ambivalence- Rating Correlation | Pro Scale- Rating Correlation | Anti Scale- Rating Correlation | (Pro-Anti)- Rating Correlation |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Victim Blame Composite Score | .04 | .06 | -.01 | .04 |
| Net Victim Blame | -.12 | .01 | -.09 | .06 |
| Victim Empathy Composite Score | -.14 | .02 | -.13 | .09 |
| Criminal Blame Composite Score | .20 | .05 | .11 | -.04 |
| General Victim Blame | -.03 | .13 | -.16 | .17 |
| Characterological Victim Blame 1 | .30 | .08 | .22 | -.07 |
| Characterological Victim Blame 2 | -.06 | .04 | -.09 | .07 |
| Behavioral Victim Blame 1 | -.28 | -.18 | -.08 | -.05 |
| Behavioral Victim Blame 2 | .07 | .07 | -.01 | .04 |
| Victim Empathy 1 | .12 | .02 | .11 | -.05 |
| Victim Empathy 2 | -.12 | .22 | -.32* | .30* |
| Victim Empathy 3 | -.30 | -.14 | -.12 | -.01 |
| General Criminal Blame | -.07 | -.10 | .01 | -.06 |
| Characterological Criminal Blame | .22 | -.08 | .22 | -.17 |
| Behavioral Criminal Blame | .26 | .25 | .01 | .13 |

Note. ^an=30

*p<.10; **p<.05; ***p<.01 (all tests are two-tailed).

These results disconfirmed the major hypothesis that subjects who are high on ambivalence toward women will blame the high blame rape victim more and empathize with her less than subjects who are lower on ambivalence toward women.

Other Findings-High Blame Rape Condition

Measures of blame and empathy were also correlated with the additive score for the high blame rape condition, as shown in Table 4. No predictions were made concerning the relationship between the additive score and blame and empathy. The results indicated that the additive score was not significantly correlated with any composite measures of victim blame, victim empathy, or criminal blame.

The complete matrix of intercorrelations for the scales and the composite and net ratings in the high blame rape condition is found in Appendix N. In the high blame rape condition the pro/equal rights score was found to be significantly negatively correlated with the anti/traditionality score, $r(30) = -.57, p < .001$, as shown in Appendix N.

Test of Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3a states that ambivalence will not be correlated with victim blame or with victim empathy in the low blame robbery condition. This prediction was confirmed as shown in Table 5. The results showed that ambivalence was not significantly correlated with the victim blame composite score, the net victim blame score, nor was it correlated with the victim empathy composite score.

Hypothesis 3 b states that neither the pro/equal rights nor the anti/traditionality scores alone will be correlated with victim blame or victim empathy in the low blame robbery condition. As shown in Table 5, the pro/equal rights score was not correlated with the victim blame composite score, the net victim blame score, nor with the victim empathy composite score. The anti/traditionality score was also not found to be significantly correlated with the

TABLE 5. Low Blame Robbery Correlations for Scales and Ratings^a

| Blame & Empathy Ratings | Ambivalence- Rating Correlation | Pro Scale- Rating Correlation | Anti Scale- Rating Correlation | (Pro-Anti)- Rating Correlation |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Victim Blame Composite Score | .11 | -.09 | .24 | -.21 |
| Net Victim Blame | .23 | -.10 | .41** | -.33* |
| Victim Empathy Composite Score | -.06 | .25 | -.33* | .38** |
| Criminal Blame Composite Score | -.20 | .05 | -.33* | .25 |
| General Victim Blame | -.10 | -.09 | -.01 | -.05 |
| Characterological Victim Blame 1 | .01 | -.18 | .22 | -.26 |
| Characterological Victim Blame 2 | .22 | .04 | .21 | -.11 |
| Behavioral Victim Blame 1 | .05 | .11 | .01 | .06 |
| Behavioral Victim Blame 2 | .18 | -.14 | .34* | -.31* |
| Victim Empathy 1 | -.10 | .12 | -.24 | .23 |
| Victim Empathy 2 | -.08 | .25 | -.34* | .38** |
| Victim Empathy 3 | .04 | .29 | -.26 | .35* |
| General Criminal Blame | -.46*** | -.23 | -.36** | .08 |
| Characterological Criminal Blame | -.15 | -.02 | -.16 | .09 |
| Behavioral Criminal Blame | .27 | .46*** | -.18 | .41** |

Note. ^a n=30

*p<.10; **p<.05; ***p<.01 (all tests are two-tailed).

victim blame composite score. However, the anti/traditionality score was significantly positively correlated with the net victim blame score, $r(30) = .41, p < .03$. Additionally, there was a trend for the anti/traditionality score to be negatively correlated with the victim empathy composite score, $r(30) = -.33, p < .07$. Therefore, hypothesis 3 b was confirmed except for the positive correlation between the anti/traditionality score and the net victim blame score and the trend for the anti/traditionality score to be negatively correlated with the victim empathy composite score.

Hypothesis 3 c states that neither ambivalence nor the pro/equal rights or anti/traditionality scores alone will be correlated with criminal blame in the low blame robbery condition. Ambivalence was not found to be correlated with the criminal blame composite score, nor was the pro/equal rights score found to be correlated with the criminal blame composite score. However, there was a trend for the anti/traditionality score to be negatively correlated with the criminal blame composite score, $r(30) = -.33, p < .07$. Therefore, hypothesis 3 c was confirmed except for the trend for the anti/traditionality score to be negatively correlated with the criminal blame score.

Therefore, the results for the low blame robbery condition largely confirmed the prediction that ambivalent attitudes, or pro/equal rights scores or anti/traditionality scores alone will not be related to evaluations of victim blame, victim empathy, or criminal blame with a low blame robbery victim. However, there was a trend for people with higher anti/traditionality scores to empathize less with the low blame robbery victim and blame the criminal in this condition to a lesser degree than those with lower anti/traditionality scores. Additionally, the anti/traditionality score was significantly positively correlated with the net victim blame score (although it was not significantly correlated with the victim blame composite score or with most individual measures of victim blame).

Other Findings-Low Blame Robbery Condition

Measures of blame and empathy were also correlated with the additive score for the low blame robbery condition, as shown in Table 5, although no predictions were made concerning the relationship between the additive score and blame and empathy. The results indicated that the additive score was not significantly correlated with either the victim blame composite score, nor with the criminal blame composite score. However, the additive score was significantly positively correlated with the victim empathy composite score, $r(30)=.38, p<.04$. There was also a trend for the additive score to be negatively correlated with the net victim blame score, $r(30)=-.33, p<.08$.

The complete matrix of intercorrelations for the scales and composite and net ratings in the low blame robbery condition is found in Appendix O. As shown in Appendix O, the pro/equal rights score was not significantly correlated with the anti/traditionality score in the low blame robbery condition, $r(30)=-.21, p<.26$.

Test of Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 a states that ambivalence will not be correlated with victim blame or with victim empathy in the high blame robbery condition. This prediction was confirmed as shown in Table 6. The results show that ambivalence was not significantly correlated with the victim blame composite score, the net victim blame score, nor with the victim empathy composite score.

Hypothesis 4 b states that neither the pro/equal rights nor the anti/traditionality scores alone will be correlated with victim blame or victim empathy in the high blame robbery condition. The results indicated that there was a trend for the pro/equal rights score to be somewhat positively correlated with the victim blame composite score, $r(30)=.35, p<.06$, and to be significantly positively correlated with the net victim blame score, $r(30)=.47, p<.01$.

TABLE 6. High Blame Robbery Correlations for Scales and Ratings^a

| Blame & Empathy Ratings | Ambivalence- Rating Correlation | Pro Scale- Rating Correlation | Anti Scale- Rating Correlation | (Pro-Anti)- Rating Correlation |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Victim Blame Composite Score | .27 | .35* | .06 | .19 |
| Net Victim Blame | .11 | .47*** | -.28 | .49*** |
| Victim Empathy Composite Score | .03 | .17 | -.20 | .24 |
| Criminal Blame Composite Score | .10 | -.35* | .48*** | -.54*** |
| General Victim Blame | -.07 | .26 | -.30 | .36** |
| Characterological Victim Blame 1 | .32* | .44** | -.01 | .29 |
| Characterological Victim Blame 2 | .26 | .25 | .13 | .08 |
| Behavioral Victim Blame 1 | -.03 | -.06 | .05 | -.07 |
| Behavioral Victim Blame 2 | .35* | .20 | .29 | -.06 |
| Victim Empathy 1 | .32* | .28 | .10 | .12 |
| Victim Empathy 2 | -.24 | .10 | -.43** | .35* |
| Victim Empathy 3 | -.07 | -.03 | -.14 | .07 |
| General Criminal Blame | -.01 | -.33* | .34* | -.43** |
| Characterological Criminal Blame | .13 | -.35* | .46*** | -.52*** |
| Behavioral Criminal Blame | .13 | -.15 | .35* | -.32* |

Note. ^a n=30

*p<.10; **p<.05; ***p<.01 (all tests are two-tailed).

However, the pro/equal rights score was not correlated with the victim empathy composite score. Lastly, the anti/traditionality score was not significantly correlated with the victim blame composite score, the net victim blame score, nor with the victim empathy composite score. Therefore, the results largely confirm hypothesis 3 b except for the trend for the pro/equal rights score to be positively correlated with the victim blame composite score and significantly positively correlated with the net victim blame score.

Hypothesis 4 c states that neither the ambivalence nor the pro/equal rights or the anti/traditionality scores alone will be correlated with criminal blame in the high blame robbery condition. As shown in Table 6, ambivalence was not found to be significantly correlated with the criminal blame composite score. However, there was a trend showing that the pro/equal rights score was negatively correlated with criminal blame in the high blame robbery condition, $r(30) = -.35, p < .06$. Lastly, the anti/traditionality score was found to be significantly positively correlated with criminal blame in this condition, $r(30) = .48, p < .01$. Therefore, hypothesis 4c was only partially confirmed due to the unexpected trend for the pro/equal rights score to be negatively correlated with criminal blame and the significant positive correlation between the anti/traditionality score and criminal blame in the high blame robbery condition.

Therefore, the results for the high blame robbery condition confirmed the prediction that ambivalent attitudes toward women will not influence victim blame, victim empathy, or criminal blame in the high blame robbery condition. However, there was an unexpected trend for the pro/equal rights score to be positively correlated with the victim blame composite score and negatively correlated with the criminal blame composite score. Additionally, there was a significant positive correlation between the pro/equal rights score and the net victim blame score. Therefore, subjects with a high pro/equal rights score tended to blame the victim more

and the criminal less in the high blame robbery condition. Lastly, unexpectedly the anti/traditionality score was found to be significantly positively correlated with criminal blame in the high blame robbery condition.

Other Findings-High Blame Robbery Condition

Measures of blame and empathy were also correlated with the additive score for the high blame robbery condition, as shown in Table 6. The results indicated that the additive score was not significantly correlated with either the victim blame composite score or with the victim empathy composite score. However, the additive score was significantly positively correlated with the net victim blame score, $r(30)=.49, p<.01$, and significantly negatively correlated with the criminal blame composite score, $r(30)=-.54, p<.002$.

The complete matrix of intercorrelations for the scales and composite and net ratings in the high blame robbery condition is found in Appendix P. As shown in Appendix P, the pro/equal rights score was not significantly correlated with the anti/traditionality score in the high blame robbery condition, $r(30)=-.20, p<.29$.

4. DISCUSSION

This research first developed a scale to measure men's ambivalence toward women. Previous research had taken a unidimensional approach to the topic of how men viewed women. This study viewed men's attitudes as not simply positive or negative toward women, but as having both positive as well as negative components. It was hypothesized that men's attitudes toward women in the domain of social issues would be independent from men's attitudes toward women in the domain of interpersonal relationships. For example, men can believe that women should get equal pay for equal work and at the same time believe that women should primarily be responsible for housekeeping and childrearing. The results showed in the original validation study that these attitudes were uncorrelated ($-.11$). However, in the experiment, these attitudes were found to be negatively correlated ($-.25$). Although this correlation reached statistical significance, the correlation itself is still not very high. Only in the high blame rape condition were the pro/equal rights and anti/traditionality attitudes found to be significantly correlated. Therefore, one can tentatively conclude that while these attitudes may tend to be somewhat negatively correlated in some samples they can also function independently.

The scales developed were found to be internally consistent, uncorrelated with the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale, and differentiated between known groups (women scored higher on the pro/equal rights scale and lower on the anti/traditionality scale than did men). The advantage of having two scales is that sometimes the pro/equal rights scale is predictive of evaluations of female victims while sometimes the anti/traditionality scale is predictive of evaluations of female victims. That is, the results show that these scales tend to function independently and sometimes one score is more predictive of evaluations of female victims than is the other score.

The results of this study do not confirm the major hypotheses. Post hoc tests done on items

that most clearly met the psychometric criteria (items with a significant and higher correlation with the total score on other items of the same type and a low correlation with the total score on items of the opposite type) yielded the same results. It was predicted that ambivalence would be negatively correlated with victim blame and positively correlated with victim empathy in the low blame rape condition. The results indicated that ambivalence was significantly positively $r(30) = .40, p < .03$, not negatively, correlated with victim blame and somewhat negatively $r(30) = -.19, p < .32$, not positively, correlated with victim empathy in the low blame rape condition. However, the ambivalence score was significantly correlated only with the general and characterological measures of victim blame and not the behavioral measures. Therefore, these results can be considered a significant disconfirmation of the hypothesis since the signs of the two correlations are in directions opposite to the prediction.

Secondly, it was predicted that neither the pro/equal rights nor the anti/traditionality scores alone would affect victim blame or victim empathy in the low blame rape condition. This hypothesis was only partially confirmed with the pro/equal rights scale being uncorrelated with both the victim blame composite score and the victim empathy composite score. However, an unexpected, but similar pattern of correlations was found between the anti/traditionality score and victim blame and victim empathy as was found between the ambivalence score and victim blame and victim empathy (the anti/traditionality score was significantly positively correlated with victim blame, $r(30) = .42, p < .02$, and somewhat negatively correlated with victim empathy, $r(30) = -.25, p < .18$). Like the ambivalence score, the anti/traditionality score was significantly correlated with only the general and characterological measures of victim blame and not the behavioral measures.

In the low blame rape condition, an innocent victim is raped by a stranger in a parking lot and receives bodily injury. Her behavior did not contribute to her victimization and none of the

scores (the pro, anti, or ambivalence) were correlated with the measures of behavioral victim blame. The more ambivalent the subject or the higher the subject's anti/traditionality score, the more the subject blamed the victim's character. These results may be explained by what Lerner (1971) refers to as the just world theory, which states that there is a pervasive tendency for people to blame victims for their fates. In other words, people have a need to believe in a just world where people get what they deserve. Since the belief that the world is just serves an important adaptive function, individuals are very reluctant to give up this belief (Lerner & Miller, 1978).

Individuals who are confronted with an injustice generally will be motivated to restore justice. One way of accomplishing this is by acting to compensate the victim (which is usually difficult or impossible to do). The second method of restoring justice is to blame or derogate an innocent victim by claiming that the victim deserves to suffer. Victims can "deserve" their fate as a consequence of having a bad character or as a consequence of engaging in bad behaviors (Lerner & Miller, 1978).

Much research has documented the belief in a just world effect (Walster, 1966; Lerner & Simmons, 1966; Rubin & Peplau, 1978). Walster (1966) found that blaming others for an uncontrollable event is pervasive especially when the consequences become more severe. However, when the consequences are relatively minor, people can feel compassion for the individual. Lerner (1971) found that those who suffer the most and are the most innocent ("martyrs") are blamed the most for their misfortunes. The greater the suffering and the less deserved the suffering, the greater the likelihood that the victim will be rejected and blamed.

Jones and Aronson (1973) demonstrated that the more respectable the victim is perceived as being the more responsible the victim may be found for her misfortune. In a simulated jury context, a defendant was depicted as having raped or as having attempted to rape a virgin, a

married women, or a divorced women. Pretesting had established that subjects differentiated among these three categories in terms of perceived respectability, with the virgin being perceived as the most respectable and the divorced women being perceived as the least respectable. The results showed that the victim of the rape was seen as more personally responsible when she was either a virgin or a married woman than when she was a divorced woman. Apparently, the knowledge that innocent and highly respectable females can be raped was especially threatening to the subjects' belief that the world is just and to avoid the threat posed by this type of an admission it was necessary to find fault with the victim.

Perhaps in the low blame rape condition where an extreme injustice has occurred, these just world beliefs were brought into focus. Therefore, the men who were more ambivalent toward women to begin with and who were experiencing more emotional tension sought a way to restore justice to this situation and reduce their emotional tension. The way to do this was by blaming the low blame rape victim and empathizing with her less. Because there was no justification in blaming her behavior, the ambivalent men blamed the victim's character. Additionally, because of the nature of the low blame rape condition, the anti attitudinal component may have been made more salient than the pro attitudinal component. The fact that subjects with a higher anti/traditionality score blamed the victims more in the low blame rape condition may indicate that misogynistic men may have a very critical opinion of women and since the women's behavior did not precipitate the rape, they felt that there must be something wrong with her character.

It was also hypothesized that neither the ambivalence nor the pro/equal rights or anti/traditionality scores alone would be correlated with criminal blame in the low blame rape condition. This hypothesis was only partially confirmed. The anti/traditionality score, as hypothesized, was not significantly correlated with criminal blame in this condition. However,

both the subjects' ambivalence scores and pro/equal rights scores were significantly negatively correlated with criminal blame in the low blame rape condition ($-.56$ & $-.45$ respectively). That is, the higher the subjects' ambivalence score or pro/equal rights score, the less likely they were to blame the criminal in the low blame rape condition.

The fact that ambivalent men in the low blame rape condition blamed the rape victim significantly more than men who were less ambivalent, empathized with her less, and blamed the rapist significantly less than men who scored lower on the ambivalence scale may reflect a misogynistic tendency on the part of these men. It is also possible that in a situation in which an "innocent" woman is a victim of a heinous crime, ambivalent men may feel an extraordinary amount of tension. Not only are these men ambivalent about women, but their concept of a just world is also threatened. The low blame rape situation, instead of making the characteristics of the victim more salient (i.e., her respectability and intelligence) resulting in less blame toward the victim and more blame toward the criminal, may have made the injustice more salient resulting in more blame toward the victim and less blame toward the criminal.

The fact that men who scored higher on the profemale/equal rights scale blamed the rapist less is harder to interpret. Perhaps in the low blame rape condition the pro/equal rights scale functioned more as a liberalism scale than as a profemale scale. Men who scored higher on the pro/equal rights scale blamed the criminal less but they did not tend to blame the victim more than men who scored lower on the pro scale. On most of the measures of victim blame, there were no significant correlations between the pro/equal rights score and victim blame. In other words, these men were not simply antifemale. Therefore, men who were more liberal (rather than more profemale) were less punitive toward a criminal offender. These men may have been more reluctant in believing the victim's side of the story without hearing the alleged perpetrator's side of the story.

The second hypothesis predicted that ambivalence would be positively correlated with victim blame and negatively correlated with victim empathy in the high blame rape condition. The results disconfirmed the hypothesis, showing instead that ambivalence was not correlated with victim blame or with victim empathy. As predicted, neither the pro/equal rights nor the anti/traditionality scores alone were correlated with victim blame or with victim empathy. Additionally, as predicted, neither the ambivalence score nor the pro/equal rights or anti/traditionality scores alone were correlated with criminal blame in the high blame rape condition.

Interestingly, none of the correlations between attitude scores and blame or empathy ratings were found to be significant. As discussed earlier, people's definitions and perceptions of rape can vary greatly. At one extreme end of the continuum, some people contend that it is virtually impossible for a woman to be raped against her will; others believe that all coerced sex is rape whether or not the coercion is physical, psychological, or economic (Burt & Albin, 1981). Additionally, the characteristics of the women play a major role in people's appraisal of the rape and the rape victim. Women are blamed more for the rape if they are seen to have any of the following characteristics: being perceived as less "respectable", being less traditional, putting up less physical resistance to the rape, not receiving physical injury, and knowing their assailant (Werner & Rinehart, 1986; Kanaker & Kolsowalla, 1981; Mushlenhard, Friedman, & Thomas, 1985). These are exactly the characteristics and situation of the high blame rape victim in this study.

The victim in the high blame rape condition was a cashier who went to a party, got drunk, and later went back to a strange man's apartment. The woman did not put up any physical resistance to the attack and received no other injuries. Because of the behavior and characteristics of the women in the high blame rape condition, she may not have been perceived

as a "real" victim of rape. Perhaps subjects did not see the situation as a rape situation at all. Therefore, the subjects' attitudes toward women (ambivalent, pro, or anti) had no bearing on their evaluations of the victim and criminal. This conclusion has some validity since it has been demonstrated that males are more responsive to subtle manipulations of the rape situation than are females. Krulowitz (1982) examined the effects of the circumstances of a rape on subjects' perceptions of a rape victim. The results indicated that men perceived a victim assaulted in her home by an acquaintance as being less psychologically upset than a victim who was attacked by a stranger. Furthermore, men attributed less emotional upset to victims of acquaintance rape than did women. Women, on the other hand, did not make a distinction among different rape situations and perceived all the situations as likely to be very upsetting to the victim.

Additionally, the high blame rape scenario is an example of what has been referred to as "date rape". Over the past several years date rape has received significantly more publicity especially concerning the increased reporting of incidences at college campuses throughout the United States. Indeed studies have shown that significant numbers of college men have admitted to using forceful or manipulative tactics in order to have sex with a woman they were dating (Mosher & Anderson, 1986). Furthermore, a rather sizable number of college men indicate that they would be willing to rape a woman if they knew that they would not be caught and punished (Malamuth, 1981; Tieger, 1981). This willingness on the part of college men to state that they would be willing to commit a rape may be due to the fact that many people today see date rape as a common outcome of the dating situation and accept violence in interpersonal relationships. A study by Dull and Giacopessi (1987) found that 44% of college students they interviewed believed that date rape is a common occurrence for those dating.

It is possible that the absence of any significant correlations between attitudes toward women and ratings of the victim and criminal in the high blame rape condition is not only due to the

perception that the victim is not a true victim of rape, but to the acceptance of sexual violence in dating situations. It is unlikely that the male subjects would identify with a man who follows a strange woman into a parking lot and savagely rapes her (low blame rape condition); it is however likely that at least some of the male subjects did identify with a man who "takes advantage of" a drunk woman whom he had just met at a party (high blame rape condition).

The third hypothesis was largely confirmed. The prediction that ambivalent attitudes toward women would not be significantly correlated with victim blame or victim empathy in the low blame robbery condition was indeed confirmed. This finding supports the notion that because robbery is not as affect-laden a crime as rape and not one in which men's ambivalence toward women is manifested (it is not a gender-related crime), ambivalence toward women will not affect men's evaluations of female robbery victims.

The third hypothesis also predicted that neither the pro/equal rights nor the anti/traditionality scores alone would be correlated with victim blame or with victim empathy in the low blame robbery condition. This hypothesis was partially confirmed with the pro/equal rights scale not being found to be significantly correlated with either victim blame or victim empathy. On the other hand while the anti/traditionality score was not found to be significantly correlated with the victim blame composite score, it was significantly positively correlated with the net victim blame score, $r(30) = .41, p < .03$. Additionally, there was a trend for the anti/traditionality score to be negatively correlated with the victim empathy composite score, $r(30) = -.33, p < .07$.

In the low blame robbery condition it was also predicted that neither the ambivalence score nor the pro/equal rights or anti/traditionality scores alone would be correlated with criminal blame. This hypothesis was mostly confirmed with the ambivalence score and the pro/equal rights score being found to be uncorrelated with criminal blame in the low blame robbery

condition. However, there was a trend again for the anti/traditionality score to be negatively correlated with criminal blame, $r(30) = -.33, p < .07$.

Therefore, in the low blame robbery condition the anti/traditionality score was more predictive of attitudes toward victims and criminals, with subjects who scored higher on the anti/traditionality scale tending to show less empathy toward the victim and less blame toward the criminal. In the low blame robbery condition, a woman gets followed out of a bank after having cashed a check and gets hit over the head and is mugged. Like the low blame rape condition, an injustice has occurred to an innocent victim. As discussed earlier, just world feelings may have been brought into focus. A way of resolving an injustice is to blame the victim more (or empathize with her less) and blame the criminal less. Additionally, perhaps men with more hostile attitudes toward women to begin with are very critical of women who are unfortunate victims and will empathize with these victims less than men with less hostile attitudes toward women.

The fourth hypothesis was also largely confirmed. The prediction that ambivalent attitudes toward women would not be correlated with victim blame or with victim empathy in the high blame robbery condition was confirmed. Again, one would not expect ambivalent attitudes toward women to affect evaluations of robbery victims even if they are female robbery victims.

It was also predicted that neither the pro/equal rights nor the anti/traditionality scores alone would be correlated with victim blame or with victim empathy in the high blame robbery condition. This hypothesis was only partially confirmed. The anti/traditionality score, as predicted, was not significantly correlated with either victim blame or victim empathy. Likewise, the pro/equal rights score was not correlated with victim empathy. However, surprisingly the pro/equal rights score was significantly positively correlated with the net victim blame score, $r(30) = .47, p < .01$, and there was a trend for the pro/equal rights score to

be positively correlated with the victim blame composite score in the high blame robbery condition, $r(30) = .35, p < .06$. That is, subjects who scored high on the pro/equal rights scale tended to blame the victim more in the high blame robbery condition. More specifically, those with higher pro/equal rights scores blamed the victim's character and agreed that the victim may have prevented the rape by changing some aspect of her character or personality.

Lastly, it was predicted that neither the ambivalence nor the pro/equal rights or anti/traditionality scores alone would be correlated with criminal blame in the high blame robbery condition. As predicted, ambivalence was not correlated with criminal blame in this condition. Unexpectedly, there was a trend for the pro/equal rights score to be negatively correlated with criminal blame in this condition, $r(30) = -.35, p < .06$. Additionally, the anti/traditionality score was found to be significantly positively correlated with criminal blame in this condition, $r(30) = .48, p < .01$.

Therefore, contrary to the predictions, subjects with higher pro/equal rights scores tended to blame the high blame robbery victim more and tended to blame the robber less in this condition. On the other hand, subjects with a higher anti/traditionality score blamed the criminal significantly more in the high blame robbery condition. In the high blame robbery condition, a rather gullible and greedy woman gets taken in by a conman and her purse gets stolen. The woman tells the officer that the situation sounded "fishy" to her, but the thought of getting half of the money was "so tempting". Perhaps in this condition, the pro/equal rights and anti/traditionality scales functioned more like liberalism and conservatism scales. Therefore, the subjects who scored higher on the pro/equal rights scale may have been more liberal and explored both sides of the story coming to the conclusion that the victim was greedy and culpable for her own victimization. Those subjects who scored higher on the anti/traditionality scale may have been conservatives who viewed criminals, any criminals, in a punitive fashion.

Additionally, measures of blame and empathy were also correlated with the additive score (the standardized total pro minus the standardized total anti score) in each of the conditions, although no predictions were made concerning the nature of these correlations. In both rape conditions, the additive score was not significantly correlated with measures of victim blame, victim empathy, or criminal blame and therefore, was not more effective in predicting evaluations of victims or criminals than were the other scores. However, in the low blame robbery condition the additive score was significantly positively correlated with victim empathy, $r(30) = .38, p < .04$. Additionally, in the high blame robbery condition the additive score was significantly correlated with the net victim blame score, $r(30) = .49, p < .01$, and the criminal blame composite score, $r(30) = -.54, p < .002$.

Concluding Remarks

Although this research examined men's ambivalence toward women and its manifestations in their evaluations of rape victims, perhaps rape is not an adequate domain in which to examine men's ambivalence toward women. Indeed, the results presented here failed to show that ambivalent men will blame a high blame rape victim more and empathize with her less than will men who score lower on ambivalence. Conversely, the results also failed to show that ambivalent men will blame a low blame rape victim less and empathize with her more than will men who score lower on ambivalence.

First when looking at the crime of rape and attitudes toward its victims, we not only see in our attitudes toward rape victims our attitudes toward women but other salient attitudes as well. Attitudes toward rape victims reflect our attitudes toward victims and crime in general as well as our attitudes toward sex and violence. For example, it is possible that a person (male or female) with conservative sexual attitudes will blame a rape victim a good deal. However, this blame need not have a misogynistic origin and may be due to a conservative attitude that frowns

upon sexual activity (even coerced activity) outside the domain of marriage. Additionally, people who are accepting of violence in interpersonal relationships may see nothing wrong in a man exerting a certain amount of force in order to get a woman to have sex with him. While it is true that sexual attitudes and attitudes concerning the acceptance of violence in interpersonal relationships may be somewhat related to attitudes toward women, they are still rather distinct attitudes in their own right. Research would be needed to explore more completely the relationships between these sets of attitudes.

In addition, rape is an extremely effect-laden situation which may conjure up not only sympathetic and hostile attitudes toward the victims and criminals but other attitudes as well. For example, just world beliefs may be brought forth in a situation where an innocent person suffers from an extreme injustice. A person's sense of the world as being a just and orderly place where good things happen to good people and bad things happen to bad people is severely threatened with a situation such as rape.

Further research is needed to explore men's ambivalence toward women in a less conflict producing or threatening domain. An example of such a domain would be women's competence. The area of female competency would be a good area because men may in fact feel conflicted over the accomplishments of women. On the one hand, men may feel that women who achieve despite the barriers that exist are truly worthy and competent, yet they may feel a certain level of threat or resentment toward these women. Extrapolating from the research exploring attitudes toward blacks and the handicapped, one might hypothesize that ambivalent men would evaluate a very competent woman more positively than an equally competent man and ambivalent men would evaluate a woman who was not competent more negatively than they would evaluate an equally incompetent man. These are of course merely speculations and further research is needed to examine them more critically.

Appendix A-- 50 item Attitude Questionnaire

Pro Items- 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14, 16, 17(R), 19, 24(R), 25, 26, 28, 30,
32, 37, 39(R), 41, 43, 44, 45, 48, 50

Anti Items- 3, 6, 9(R), 11, 12, 13, 15(R), 18(R), 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 29,
31(R), 33(R), 34, 35, 36, 38, 40, 42, 46, 47, 49

Note R=Reverse coded

This questionnaire concerns attitudes toward various different issues and is part of a study being done at the City University of New York. This is an anonymous questionnaire so please do not write your name on it. Before reading the statements on the following pages, please answer all of the following questions.

College _____

Major _____

Age _____

Sex _____

How would you describe yourself? (Check one)

_____ Black or Afro-American

_____ Hispanic or Latin American

_____ Oriental or Asian American

_____ White (Non-Hispanic)

_____ Other (Write in) _____

Please read each statement and decide the extent to which you agree or disagree with it.

For example, if you agree strongly, you would write +3 in the margin to the left of the statement, but if you disagree with it a little, you would put -1. Please put only one number (+3, +2, +1, -1, -2, or -3) next to each statement and answer all of the statements.

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| Agree Strongly | +3 |
| Agree Moderately | +2 |
| Agree Slightly | +1 |
| Disagree Slightly | -1 |
| Disagree Moderately | -2 |
| Disagree Strongly | -3 |

- _____ 1. Men and women should be paid the same money if they do work that requires the same training, skills and effort.
- _____ 2. It's surprising that women do as well as they do, considering all the obstacles that they face.
- _____ 3. Women are often their own worst enemies.
- _____ 4. Less media attention is paid to female athletes in comparison to male athletes.
- _____ 5. Television commercials portray women in a stereotypical way.
- _____ 6. It is not a good idea if a woman asks a man out for a date first.
- _____ 7. In general, men are not as tactful as women.
- _____ 8. Most women still cannot rise to positions of power in the business world because of discrimination.
- _____ 9. A woman can live a full and happy life without ever marrying.
- _____ 10. Today women still do not earn as much money as most men do.
- _____ 11. Women are less scientifically oriented than are men.
- _____ 12. A wife should be willing to move if her husband's job involves relocation to a new place.
- _____ 13. Women who do not want at least one child are being selfish.

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| Agree Strongly | +3 |
| Agree Moderately | +2 |
| Agree Slightly | +1 |
| Disagree Slightly | -1 |
| Disagree Moderately | -2 |
| Disagree Strongly | -3 |

- _____ 14. Most men are not as sensitive as women are to the feelings of others.
- _____ 15. Women are not any more neurotic than men.
- _____ 16. Generally speaking, women make better parents than men do.
- _____ 17. No special efforts should be made to recruit women into jobs traditionally held by men.
- _____ 18. Women should not be expected to do the majority of the housework.
- _____ 19. Women do not have the same employment opportunities that men do.
- _____ 20. In their push for equal rights women have become too demanding.
- _____ 21. Most women are not as adventurous as men.
- _____ 22. Women often do not accept the responsibility that goes along with equality.
- _____ 23. A preschool child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works full-time.
- _____ 24. There is too much media attention being paid to the problems that women face.
- _____ 25. Women are more nurturant than men.
- _____ 26. After being held back for so long, women deserve help in catching up.
- _____ 27. Most women are not able to make up their minds easily.
- _____ 28. Most big corporations in America are not really interested in treating their male and female employees equally.
- _____ 29. Today women are not devoting enough time to their families.
- _____ 30. Too many women still lose out on jobs and promotions because they are women.
- _____ 31. Women are every bit as clear thinking as men.
- _____ 32. Women are better than men at expressing tender emotions.

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| Agree Strongly | +3 |
| Agree Moderately | +2 |
| Agree Slightly | +1 |
| Disagree Slightly | -1 |
| Disagree Moderately | -2 |
| Disagree Strongly | -3 |

- _____ 33. It is perfectly acceptable if a husband does not make as much money as his wife.
- _____ 34. Women should be more concerned with becoming good wives and mothers than with desiring a professional career.
- _____ 35. It is probably better for the relationship if the man is more sexually experienced than the woman.
- _____ 36. Women should primarily be held responsible for the use of birth control.
- _____ 37. Movies often depict women in a negative way.
- _____ 38. It is more damaging to a marriage if the wife commits adultery than if the husband commits adultery.
- _____ 39. Women are gaining too much economic power too quickly.
- _____ 40. Because many women are more emotional than men, they are not suitable for certain types of jobs.
- _____ 41. Sometimes female job seekers should be given special consideration in hiring.
- _____ 42. It seems that most women are preoccupied with their physical appearance.
- _____ 43. There should be a female president in the near future.
- _____ 44. Rape victims are not treated fairly by the criminal justice system.
- _____ 45. Portrayals of women in the media are not fair to women.
- _____ 46. Most women are too demanding in their relationships with men.
- _____ 47. Sexually assertive women are threatening to most men.
- _____ 48. Most women who work have a serious purpose in doing so.
- _____ 49. Because women spend too much money, husbands should primarily be responsible for the finances in the family.
- _____ 50. It is likely that an article written by a woman will not be regarded as favorably as a comparable article written by a man.

Appendix B--Revised 29 Item Attitude Questionnaire

Pro Items- 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 11, 16, 18, 20, 23, 25, 26, 29

Anti Items- 5(R), 7, 8, 10(R), 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 27, 28

Note R=Reverse coded

This questionnaire concerns attitudes toward various different issues and is part of a study being done at the City University of New York. This is an anonymous questionnaire so please do not write your name on it. Before reading the statements on the following pages, please answer all of the following questions.

College _____

Major _____

Age _____

Sex _____

How would you describe yourself? (Check one)

_____ Black or Afro-American

_____ Hispanic or Latin American

_____ Oriental or Asian American

_____ White (Non-Hispanic)

_____ Other (Write in) _____

Please read each statement and decide the extent to which you agree or disagree with it.

For example, if you agree strongly, you would write +3 in the margin to the left of the statement, but if you disagree with it a little, you would put -1. Please put only one number (+3, +2, +1, -1, -2, or -3) next to each statement and answer all of the statements.

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| Agree Strongly | +3 |
| Agree Moderately | +2 |
| Agree Slightly | +1 |
| Disagree Slightly | -1 |
| Disagree Moderately | -2 |
| Disagree Strongly | -3 |

- _____ 1. It's surprising that women do as well as they do, considering all the obstacles that they face.
- _____ 2. Less media attention is paid to female athletes in comparison to male athletes.
- _____ 3. Television commercials portray women in a stereotypical way.
- _____ 4. Most women still cannot rise to positions of power in the business world because of discrimination.
- _____ 5. A woman can live a full and happy life without ever marrying.
- _____ 6. Today women still do not earn as much money as most men do.
- _____ 7. A wife should be willing to move if her husband's job involves relocation to a new place.
- _____ 8. Women who do not want at least one child are being selfish.
- _____ 9. Most men are not as sensitive as women are to the feelings of others.
- _____ 10. Women should not be expected to do the majority of the housework.
- _____ 11. Women do not have the same employment opportunities that men do.
- _____ 12. In their push for equal rights women have become too demanding.
- _____ 13. Most women are not as adventurous as men.
- _____ 14. Women often do not accept the responsibility that goes along with equality.

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| Agree Strongly | +3 |
| Agree Moderately | +2 |
| Agree Slightly | +1 |
| Disagree Slightly | -1 |
| Disagree Moderately | -2 |
| Disagree Strongly | -3 |

- _____ 15. A preschool child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works full-time
- _____ 16. After being held back for so long, women deserve help in catching up.
- _____ 17. Most women are not able to make up their minds easily.
- _____ 18. Most big corporations in America are not really interested in treating their male and female employees equally.
- _____ 19. Today women are not devoting enough time to their families.
- _____ 20. Too many women still lose out on jobs and promotions because they are women.
- _____ 21. Women should be more concerned with becoming good wives and mothers than with desiring a professional career.
- _____ 22. It is probably better for the relationship if the man is more sexually experienced than the woman.
- _____ 23. Movies often depict women in a negative way.
- _____ 24. Because many women are more emotional than men, they are not suitable for certain types of jobs.
- _____ 25. Sometimes female job seekers should be given special consideration in hiring.
- _____ 26. Portrayals of women in the media are not fair to women.
- _____ 27. Most women are too demanding in their relationships with men.
- _____ 28. Because women spend too much money, husbands should primarily be responsible for the finances in the family.
- _____ 29. It is likely that an article written by a woman will not be regarded as favorably as a comparable article written by a man.

Appendix C-- Item Analysis for Original Sample

Table 7

Item-Total Scale Correlations for Pro and Anti Items-Original Sample^a

| Item | Item Pro Scale Correlation ^b | Item-Anti Scale Correlation |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| P1. It's surprising that women do as well as they do, considering all the obstacles that they face. | .37*** | .15** |
| P2. Less media attention is paid to female athletes in comparison to male athletes. | .47*** | -.10 |
| P3. Television commercials portray women in a stereotypical way. | .50*** | -.13* |
| P4. Most women still cannot rise to positions of power in the business world because of discrimination. | .58*** | -.13* |
| P5. Today women still do not earn as much money as most men do. | .48*** | -.17** |
| P6. Most men are not as sensitive as women are to the feelings of others. | .36*** | .23*** |
| P7. Women do not have the same employment opportunities that men do. | .63*** | -.13* |
| P8. After being held back for so long, women deserve help in catching up. | .57*** | -.13* |
| P9. Most big corporations in America are not really interested in treating their male and female employees equally. | .55*** | -.03 |
| P10. Too many women still lose out on jobs and promotions because they are women. | .67*** | -.18** |
| P11. Movies often depict women in a negative way. | .56*** | -.01 |

| Item | Item-Pro Scale Correlation | Item-Anti Scale Correlation |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| P12. Sometimes female job seekers should be given special consideration in hiring. | .38*** | .21*** |
| P13. Portrayals of women in the media are not fair to women. | .54*** | -.21*** |
| P14. It is likely that an article written by a woman will not be regarded as favorably as a comparable article written by a man. | .44*** | -.12* |
| A1. A woman can lead a full and happy life without ever marrying. (R) ^c | -.14* | .45*** |
| A2. A wife should be willing to move if her husband's job involves relocation to a new place. | -.15* | .51*** |
| A3. Women who do not want at least one child are being selfish. | -.12 | .60*** |
| A4. Women should not be expected to do the majority of the housework. (R) ^c | -.20*** | .42*** |
| A5. In their push for equal rights women have become too demanding. | -.13* | .65*** |
| A6. Most women are not as adventurous as men. | .06 | .55*** |
| A7. Women often do not accept the responsibility that goes along with equality. | -.03 | .56*** |
| A8. A preschool child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works full-time. | -.05 | .49*** |
| A9. Most women are not able to make up their minds easily | -.09 | .66*** |
| A10. Today women are not devoting enough time to their families. | -.14* | .68*** |

| Item | Item-Pro Scale Correlation | Item-Anti Scale Correlation |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| A11. Women should be more concerned with being good wives and mothers than with desiring a professional career. | -.16** | .70*** |
| A12. It is probably better for the relationship if the man is more sexually experienced than the women. | -.14* | .66*** |
| A13. Because many women are more emotional than men, they are not suitable for certain types of jobs. | -.02 | .67*** |
| A14. Most women are too demanding in their relationships with men. | -.04 | .60*** |
| A15. Because women spend too much money, husbands should primarily be responsible for the finances in the family. | -.19** | .65*** |

Note. "P" refers to Pro items and "A" refers to "Anti" items.

^a n=256

^b Item-scale correlation excludes the item with which it is correlated

^c (R)=Reverse scored items

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$ (all tests are two-tailed)

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

79-80

U·M·I

Appendix E-- Attitude Questionnaire with filler items

Pro items- 3, 7, 8, 9, 14, 20, 25, 34, 38, 42, 49, 53, 54, 62

Anti items- 13(R), 17, 18, 24(R), 26, 28, 30, 33, 35, 41, 46, 47, 52, 58, 59

Note. R=Reverse coded

This questionnaire concerns attitudes toward various different issues and is part of a study being done at the City University of New York. This is an anonymous questionnaire so please do not write your name on it. Before reading the statements on the following pages, please answer all of the following questions.

College _____

Major _____

Age _____

Sex _____

How would you describe yourself? (Check one)

_____ Black or Afro-American

_____ Hispanic or Latin American

_____ Oriental or Asian American

_____ White (Non-Hispanic)

_____ Other (Write in) _____

Please read each statement and decide the extent to which you agree or disagree with it. For example, if you agree strongly, you would write +3 in the margin to the left of the statement, but if you disagree with it a little, you would put -1. Please put only one number (+3, +2, +1, -1, -2, or -3) next to each statement and answer all of the statements.

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| Agree Strongly | +3 |
| Agree Moderately | +2 |
| Agree Slightly | +1 |
| Disagree Slightly | -1 |
| Disagree Moderately | -2 |
| Disagree Strongly | -3 |

- _____ 1. Many teachers don't seem to care about their students.
- _____ 2. Sometimes Hispanic job seekers should be given special consideration in hiring.
- _____ 3. It's surprising that women do as well as they do, considering all the obstacles that they face.
- _____ 4. Liberal democrats are responsible for many of the problems in this country.
- _____ 5. Sometimes Black job seekers should be given special consideration in hiring.
- _____ 6. Many Hispanics have strong bonds with their community and culture.
- _____ 7. Less media attention is paid to female athletes in comparison to male athletes.
- _____ 8. Television commercials portray women in a stereotypical way.
- _____ 9. Most women still cannot rise to positions of power in the business world because of discrimination.
- _____ 10. Because of the care and dedication on the part of doctors, many people's lives have been saved.
- _____ 11. Teachers are very underpaid for the work that they do.
- _____ 12. Too many Blacks still lose out on jobs and promotions because of their skin color.

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| Agree Strongly | +3 |
| Agree Moderately | +2 |
| Agree Slightly | +1 |
| Disagree Slightly | -1 |
| Disagree Moderately | -2 |
| Disagree Strongly | -3 |

- _____ 13. A woman can live a full and happy life without ever marrying.
- _____ 14. Today women still do not earn as much money as most men do.
- _____ 15. Most Blacks have the drive and determination to get ahead.
- _____ 16. Republicans believe that this country needs a strong military.
- _____ 17. A wife should be willing to move if her husband's job involves relocation to a new place.
- _____ 18. Women who do not want at least one child are being selfish.
- _____ 19. The Republican party is primarily the party of rich people.
- _____ 20. Most men are not as sensitive as women are to the feelings of others.
- _____ 21. Asians tend to do better in math and science than do other groups of people.
- _____ 22. Republicans often cut social services that help the poor.
- _____ 23. It is still true that Hispanics are discriminated against.
- _____ 24. Women should not be expected to do the majority of the housework.
- _____ 25. Women do not have the same employment opportunities that men do.
- _____ 26. In their push for equal rights women have become too demanding.
- _____ 27. Black people do not have the same employment opportunities that Whites do.
- _____ 28. Most women are not as adventurous as men.
- _____ 29. Many criminal defense lawyers will say anything to get their clients free.
- _____ 30. Women often do not accept the responsibility that goes along with equality.
- _____ 31. The Democratic party is more representative of the people of this country than is the Republican party.

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| Agree Strongly | +3 |
| Agree Moderately | +2 |
| Agree Slightly | +1 |
| Disagree Slightly | -1 |
| Disagree Moderately | -2 |
| Disagree Strongly | -3 |

- _____32. Most Asians are very hardworking people.
- _____33. A preschool child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works full-time.
- _____34. After being held back for so long, women deserve help in catching up.
- _____35. Most women are not able to make up their minds easily.
- _____36. This country would be better off if it were more willing to utilize the good things in Black culture.
- _____37. Most doctors are honest and hardworking.
- _____38. Most big corporations in America are not really interested in treating their male and female employees equally.
- _____39. Many of the programs of the Democratic party have failed.
- _____40. Democrats are weak when it comes to issues of military defense.
- _____41. Today women are not devoting enough time to their families.
- _____42. Too many women still lose out on jobs and promotions because they are women.
- _____43. Most lawyers in the United States are only concerned about money.
- _____44. Asians have come to this country and through hard work have become very successful.
- _____45. Republicans are often insensitive to the needs of others.
- _____46. Women should be more concerned with becoming good wives and mothers than with desiring a professional career.
- _____47. It's probably better for the relationship if the man is more sexually experienced than the woman.
- _____48. If this country wants a balanced budget, it's more likely to be accomplished by a Republican administration than a Democratic administration.
- _____49. Movies often depict women in a negative way.

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| Agree Strongly | +3 |
| Agree Moderately | +2 |
| Agree Slightly | +1 |
| Disagree Slightly | -1 |
| Disagree Moderately | -2 |
| Disagree Strongly | -3 |

- _____50. Blacks have more to offer than they have been allowed to show.
- _____51. Teachers have a very difficult and demanding job.
- _____52. Because many women are more emotional than men, they are not suitable for certain types of jobs.
- _____53. Sometimes female job seekers should be given special consideration in hiring.
- _____54. Portrayals of women in the media are not fair to women.
- _____55. English speakers should make an effort to learn the Spanish language.
- _____56. Democrats care about the poor people of this country.
- _____57. Lawyers have a very difficult job.
- _____58. Most women are too demanding in their relationships with men.
- _____59. Because women spend too much money, husbands should primarily be responsible for the finances in the family.
- _____60. Many doctors in the United States are only concerned about money.
- _____61. Hispanic Americans have contributed much to American culture.
- _____62. It is likely that an article written by a woman will not be regarded as favorably as a comparable article written by a man.
- _____63. The typical urban ghetto public school is not as good as it should be to provide equal opportunities for Blacks.
- _____64. The large majority of lawyers are honest.

Appendix F-- High blame rape scenario

The following is an excerpt of an account between a woman who alleges that she had been sexually assaulted and the police officer interviewing her.

Officer Hartley: I just have to ask you a few background questions first. I need to know your name and address.

Ms. T. : My name is Nancy T. [Last name deleted]
[Address deleted]

Officer Hartley: What is your date of birth?

Ms. T. : July 16, 1967.

Officer Hartley: What's your occupation?

Ms. T. : I'm a cashier at Alexander's Department Store.

Officer Hartley: Could you please tell me exactly what happened?

Ms. T. : Well, I went to this party to celebrate a friend's birthday. We were sitting around eating and drinking for a couple of hours and I saw this guy who was looking at me. We started talking and he was very friendly. Anyway, we had a couple of more drinks and he told me that he wanted to get some air. So we both stepped out of the apartment for awhile. He told me that he lived only a couple of blocks away on 61st Street and invited me to join him. I wasn't sure at first but he seemed OK so I said yes. When I got there, I sat down on the couch because I felt a little dizzy from all of the drinks I had. Anyway, he became very pushy and nasty. I told him to get away from me, but he insisted that he knew that I wanted him. I told him "NO" and to get away from me. He then pushed me down on the couch and raped me.

Officer Hartley: What's the man's name and address?

Ms. T. : His first name is Steve. I don't know his last name. He lives on West 61st Street. He's in his mid-twenties and has blondish hair with brown eyes. I'd say he was about five foot ten and of average build. The woman who gave the party, Jessica Stewart, knows him. You should contact her.

Officer Hartley: Did you try to resist his attack in any way?
Ms. T. : I couldn't. It happened too quickly and I was sort of drunk.
Officer Hartley: Are there any bruises on your body?
Ms. T. : No, I don't think so.
Officer Hartley: Were you examined by the doctor yet?
Ms. T. : Yes
Officer Hartley: We're through. Is there anything else that you can recall
that may be important?
Ms. T. : No

Appendix G-- Low blame rape scenario

The following is an excerpt of an account between a woman who alleges that she had been sexually assaulted and the police officer interviewing her.

Officer Hartley: I just have to ask you a few background questions first. I need to know your name and address.

Ms. T. : My name is Nancy T. [Last name deleted]
[Address deleted]

Officer Hartley: What is your date of birth?

Ms. T. : July 16, 1967

Officer Hartley: What's your occupation?

Ms. T. : I'm a college student at New York University.

Officer Hartley: Could you please tell me exactly what happened?

Ms. T. : Well, I got out of class at about nine-thirty at night and I was walking to the parking lot. It's dangerous around that area at night and I always walk to the parking lot with someone from class. But I stupidly didn't that night. Anyway, as I was walking I thought that I heard footsteps behind me and I turned around but nobody was there. My God... It happened all of a sudden. Just as I approached my car, a man grabbed me from behind and put his hand over my mouth and held a knife to my throat and told me to shut up and not to scream. I tried to push his hand away from my throat and get away. He was much stronger than me and he pulled my arm away and cut my arm with his knife. I kept thinking he's going to kill me... he's going to kill me. He then threw me into my car. My head hit the steering wheel and I could not move. He then raped me. I was sort of dazed for awhile afterward but I managed to cry out for help and a woman saw me lying there and I believe she called the police.

Officer Hartley: Did you recognize this man?

Ms. T. : No. I never saw him before in my life.

Officer Hartley: Can you describe him?

Ms. T. : Yes, a little. He was in his mid-twenties and had blondish hair with brown eyes. I'd say he was about five foot ten and of average build.

Officer Hartley: Did you try to resist his attack in any way?

Ms. T. : Yes, as I told you before I tried to push his hand away from my throat and get away. He was very strong and he yanked my hand away and cut my arm with his knife.

Officer Hartley: Are there any bruises on your body in addition to your arm?

Ms. T. : Yes, there's a big black and blue mark on my head where my head hit the steering wheel. Also, there are bruises on my neck and shoulders.

Officer Hartley: Were you examined by the doctor yet?

Ms. T. : Yes

Officer Hartley: We're through. Is there anything else that you can recall that may be important?

Ms. T. : No

Appendix H-- High blame robbery scenario

The following is an excerpt of an account between a woman who alleges that she had been robbed and the police officer interviewing her.

Officer Hartley: I just have to ask you a few background questions first.
I need to know your name and address.

Ms. T. : My name is Nancy T. [Last name deleted]
[Address deleted]

Officer Hartley: What is your date of birth?

Ms. T. : July 16, 1967

Officer Hartley: What's your occupation?

Ms. T. : I'm a cashier at Alexander's Department Store.

Officer Hartley: Could you please tell me exactly what happened?

Ms. T. : I was waiting for the number six train at Grand Central Station. This guy approached me and told me that he had found a bag full of money- a lot of money and that he wasn't sure whether to go to the police because there was no identification on the bag. He then decided that he should try to find a cop in the subway station and asked me to hold the bag. If he couldn't find a cop in a few minutes he said he would come back and we would split the money. I should have known that this sounds very fishy but the thought of getting half the money was so tempting. While he handed me the brown bag, I put down my purse. Anyway, after he left I looked in the bag and just saw little bits of newspaper and no money. I then realized that I didn't know what happened to my pocketbook. It wasn't on the floor where I had left it. It then dawned on me that the jerk must have stolen my bag. I still can't believe that I was taken in by his story.

Officer Hartley: Did you recognize this man?

Ms. T. : No. I usually wait at the station at that spot when I come home from work and I never saw him there before.

Officer Hartley: Can you describe him?

Ms. T. : Yes, a little. He was in his mid-twenties and had blondish hair with brown eyes. I'd say he was about five foot ten and of average build.

Officer Hartley: Did he physically hurt you in any way?

Ms. T. : No

Officer Hartley: We're through. Is there anything else that you can recall that may be important?

Ms. T. : No

Appendix I-- Low blame robbery scenario

The following is an excerpt of an account between a woman who alleges that she had been robbed and the police officer interviewing her.

Officer Hartley: I just have a few background questions first.
I need to know your name and address.

Ms. T. : My name is Nancy T. [Last name deleted]
[Address deleted]

Officer Hartley: What is your date of birth?

Ms. T. : July 16, 1967.

Officer Hartley: What's your occupation?

Ms. T. : I'm a college student at New York University.

Officer Hartley: Could you please tell me exactly what happened?

Ms. T. : Yes. I went to the bank to cash a check I received.
When the bank teller handed the money to me,
I figured that I better double check and count it. Well,
I moved over so that she could serve the next person on
line and I counted my money. I then counted the
money that I had just cashed. I guess that I
shouldn't have counted the money out in the open like
I did but I was in a hurry. When I finished counting, I
noticed that a man waiting at the end of the line was
staring at me. I left the bank and started crossing the
street. Just when I was crossing the street, someone
knocked me to the ground and stole my purse. I felt
very sick and dizzy when I fell to the ground but I did
get a chance to see that the man who was running away
was the same man who was staring at me in the bank.
I guess he saw me cash my check and followed me.

Officer Hartley: Did you recognize this man?

Ms. T. : No. He was a stranger.

Officer Hartley: Can you describe him?

Ms. T. : Yes, a little. He was in his mid-twenties and had blondish
hair with brown eyes. I'd say he was about five foot ten

and of average build.

Officer Hartley: Did he physically hurt you in any way?

Ms. T. : Yes, he hit me with his fist on the side of my head and I fell to the ground. I still have a great deal of pain from the blow. Also when I fell I bruised my knees badly.

Officer Hartley: We're through. Is there anything else that you can recall that may be important?

Ms. T. : No.

Appendix J-- Rape dependent measure

| | |
|--|------------|
| General victim blame item- | 1 |
| Characterological victim blame items- | 3, 7 |
| Behavioral victim blame items- | 6, 8 |
| General criminal blame item- | 2 |
| Characterological criminal blame item- | 4 |
| Behavioral criminal blame item- | 5 |
| Victim empathy items- | 11, 12, 13 |
| Manipulation check items- | 9, 10 |

Please read each statement and decide the extent to which you agree or disagree with it based on the excerpt that you have just read. For example, if you agree strongly, you would write +3 in the margin to the left of the statement, but if you disagree with it a little, you would put -1. Please put only one number (+3, +2, +1, -1, -2, or -3) next to each statement and answer all of the statements.

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| Agree Strongly | +3 |
| Agree Moderately | +2 |
| Agree Slightly | +1 |
| Disagree Slightly | -1 |
| Disagree Moderately | -2 |
| Disagree Strongly | -3 |

- _____ 1. The victim is at least partially responsible for what happened to her.
- _____ 2. The rapist should be given the maximum jail sentence if caught and convicted.
- _____ 3. The victim may have prevented the rape by changing some aspect of her character or personality.
- _____ 4. The rapist is a cold-blooded criminal.
- _____ 5. The rapist behaved in a reckless way.
- _____ 6. The victim may have prevented the rape by changing some aspect of her behavior.
- _____ 7. The victim is a somewhat careless person.
- _____ 8. The victim should have known better than to behave as she did.
- _____ 9. The victim seems like an intelligent person.
- _____ 10. The victim seems like a very respectable person.
- _____ 11. I feel sympathy for the victim.
- _____ 12. The victim deserves all the help and understanding that she can get.
- _____ 13. The victim did not deserve what happened to her.

Appendix K-- Robbery dependent measure

| | |
|--|------------|
| General victim blame item- | 1 |
| Characterological victim blame items- | 3, 7 |
| Behavioral victim blame items- | 6, 8 |
| General criminal blame item- | 2 |
| Characterological criminal blame item- | 4 |
| Behavioral criminal blame item- | 5 |
| Victim empathy items- | 11, 12, 13 |
| Manipulation check items- | 9, 10 |

Please read each statement and decide the extent to which you agree or disagree with it based on the excerpt that you have just read. For example, if you agree strongly, you would write +3 in the margin to the left of the statement, but if you disagree with it a little, you would put -1. Please put only one number (+3, +2, +1, -1, -2, or -3) next to each statement and answer all of the statements.

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| Agree Strongly | +3 |
| Agree Moderately | +2 |
| Agree Slightly | +1 |
| Disagree Slightly | -1 |
| Disagree Moderately | -2 |
| Disagree Strongly | -3 |

- _____ 1. The victim is at least partially responsible for what happened to her.
- _____ 2. The robber should be given the maximum jail sentence if caught and convicted.
- _____ 3. The victim may have prevented the robbery by changing some aspect of her character or personality.
- _____ 4. The robber is a cold-blooded criminal.
- _____ 5. The robber behaved in a reckless way.
- _____ 6. The victim may have prevented the robbery by changing some aspect of her behavior.
- _____ 7. The victim is a somewhat careless person.
- _____ 8. The victim should have known better than to behave as she did.
- _____ 9. The victim seems like an intelligent person.
- _____ 10. The victim seems like a very respectable person.
- _____ 11. I feel sympathy for the victim.
- _____ 12. The victim deserves all the help and understanding that she can get.
- _____ 13. The victim did not deserve what happened to her.

Appendix L -- Item Analysis for Experimental Sample

Table 8

Item-Total Scale Correlations for Pro and Anti Items-Experimental Sample^a

| Item | Item Pro Scale Correlation ^b | Item-Anti Scale Correlation |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| P1. It's surprising that women do as well as they do, considering all the obstacles that they face. | .04 | -.03 |
| P2. Less media attention is paid to female athletes in comparison to male athletes. | .16 | -.27 |
| P3. Television commercials portray women in a stereotypical way. | .57*** | -.04 |
| P4. Most women still cannot rise to positions of power in the business world because of discrimination. | .49** | -.19 |
| P5. Today women still do not earn as much money as most men do. | .06 | -.33 |
| P6. Most men are not as sensitive as women are to the feelings of others. | .51** | -.02 |
| P7. Women do not have the same employment opportunities that men do. | .44* | -.31 |
| P8. After being held back for so long, women deserve help in catching up. | .32 | .23 |
| P9. Most big corporations in America are not really interested in treating their male and female employees equally. | .45** | .05 |
| P10. Too many women still lose out on jobs and promotions because they are women. | .37* | -.02 |
| P11. Movies often depict women in a negative way. | .51** | .13 |

| Item | Item-Pro Scale Correlation | Item-Anti Scale Correlation |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| P 12. Sometimes female job seekers should be given special consideration in hiring. | .32 | .34 |
| P 13. Portrayals of women in the media are not fair to women. | .62*** | -.09 |
| P 14. It is likely that an article written by a woman will not be regarded as favorably as a comparable article written by a man. | .53** | .34 |
| A1. A woman can lead a full and happy life without ever marrying. (R) ^c | .02 | .61*** |
| A2. A wife should be willing to move if her husband's job involves relocation to a new place. | -.02 | .49** |
| A3. Women who do not want at least one child are being selfish. | .10 | .49** |
| A4. Women should not be expected to do the majority of the housework. (R) ^c | -.27 | .42* |
| A5. In their push for equal rights women have become too demanding. | -.31 | .52** |
| A6. Most women are not as adventurous as men. | .04 | .41* |
| A7. Women often do not accept the responsibility that goes along with equality. | .14 | .41* |
| A8. A preschool child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works full-time. | .27 | .58*** |
| A9. Most women are not able to make up their minds easily | -.01 | .36* |
| A10. Today women are not devoting enough time to their families. | .01 | .72*** |

| Item | Item-Pro Scale Correlation | Item-Anti Scale Correlation |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| A11. Women should be more concerned with being good wives and mothers than with desiring a professional career. | -.17 | .68*** |
| A12. It is probably better for the relationship if the man is more sexually experienced than the woman. | .09 | .50** |
| A13. Because many women are more emotional than men, they are not suitable for certain types of jobs. | .13 | .64*** |
| A14. Most women are too demanding in their relationships with men. | -.17 | .64*** |
| A15. Because women spend too much money, husbands should primarily be responsible for the finances in the family. | -.03 | .39* |

Note. "P" refers to Pro items and "A" refers to "Anti" items.

^a n=120

^b Item-scale correlation excludes the item with which it is correlated

^c (R)=Reverse scored items

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$ (all tests are two-tailed)

Appendix M-- Low Blame Rape Intercorrelations for Scales and Composite and Net Ratings

Table 9

Low Blame Rape Intercorrelations for Scales and Composite and Net Ratings^a

| Blame & Empathy Ratings | Victim Blame Composite Score | Victim Empathy Composite Score | Criminal Blame Composite Score | Net Victim Blame | Ambivalence Score | Pro Score | Anti Score | (Pro-Anti) Score |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|------------------|
| Victim Blame Composite Score | 1.00 | -.17 | -.33* | .81*** | .40** | .11 | .42** | -.22 |
| Victim Empathy Composite Score | | 1.00 | .35* | -.32* | -.19 | -.01 | -.25 | .17 |
| Criminal Blame Composite Score | | | 1.00 | -.81*** | -.56*** | -.45*** | -.27 | -.13 |
| Net Victim Blame | | | | 1.00 | .59*** | .34* | .43** | -.06 |
| Ambivalence Score | | | | | 1.00 | .67*** | .71*** | -.03 |
| Pro Score | | | | | | 1.00 | -.02 | .71*** |
| Anti Score | | | | | | | 1.00 | -.71*** |
| Pro-Anti Score | | | | | | | | 1.00 |

Note. ^an=30

*p<.10; **p<.05; ***p<.01 (all tests are two-tailed)

Appendix N-- High Blame Rape Intercorrelations for Scales and Composite and Net Ratings

Table 10

High Blame Rape Intercorrelations for Scales and Composite and Net Ratings^o

| Blame & Empathy Ratings | Victim Blame Composite Score | Victim Empathy Composite Score | Criminal Blame Composite Score | Net Victim Blame | Ambivalence Score | Pro Score | Anti Score | (Pro-Anti) Score |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|------------------|
| Victim Blame Composite Score | 1.00 | -.10 | .15 | .65*** | .04 | .06 | -.01 | .04 |
| Victim Empathy Composite Score | | 1.00 | .35* | -.34* | -.14 | .02 | -.13 | .09 |
| Criminal Blame Composite Score | | | 1.00 | -.65*** | .20 | .05 | .11 | -.04 |
| Net Victim Blame | | | | 1.00 | -.12 | .01 | -.09 | .06 |
| Ambivalence Score | | | | | 1.00 | .48*** | .43** | .03 |
| Pro Score | | | | | | 1.00 | -.57*** | .89*** |
| Anti Score | | | | | | | 1.00 | -.89*** |
| Pro-Anti Score | | | | | | | | 1.00 |

Note. ^on=30

*p<.10; **p<.05; ***p<.01 (all tests are two-tailed)

Appendix O-- Low Blame Robbery Intercorrelations for Scales and Composite and Net Ratings

Table 11

Low Blame Robbery Intercorrelations for Scales and Composite and Net Ratings^a

| Blame & Empathy Ratings | Victim Blame Composite Score | Victim Empathy Composite Score | Criminal Blame Composite Score | Net Victim Blame | Ambivalence Score | Pro Score | Anti Score | (Pro-Anti) Score |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|------------------|
| Victim Blame Composite Score | 1.00 | -.32* | .04 | .69*** | .11 | -.09 | .24 | -.21 |
| Victim Empathy Composite Score | | 1.00 | .31* | -.46*** | -.06 | .25 | -.33* | .38** |
| Criminal Blame Composite Score | | | 1.00 | -.69*** | -.20 | .05 | -.33* | .25 |
| Net Victim Blame | | | | 1.00 | .23 | -.10 | .41** | -.33* |
| Ambivalence Score | | | | | 1.00 | .66*** | .58*** | .05 |
| Pro Score | | | | | | 1.00 | -.21 | .78*** |
| Anti Score | | | | | | | 1.00 | -.78*** |
| Pro-Anti Score | | | | | | | | 1.00 |

Note. ^an=30

*p<.10; **p<.05; ***p<.01 (all tests are two-tailed)

Appendix P-- High Blame Robbery Intercorrelations for Scales and Composite and Net Ratings

Table 12

High Blame Robbery Intercorrelations for Scales and Composite and Net Ratings^a

| Blame & Empathy Ratings | Victim Blame Composite Score | Victim Empathy Composite Score | Criminal Blame Composite Score | Net Victim Blame | Ambivalence Score | Pro Score | Anti Score | (Pro-Anti) Score |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|------------------|
| Victim Blame Composite Score | 1.00 | -.18 | -.13 | .75*** | .27 | .35* | .06 | .19 |
| Victim Empathy Composite Score | | 1.00 | .03 | -.14 | .03 | .17 | -.20 | .24 |
| Criminal Blame Composite Score | | | 1.00 | -.75*** | .10 | -.35* | .48*** | -.54*** |
| Net Victim Blame | | | | 1.00 | .11 | .47*** | -.28 | .49*** |
| Ambivalence Score | | | | | 1.00 | .62*** | .64*** | -.01 |
| Pro Score | | | | | | 1.00 | -.20 | .77*** |
| Anti Score | | | | | | | 1.00 | -.77*** |
| Pro-Anti Score | | | | | | | | 1.00 |

Note. ^an=30

*p<.10; **p<.05; ***p<.01 (all tests are two-tailed)

References

- Adams, J., Lawrence, F., & Cook, S. (1979). Analyzing stereotypes of women in the work force. Sex Roles, 5, 581-584.
- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J. & Sanford, R.N. (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York: Norton Company.
- Ashmore, R. & DelBoca, F. (1976). Psychological approaches to understanding intergroup conflict. In P. Katz (Ed.), Towards the elimination of racism. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Ashmore, R. & DelBoca, F. (1981). Conceptual approaches to stereotypes and stereotyping. In D.L. Hamilton (Ed.). Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior. New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Bailey, J.W. (1988). Attitudes about disabled people and evaluations of a disabled or nondisabled task partner after success or failure. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, City University, New York.
- Benson, P. & Vincent, S. (1980). Development and validation of the Sexist Attitudes Toward Women Scale (SATWS). Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5, 276-291.
- Bigness, W. (1976). Effect of applicant's sex, race, and performance on employer's performance ratings: Some additional findings. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 80-84.
- Broverman, I., Vogel, S., Broverman, D., Clarkson, F., & Rosenkrantz, P. (1972). Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 28, 59-78.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). Against our will: Men, women and rape. New York: Bantam Books.
- Burt, M. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 217-230.
- Burt, M. & Albin, R. (1981). Rape myths, rape definitions, and probability of conviction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 11, 212-230.
- Carver, C., Glass, D., Synder, M. & Katz, I. (1977). Favorable evaluations of stigmatized others. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3, 232-235.
- Cicone, M. & Ruble, D. (1978). Beliefs about males. Journal of Social Issues, 34, 5-16.
- Cohen, C. (1981). Person categories and social perception: Testing the boundaries of the processing effects of prior knowledge. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 441-452.
- Cooper, V.W. (1985). Women in popular music: A quantitative analysis of feminine images over time. Sex Roles, 13, 499-506.

- Crosby, F. & Herek, G. (1986). Male sympathy with the situation of women: Does personal experience make a difference? Journal of Social Issues, 42, 55-66.
- Darley, J. & Gross, P. (1983). A hypothesis-confirming bias in labeling effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 20-33.
- Deitz, S., Blackwell, K., Deley, P. & Bentley, B. (1982). Measurement of empathy toward rape victims and rapists. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 372-384.
- Deitz, S., Littman, M., & Bentley, B. (1984). Attribution of responsibility for rape: The influence of observer empathy, victim resistance, and victim attractiveness. Sex Roles, 10, 261-280.
- Denmark, F., Shaw, J. & Ciall, S. (1985). The relationship among sex roles, living arrangements, and the division of household responsibilities. Sex Roles, 12, 617-625.
- Dienstbier, R. (1970). Positive and negative prejudice: Interactions of prejudice with race and social desirability. Journal of Personality, 38, 198-215.
- Dipboye, R., Arvey, R. & Terpstra, D. (1977). Sex and physical attractiveness of raters and applicants as determinants of resume evaluations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 288-294.
- Dipboye, R., Fromkin, H., & Wiback, K. (1975). Relative importance of applicant sex, attractiveness, and scholastic standing in evaluations of job applicant resumes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 39-43.
- Dull, R.T., & Giacomessi, D. (1987). Demographic correlates of sexual and dating attitudes: A study of date rape. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 14(2), 175-193.
- Feather, N.T. (1984). Protestant Ethic, conservatism, and values. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 1132-1141.
- Feild, H. (1978). Attitudes toward rape: A comparative analysis of police, rapists, crisis counselors, and citizens. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 156-179.
- Fiske, S. & Taylor, S. (1984). Social cognition. Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Freud, S. (1920). Introductory lectures on Psychoanalysis. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Gelambos, N., Peterson, A., Richards, M. & Gitelson, I. (1985). The Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWSA): A study of reliability and validity. Sex Roles, 5, 343-356.
- Gergen, K. & Jones, E. (1963). Mental illness, predictability, and effective consequence as stimulus factors in person perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67, 95-104.

- Giaccopassi, D. & Dull, T. (1986). Gender and racial differences in the acceptance of rape myths within a college population. Sex Roles, 15, 63-75.
- Gilbert, L., & Deutsch, C. & Strahan, R. (1978). Feminine and masculine dimensions of the typical, desirable, and ideal women and men. Sex Roles, 4, 767-778.
- Hall, E., Howard, J. & Boezio, S. (1986). Tolerance of rape: A sexist or antisocial attitude. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 10, 101-118.
- Harari, H., Harari, O. & White, R. (1985). The reaction to rape by American male bystanders. Journal of Social Psychology, 125, 653-658.
- Hess, R. G., Katz, I., Rizzo, N., & Bailey, J. (in press). Cross-racial appraisal as related to attitude ambivalence and cognitive complexity. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin.
- Hunter, J. (1976). Images of women. Journal of Social Issues, 32, 7-17.
- Jones, C. & Aronson, E. (1973). Attribution of fault to a rape victim as a function of respectability of the victim. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 26, 415-419.
- Jones, E. (1979). The rocky road from acts to dispositions. American Psychologist, 34, 107-117.
- Jones, E. & Nisbett, R. (1971). The actor and the observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of behavior. New Jersey: General Learning Press.
- Jones, R. (1982). Perceiving other people: Stereotyping as a process of social cognition. In A.G. Miller (Ed.), In the eye of the beholder: Contemporary issues in stereotyping. New York: Praeger Press.
- Kanekar, S. & Kolsawalla, M. (1981). Factors affecting responsibility attributed to a rape victim. Journal of Social Psychology, 113, 285-286.
- Katz, I., Glass, D., & Cohen, S. (1973). Ambivalence, guilt, and the scapegoating of minority group victims. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9, 423-436.
- Katz, I., Glass, D., Lucido, D., & Farber, J. (1977). Ambivalence, guilt, and the denigration of a physically handicapped victim. Journal of Personality, 45, 419-429.
- Katz, I., Glass, D. Lucido, D. & Farber, J. (1979). Harm-doing and victim's racial or orthopedic stigma as determinants of helping behavior. Journal of Personality, 47, 340-364.
- Katz, I. & Hess, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 893-905.

- Katz, I., Hass, R.G., & Wackenhut, J. (1986). Racial ambivalence, value duality, and behavior. In J.F. Dovidio & S.L. Gaertner (Eds.), Prejudice, discrimination and racism. New York: Academic Press.
- Kellerman, J. & Katz, E. (1978). Attitudes toward the division of child-rearing responsibility. Sex Roles, 4, 505-512.
- Kelley, H., Bersheid, E., Christensen, A., Harvey, H., Huston, T., & Levinger, G. (1983). Close relationships. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Kerlinger, F. (1984). Liberalism and conservatism: the nature and structure of social attitudes. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kinder, D. (1986). The continuing American dilemma: White resistance to racial change 40 years after Myrdal. Journal of Social Issues, 42, 151-171.
- Kinder, D. & Sears, D. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 414-431.
- Krulowitz, J. (1982). Reactions to rape victims: Effects of rape circumstances, victim's emotional response, and sex of helper. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29, 645-654.
- Lerner, M.J. (1971). Observer's evaluation of a victim: Justice, guilt, and verdictal perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 20, 127-135.
- Lerner, M.J. & Miller, D.T. (1978). Just world research and the attribution process: Looking back and ahead. Psychological Bulletin, 85, 1030-1051.
- Lerner, M.J. & Simmons, C.H. (1966). Observers' reactions to the innocent victim: Compassion or rejection? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 203-210.
- Lipset, S.M. (1963). The first new nation. New York: Basic Books.
- Malamuth, N. (1981). Rape proclivity among males. Journal of Social Issues, 37, 138-157.
- Mason, K., Czajka, J., & Arber, S. (1976). Change in women's sex-role attitudes, 1964-1974. American Sociological Review, 41, 573-596.
- Massengill, D. & DeMarco, N. (1979). Sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics: A current replication. Sex Roles, 5, 561-570.
- McConahay, J. & Hough, J. (1976). Symbolic racism. Journal of Social Issues, 32, 23-45.
- McDonald, A. P. (1972). More on the Protestant Ethic. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 39, 116-122.
- Miller, A. G. (1981). Historical and contemporary perspectives on stereotyping. In A. G. Miller (Ed.), In the eye of the beholder: Contemporary issues in stereotyping. New York: Praeger Press.

- Mosher, D. & Anderson, R. (1986). Macho personality, sexual aggression, and reactions to guided imagery of realistic rape. Journal of Research in Personality, 20, 77-94.
- Muehlenhard, D., Friedman, D., & Thomas, C. (1985). Is date rape justifiable? The effects of dating activity, who initiated, who paid, and men's attitude toward women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9, 297-310.
- Nyquist, L., Slivken, K. Spence, S., & Helmreich, R. (1985). Household responsibilities in middle class couples: The contribution of demographic and personality variables. Sex Roles, 12, 15-34.
- Petro, C.S. & Putnam, B. (1979). Sex-role stereotypes: Issues of attitudinal changes. Sex Roles, 5, 29-39.
- Pettigrew, T. (1981). Extending the stereotype concept. In D.L. Hamilton (Ed.), Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior. New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Pleck, J. (1976). The male sex role: Definitions, problems, and sources of change. Journal of Social Issues, 32, 155-164.
- Rambo, W. (1972). Measurement of broad spectrum social attitudes. Liberalism-conservatism. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 35, 463-477.
- Rosen, B. & Jerdee, T. (1978). Perceived sex differences in managerially relevant characteristics. Sex Roles, 4, 837-843.
- Rubin, Z., & Peplau, A. (1973). Belief in a just world and reactions to another's lot: A study of participants in the national draft lottery. Journal of Social Issues, 29, 73-93.
- Ruble, T. (1983). Sex stereotypes: Issues of change in the 1970's. Sex Roles, 2, 397-402.
- Ruble, T., Cohen, R., & Ruble, D. (1984). Sex stereotypes: Occupational barriers for women. American Behavioral Scientist, 27, 339-357.
- Ruble, T. & Ruble, D. (1982). Sex stereotypes. In A.G. Miller (Ed.), In the eye of the beholder: Contemporary issues in stereotyping. New York: Praeger Press.
- Schein, V. E. (1976). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. In F. L. Denmark (Ed.), Women: Volume I APDI research reference work. New York: Psychological Dimensions.
- Shaver, K.G. (1970). Defensive attribution: Effects of severity and relevance on the responsibility assigned for an accident. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 14, 101-113.
- Smith, E. & Kluegel, J. (1984). Beliefs and attitudes about women's opportunity: Comparisons with beliefs about blacks and a general perspective. Social Psychology Quarterly, 47, 81-95.

- Spence, J., Helmreich, R. & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale. Bulletin of Psychology, 2, 219-220.
- Tovris, C. (1973). Who likes women's liberation and why: The case of the unliberated liberals. Journal of Social Issues, 29, 175-198.
- Thom, C. (1983). The human nature of social discomfort: Alienation, anomie, ambivalence. New Jersey: Rowman Publications.
- Tieger, T. (1981). Self-rated likelihood of raping and the social perception of rape. Journal of Research in Personality, 15, 147-148.
- Vandusen, R. & Sheldon, E.B. (1976). The changing status of American women. American Psychologist, 31, 106-116.
- Walster, E. (1966). Assignment of responsibility for an accident. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 73-79.
- Weiner, R. & Rinehart, N. (1986). Psychological causality in the attribution of responsibility for rape. Sex Roles, 14, 369-383.
- Werner, P. & LaRussa, G. (1985). Persistence and change in sex-role stereotypes. Sex Roles, 12, 1089-1100.
- Wilson, G. (1973). The psychology of conservatism. New York: Academic Press.
- Wilson, G. & Patterson, J. (1968). A new measure of conservatism. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 7, 264-269.